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Abstract

Individuals are key determinants of the success or failure of an organizational change process (Youssef, 2000). Hence change agents are more and more required to improve their ability to obtain employees’ support for change (Choi, 2011). This study was aimed at discovering determinants that can enhance such individual attitudes towards organizational change. Three groups of concepts were proposed to be related to an individual’s attitude towards organizational change; personality traits, social influence and organizational change characteristics. In accordance with discussions in the literature, attitude towards organizational change is treated as a multidimensional construct consisting of attitude towards specific change and attitude towards change in general. The study aimed at answering the following research question:

‘To what extent do organizational change characteristics, social influence and personality traits influence an individual’s attitude towards organizational change?’

This quantitative study was conducted in a commercial IT consultancy multinational in the Netherlands. This company has been subject to an acquisition and recently underwent major changes to adjust to the new mother company. All employees in the organization were therefore obliged to change. Over a 1000 employees from this company received a questionnaire to which 317 responded. Based on the analysis of the obtained data it was found that there is indeed a difference between the two dimensions of attitude towards organizational change. Despite the differences the model as proposed in the current study is very well applicable to all three attitude towards change constructs.

Furthermore a number of interviews were held to gain a deeper insight in how an organization can implement change more successfully. Key points from these interviews were the need for involvement in the change process and clear and honest communication during the change.

The results of this study suggest that the organizational change characteristics and social influence as derived from the Technology Acceptance field are very well applicable to organizational change contexts. The combination of constructs on three levels is able to (partly) explain an individual’s attitude towards organizational change, as well as attitudes towards specific and general change. For change agents this means that, with the exception of the personality characteristics, there are opportunities to enhance an individual’s attitude towards organizational change through 1) increasing performance expectancy, 2) lowering the effort expectancy, 3) increase the availability of support and 4) support information exchange among peers as well as between managers and their employees.
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1. Introduction

We live in an era of rapid and continuous change and no end is in sight. Every organization has to deal with the demands of its (changing) environment, forcing the organizations to change accordingly in order to survive (Caplow, 1983; Beer, Eisenstat, & Spector, 1990; Wischnevsky & Damanpour, 2008). This is not easy:

Research In Motion has put its first BlackBerry on the market in 1999, however the company failed to change according to the changing demands of its customers after the introduction of the first touchscreen smartphone by Apple in 2007. BlackBerry stuck to its keyboard and missed the shift to the now so popular smartphones. In August of last year, BlackBerry’s stock value had dropped from $84 billion in 2008 to $5 billion in 2013, the organization fired 40% of its employees and had a quarterly loss of $1 billion (Kastelijn, 2013). DSM in contrast, founded in 1902 as a Dutch state owned coalmining company, was able to diversify in such a way that it survived the closure of the mines in the Netherlands and is now an international listed company (Koninklijke DSM N.V., n.d.).

Research In Motion is not alone in its inability to change. Even though there are no official numbers, researchers estimate that at least two-third of the change initiatives fail (Choi, 2011). Research from the last decades suggests that most of these change projects fail due to the underestimation of the central role that individuals play in this process (Greenhalgh, Robert, MacFarlane, Bate, & Kyriakidou, 2004). Individuals, the employees of the organization, in fact play this crucial role because the change is often targeted at them. For these employees however organizational change can work distressing and cause conflicts of interest or feelings of insecurity as well as loss of control (Robertson, Roberts, & Porras, 1993; Greenwood & Hinnings, 1996). These feelings eventually may lead to stress, a decrease in job satisfaction or resistance (Balogun & Johnson, 2005; Brown & Cregan, 2008; McConnell, 2010). These undesired effects should not be underestimated since employees can solely determine the success or failure of an organizational change process (Yousef, 2000). Consequently, individual attitudes towards change play a significant role in the successful completion of an organizational change process (Tannenbaum, 1971; Giessner, 2011).

Not only practitioners pay too little attention to the individual in a change process. Scholars have largely neglected individual characteristics likewise, hence there is a scarcity of studies on the human aspects of change (Vakola, Tsaousis, & Nikolaou, 2004; Bareil, Savoie, & Meunier, 2007). Studies on organizational change that did include individual characteristics have identified personality traits that seem to influence
individual attitudes towards organizational change (Bareil et al., 2007). However, more often it is argued that personality traits do not determine an attitude towards change, but rather the individual’s belief about the necessity and the potential success of the change (Lewin, 1951).

This points out were two streams of research can be brought together; these so-called change characteristics have been extensively analysed and discussed in literature (e.g. Rogers, 1955). Nevertheless, a majority of these models represents relations between attitude towards change and change characteristics in a technological innovation context (e.g. Moore & Benbasat, 1991; Zhou, Lu & Wang, 2010). In addition to the change characteristics, some of these technology acceptance models include social influence as it is suggested that individuals are likely to adhere to others. Individuals do so because they are influenced by the perception of how they will be viewed by others if they do or do not adopt an innovation (Venkatesh, Morris, Davis, & Davis, 2003).

These theories have been applied across industries and countries to explain attitudes towards technological innovation (Svensen, Neset, & Eriksen, 2007), yet to my knowledge these models have not been applied to explain attitudes towards organizational change. The integration of the two streams of research can broaden the understanding of an individual’s attitude towards organizational change. The change characteristics are then applied to an organizational change setting rather than to a technological innovation context. This is possible due to the similarities in the definition of both the organizational change and innovation concepts. An innovation is defined as an object, practice or an idea that is new to the individual it is aimed at (Rogers, 2001), while change is defined as “an act or process through which something becomes different” (Oxford Dictionaries, n.d.). An organizational change therefore involves practices or ideas that are new to the employees they are aimed at.

In an attempt to combine these two fields of study and to further explore determinants of an individual’s attitude towards change, this research studies the relation between personality traits, organizational change characteristics and social influence in an organizational change context. This deductive research was conducted in a multinational commercial company in the Netherlands based on the following research question:

‘To what extent do organizational change characteristics, social influence and personality traits influence an individual’s attitude towards organizational change?’

Organizational change provokes reactions. Because change is a key determinant for organizational survival and employees are key in determining the success or failure of such a change process (Yousef,
(2000), it is important to understand what determines an individual’s attitude towards change. However, the question raised by Bareil and colleagues “Are individuals’ reactions always so predictable, regardless of the content of the change?” (Bareil et al., 2007, p.14), is an important one as it is generally believed that individuals have predisposed change reactions and, as a consequence, have a natural and instinctive tendency to respond in the same way regardless of the type of change. In this research however it is noted that there is a distinction between an individual’s attitude towards change in general and an attitude towards specific change (Fisher, 1980; Lau & Woodman, 1995; Choi, 2011). It is very well possible that an individual has a particular general attitude towards change while at the same time possesses a different attitude towards a change in specific. It is for this reason that both attitudes towards specific change and change in general are taken into account. The aim of this study is therefore to deepen the understanding of the formation of attitudes towards organizational change and the differences between attitudes towards specific change and change in general. It is proposed that the individual’s attitude towards organizational change is influenced by factors on three levels; the individual level as personality traits, the social influence on the social interaction level and the organizational change characteristics at the organizational level. The latter two determinants are derived from innovation adaption theories in technological settings and their applicability to the organizational change context is tested.

Practical and Theoretical Contributions

Practical contribution: Due to the great influence individual employees have on the possible success or failure of an organizational change and in order to successfully complete an organizational change process, managers will want to alter their employees’ future behaviour in accordance with the changing organization (Tannenbaum, 1971; Giessner, 2011). It is however fairly difficult to predict and influence future behaviour. Fortunately, an individual’s attitude towards change is a rather good predictor of individual future behaviour (Lee, Rhee, & Dunham, 2009). This research will provide change agents with knowledge on factors that can (partially) determine an individual’s attitude towards organizational change. Knowing what can determine someone’s attitude can help implement a change activity more effectively, so that an employee will develop a more positive attitude towards the organizational change. Although change is often associated with negative consequences for individuals, individuals can in fact perceive change as an opportunity (Svensen et al., 2007). A positive attitude towards organizational change is a good start for the development of support for the change itself and can potentially reduce actual resistance towards the change initiative (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980).

Theoretical contribution: This research examines the applicability of the model that explains attitudes towards technological innovation in organizational change contexts. The model is placed in a new context to examine its relation to individual attitude towards organizational change. Attitude towards
organizational change is a multidimensional concept that consists of two types of change attitudes: attitude towards change in general and attitude towards specific change. Even though scholars suggest that it is necessary to differentiate between these two types of change attitudes, this distinction has not been applied widely (Choi, 2011). When examining multidimensional concepts Edwards (2001) therefore recommends to not only study this concept as a whole, but to study the dimensions separately as well. This study will present the results of the three attitude towards change constructs and thereby provide insights in their differences.

As has been suggested by other scholars (e.g. Bareil et al., 2007), in this study attitude towards organizational change is as well proposed to be related to personality traits. However an individual in an organization is not isolated, hence attitudes will be influenced by other factors than solely personality traits. These other determinants are the characteristics of the organizational change and social influence. This combination of determinants sheds a new light on an individual’s attitude towards organizational change.

The findings of this study suggest that although there is indeed a difference between general attitudes towards change and attitude towards specific change, the model as proposed is very well applicable to all three attitude towards change concepts. Besides the personality traits, which are especially strongly related to general attitude towards change, a manager can enhance its employees’ attitudes towards organizational change by 1) enhancing the perception of an increase in performance due to the change, 2) decreasing the perception of effort associated with the change, 3) increasing the perception of help available to enable change, and, 4) supporting change related information exchange among peers as well as between managers and their employees.

Based on these results and the fairly strong correlation of the organizational change characteristics and social influence with attitude towards specific change, it is necessary for managers to facilitate in the aforementioned points for every change separately in order to enhance individual’s attitude towards organizational change.
2. Theoretical Framework
Different scholars have attempted to develop a model that explains individual attitudes towards change. In the adoption and diffusion research, the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) is the most applied model, closely followed by Innovation Diffusion Theory (Dwivedi, Williams, Lal, & Schwarz, 2008). Other models used in the literature can be traced back to Theory of Planned Behaviour and Theory of Reasoned Action. All these models have in common that they try to explain the antecedents that predict an individual’s behaviour and an individual’s intention to adopt a behaviour. These commonalities have caused quite some overlap between constructs and definitions used in competing IT acceptance and use models (Eckhardt, Laumer, & Weitzel, 2009).

Venkatesh and colleagues (2003) have proposed a rather new IT acceptance and use model; the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT). This model includes eight competing and prominent IT acceptance and use models (Kijsanayotin, Pannarunothai, & Speedie, 2009). Except for the aforementioned TAM, IDT, TPB, and TRA models, UTAUT contains components of the PC utilization model, the Motivation Model, Social Cognitive Theory (SCT), and the Integrated Model of Technology Acceptance and Planned Behaviour (Zhou et al., 2010). In these models, job fit, relative advantage, complexity, image and compatibility are amongst others predictors of use (Venkatesh et al., 2003). From these models UTAUT distilled contingencies and critical factors that are related to the prediction of behavioural intentions to use a technology and technology use in organizational contexts (Venkatesh, Thong, & Xu, 2012).

So far scholars have not applied UTAUT as much as TAM, however it is gradually drawing scholars’ attention. Earlier research has applied UTAUT to determine behavioural intention to use mobile devices in Finland and mobile commerce acceptance (Zhou et al., 2010). It has been validated cross culturally (Oshlyansky, Cairns, & Thimbleby, 2007), as well as in the healthcare industry and in third world countries (Kijsanayotin et al., 2009). However, it has not been studied in an organizational change context yet.

2.1 Attitudes towards Organizational Change
The constant presence of change (McConnell, 2010) has caused a significant increase in the degree of organizational change in the last decades. Because these changes are not necessarily beneficial for the employees, it can cause negative attitudes towards the organizational change (van den Heuvel & Schalk, 2009). This negative attitude towards organizational change is associated with, for example, job satisfaction (Oreg, 2003) which is in turn an important indicator for the success of the organizational change.
The subject of this paper is the individual’s attitude towards organizational change. In the literature, attitudes are defined as evaluative beliefs regarding objects, people, or events (Robbins & Judge, 2007). ‘Attitudes towards organizational change’ therefore is conceptualized as evaluative beliefs regarding organizational change. This dependent variable consists of two dimensions; attitude towards change in general and attitude towards specific change. This multidimensionality of the organizational change concept is important because these two attitudes can possibly differ (Fisher, 1980). Together these dimensions will determine an individual’s attitude towards organizational change.

In this paper three types of factors were researched in order to explain an individual’s attitude towards organizational change. These factors are: organizational change characteristics, social influence, and, personality traits. The characteristics of the organizational change are determined by factors that are derived from the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (Venkatesh et al., 2003). The concepts of UTAUT that are included in this research are the concepts that deal with characteristics of innovations and change in the organization, namely:

1. Performance Expectancy
2. Effort Expectancy
3. Facilitating Conditions

Concepts that are excluded from this current study are ‘experience’ and ‘voluntariness of use’. These concepts are excluded because the organizational change was new to all employees in the sample and the change was not voluntary. A fourth concept derived from this theory that was included is Social Influence. In addition to this, two personality characteristics are included in this study; perception of ability and control, and innovativeness.

These characteristics and their proposed relation to attitudes towards organizational change are explained in the next section.

2.2 Organizational Characteristics

2.2.1 Performance expectancy

Performance expectancy is defined as the degree to which an individual believes that the application of the innovation will help to increase job performance (Venkatesh et al., 2003). This concept is composed of constructs from amongst other theories TAM and IDT. The constructs in these theories share many similarities and can therefore be grouped in one overarching variable (Venkatesh et al., 2003).
Performance expectancy is highly focused on task accomplishment (Eckhardt et al., 2009) and it has been used to measure an individual’s intention to use a new system. Regarding attitudes towards organizational change it is proposed that when an individual expects that the change has a positive influence on his or her performance, this individual is more likely to have a positive attitude towards the change. When one expects to perform better as a result of the change, one will be enabled to exceed previous performance. An increase in performance is perceived to be positive as long as this increased performance is recognized by a manager or assessor. The expectation of positive feedback on one’s performance will therefore lead to a positive attitude towards change.

H1: *Higher performance expectancy will lead to a more positive attitude towards organizational change*

2.2.2 Effort expectancy
Venkatesh and colleagues defined effort expectancy as the degree of ease associated with the application of the change (Venkatesh et al., 2003). This variable is inspired by a construct from TAM and IDT, and these particular constructs are grouped together as well because of their similarity as has been noted in previous research (e.g. Moore & Benbasat, 1991). Effort expectancy is concerned with the processing of complex stimuli and the allocation of attention to information on the job (Venkatesh et al., 2003). Earlier research has tested effort expectancy as an antecedent for behavioural intention (Eckhardt et al., 2009). In this research it was found that when one expects to make much effort to adopt, it will have a negative effect on the behavioural intention. The mechanism for the attitude towards organizational change construct is expected to be similar; when one has to put much effort in changing and adopting to the new situation, one will have a more negative attitude towards the change. When individuals feel that a change is difficult to implement and it does require a lot of effort, they will have little expectation towards acquiring the expected performance in a changed performance structure (Zhou et al., 2010).

H2: *Higher effort expectancy will lead to a more negative attitude towards organizational change*

2.2.3 Facilitating conditions
“Facilitating conditions are defined as the degree to which an individual believes that an organizational and technical infrastructure exists to support use of the system” (Venkatesh et al., 2003, p.453). The availability of such an infrastructure will support the change process and thereby ease the transition (Eckhardt et al., 2009). This variable consists of different constructs from TPB, TAM and IDT, that are
brought together in one construct based on their commonalities (Venkatesh et al., 2003), and it reflects the effect of a user’s knowledge, ability and recourses (Zhou et al., 2010). When an individual perceives that there are facilitating conditions available that will remove barriers in the organizational environment to adopt to the change, one is more likely to have a positive attitude towards the change.

In the original UTAUT model facilitating conditions was found not to predict one’s intention to use new technologies, but it did predict actual technology use (Venkatesh et al., 2003). In the current research it is proposed that the perceived presence of facilitating conditions does have a positive influence on attitude towards organizational change. The perception of the availability of facilitating conditions will make the individual feel supported in attempts to adopt to a change. The available facilitating conditions will remove barriers that would have withheld individuals from adapting and therefore enhance the attitude towards organizational change.

H3: A higher perceived volume of available facilitating conditions will lead to a more positive attitude towards organizational change

2.3 Social Influence

Besides the organizational change characteristics, there is a second factor in the organization that can influence an attitude towards organizational change; Social Influence. Social psychology research defines social influence as a change of mind in behaviours, thoughts or feelings from an individual’s perspective as revealed by interaction with peers or a group. People tend to act in conformity with a distinct group as, on the one hand, they continuously compare their acting behaviour with the behaviour of others; and on the other hand, they feel pressured to act in a way that will not make them stand out (Eckhardt et al., 2009). When the majority of the employees perceives that the organization develops supportive organizational mechanisms to change, this might encourage the minority to change their opinion (Vakola et al., 2004). When co-workers or managers are positive towards an organizational change, one is more likely to conform to this change as well (Eckhardt et al., 2009). General support of colleagues, team members and leaders therefore has a positive influence on one’s attitude towards organizational change.

The second aspect of social influence is the access to change information. In the literature there are mixed findings about communication and information in change processes. Most of the research tends to see positive outcomes from information sharing, however sharing can lead to negative attitudes towards change as well. The latter is more likely to be caused by the content of the information than the information sharing itself (Oreg, Vakola, & Armenakis, 2011). In this research it is argued that,
notwithstanding the content of the information, the sharing of information about the change has a positive influence on attitudes towards the change because it creates understanding among the individuals involved. In working organizations, decisions are either made in the presence of others or with the knowledge that they will have to be understood, implemented or approved by others (Burns & Stalker, 1961). Information sharing can help to create this understanding.

Only a small number of researchers analysed social influence in the context of organizational change. Amongst these scholars there are mixed results (Eckhardt et al., 2009). In this paper it is proposed that when one’s co-workers and manager have a positive attitude towards the organizational change, one is more likely to have a positive attitude towards the organizational change because individuals tend to be influenced by the opinions of others (Zhou et al., 2010). This attitude towards change will also be enhanced when the employee is better embedded in the organization and is therefore in contact with a change agent. This interaction will create a greater understanding of the change at hand due to information sharing.

H4: A perceived positive attitude towards the change among co-workers and access to information about the change will lead to a more positive attitude towards organizational change

2.4 Personality Traits

Individual resistance towards change has for a large extent been explained by a misalignment between change consequences for the organization and the individual. When a change is beneficial for the organization and has negative consequences for the individual who is asked to change, it seems logical to assume that this individual has a somewhat negative attitude towards the change. However, there are individuals who do want to change even though the change is not beneficial for them. It is important to find out who these people are and why they behave in this counterintuitive manner (Oreg, 2003). Personality traits might be able to explain these individual differences. Vakola and colleagues (2004) found a relationship between personality traits and employees’ attitude towards change. An earlier study has proposed that responses to organizational change are influenced by, amongst other traits, locus of control and generalized self-efficacy (Judge, Thoresen, Pucik, & Welbourne, 1999). A second personality trait included in this study is innovativeness. Innovativeness has not widely been associated with attitudes towards change (e.g. Marcati, Guido & Peluso, 2008). This trait has been especially well researched in the innovation diffusion literature and research on entrepreneurial behaviour.
These personality traits and their (proposed) relation to attitude towards change will be discussed in the next section.

2.4.1 Perception of Ability and Control

Two personality traits often associated with attitudes towards organization change are locus of control and generalized self-efficacy. Some researchers suggest that self-efficacy and locus of control are in practice two strongly related concepts and the differences between the two constructs are said to be mostly theoretical (Chen, Gully, & Eden, 2001). Generalized self-efficacy is concerned with an individual’s perception that he or she possesses the skills necessary to execute the required response set to ensure a desired outcome, whereas locus of control refers to whether the consequences of such efforts are within the person’s control (Judge et al., 1999). Even though the two concepts are related, they do differ and can therefore not be used interchangeably (e.g. Judge et al., 1999; Chen et al., 2001). For this reason, internal locus of control and generalized self-efficacy will be treated as two dimensions of one concept: perception of ability and control.

Locus of control is defined as an individual’s belief concerning the source of control over events affecting them (Rotter, 1966). A person can possess a locus of control ranging from internal to external. Individuals who believe that they have control over change events have an internal locus of control. These individuals are less likely to resist change if they see a reasonable probability of success. Furthermore, internals are more likely to perceive having control over a change because of their belief of control over their environment (Kaufmann, Welsh, & Bushmarin, 1995). Externals on the other hand, accept or reject change depending on external sources of success or failure. Externals do not feel like they have the success of a change in their own hands and are therefore less likely to adopt to a change (Lau & Woodman, 1995). Even though individuals with an internal locus of control generally have a more positive attitude towards change and can better cope with change, it does not mean that internals will never resist change, or that externals will never be positive about a change (Chen & Wang, 2007).

In the literature there has been a discussion whether or not generalized self-efficacy is an unambiguous construct. From the development of the self-efficacy construct onwards it has been argued that one cannot master every realm of human life, and therefore a ‘one measure fits all’ approach is not adequate (Bandura, 2006). However, the need for a more generalized trait-like self-efficacy construct that is more resistant to temporary influences has arisen (Eden, 1988; Chen et al., 2001). Generalized self-efficacy is defined as an “individual’s perception of their ability to perform across a variety of different situations” (Judge, Erez, & Bono, 1998 p. 170). In earlier research it was found that low self-efficacy is related to resistance to change and high self-efficacy to a positive attitude towards change (Ashforth &
Lee, 1990). Individuals with a high self-efficacy feel more able to adapt to changing circumstances in which they have to perform (Judge et al., 1999). Low self-efficacy on the other hand has found to be correlated with job withdrawal and defensive behaviours, such as resistance to change, because these individuals do not feel able to perform in a novel situation (Ashforth & Lee, 1990).

Taking these two dimensions of the perception of ability and control construct together it is argued that a high perception of ability of control will have a positive influence on attitudes towards organization change. A high(er) perception of ability and control means an internal locus of control and a high(er) level of self-efficacy. An individual that scores high on this continuum therefore feels in control, as well as in more challenging situations and feels able to perform across situations, this has a positive influence on the attitude towards organizational change.

H5: A higher perception of ability and control will lead to a more positive attitude towards organizational change

2.4.2 Innovativeness

Individual innovativeness has been researched extensively in the innovation diffusion domain (Agarwal & Prasad, 1998), however the definition as used in this field comes with its limitations. Rogers (1955) conceptualizes innovation as the speed with which one adopts to an innovation. It is argued that when using this definition, ‘innovativeness’ becomes a hypothetical construct and lacks abstraction. Besides this theoretical problem, there seems to be a methodological challenge as well. Flynn and Goldsmith point out the issue of generalizability and comparability across studies when using this definition (Flynn & Goldsmith, 1993). Taking this critique into account, innovativeness in this research is treated as a personality trait and is defined as “the tendency to be creative in thought and action” (Mueller & Thomas, 2000, p.63). This definition is broader than the previous mentioned definition since it does not only include innovation, but creativity and initiative as well (Mueller & Thomas, 2000). Innovativeness is related to concepts as creativity and openness to experience (Marcati et al., 2008), but it differs from these concepts in that innovativeness deals with both the adoption to and the implementation of something new. Openness to experience is generally associated with terms as perceptiveness, imagination and curiosity (Judge et al., 1999), and focusses on thoughts rather than actions while creativity is associated with action rather than thoughts. Innovativeness combines these two hence an innovative person prefers new solutions to existing problems and appreciates novel ideas (Mueller & Thomas, 2000).
The association between innovativeness and attitude towards organizational change has not been studied widely, however the relation between innovativeness and entrepreneurship has, as well as the association between entrepreneurship and attitude towards change. In this research a direct association between innovativeness and attitude towards organizational change is proposed. Innovativeness is often cited to be associated with entrepreneurial behaviour. Innovative activity is actively present in Schumpeter’s (1934) definition of an entrepreneur (Mueller & Thomas, 2000). In previous research the innovator role is assigned to entrepreneurs (e.g. Bird, 1989), implying that an entrepreneur is willing to try-out, adopt to and to implement competitive strategies. The later suggests that entrepreneurs, innovative individuals (Marcati et al., 2008), tend to have a positive attitude towards change. In this paper it is therefore suggested that personal innovativeness is directly associated with a positive attitude towards change.

H6: A higher level of innovativeness will lead to a more positive attitude towards organizational change

The hypotheses can be summarized in the conceptual model as depicted below (Figure 1).

Figure 1 - Conceptual Model
3. Methodological Framework

3.1 Research Design

This study, of a deductive nature, was conducted in a commercial multinational in the Netherlands. This company is part of a North-American based IT consultancy organization. The Dutch branch of this company, from now on referred to as ‘the company’, has six locations in the Netherlands. The company operates in both the public and private sector and employs about 3,000 employees. The company is currently undergoing a major change. The company has been the subject of an acquisition. At the time of data collection the acquisition had been finalized for two years. In the years that have passed since, the company has been transforming through several phases. One of the final steps in this particular transformation took place during the data collection. Former changes included the implementation of new rules and procedures which made the employees perform and report their job in a slightly different way. The, for now, last phase of the transformation has altered the company’s internal structure. These recent changes made the company very suitable to perform this research in.

This quantitative study has a cross-sectional design since it is conducted at one point in time. The population of this research is all employees of the company in the Netherlands. Due to convenience sampling the research was performed in two of the four company divisions. About one third of the employees operates in these two divisions. The employees of these divisions have been approached to fill-out a questionnaire. Hence, approximately 1,000 employees have received an email with a link to an online questionnaire.

Not all employees of the company were included in this study. In order to see whether or not the results are generalizable to the whole company the sample has to be representative for the population. The demographics from the sample were compared to the data from the population. This data was obtained via the human resource department of the company and included data on the distribution of age and tenure in the company. The comparison between the dispersion of age and tenure in the sample and the population can be found in Figure 2. Table 1, as well on the next page, includes data on the ratio of men to women and relative proportion of employees operating in Division 1 and Division 2 complemented with the average age and tenure in the sample and the population.
Figure 2 - Age and Tenure in Population and Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>DI</th>
<th>DII</th>
<th>Average Age</th>
<th>Average Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>43 years</td>
<td>11 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sample</strong></td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>86.1%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>45 years</td>
<td>12 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 - Comparison Population and Sample

In Figure 2 the age and tenure structure from both the sample and the population are depicted. Even though the sample and population differ in terms of the share each category has compared to the whole, the demographics in both the population and the sample are rather similar, and therefore very well comparable. As depicted in Table 1, the average age and average tenure between the population and the sample differ respectively 2 and 1 year(s). Whether or not there is a significant difference between the spread of age and tenure in the population and the sample could not be tested; there was no information available about the actual age and tenure in years in the company solely on the spread of the categories as depicted in Figure 2.

Complementary to the above mentioned demographic data, questions have been asked related to respondents function, education, and location. The objective was to obtain a clear picture of the sample.

As described, the company has six offices in the Netherlands; one head office and five offices spread over the country. Nearly half of the sample indicated to be stationed at the head office (49%), the other respondents indicated to be working at one of the five other offices in the Netherlands (51%).

---

1 DI: Division One  
DII: Division Two
In internal communication, the company distinguishes between five function groups. In this study a distinction has been made accordingly; administrative employee, consultant, manager, director, and (Senior) Vice-President. The sample consisted for 2% of administrative employees, directors and (Senior) Vice-Presidents each. 16% of the respondents is manager, and a majority is consultant (78%).

The final demographic is the level of education. The respondents’ highest obtained level of education has been assessed according to the Dutch educational system. 4.1% of the sample has a high school diploma and 3.8% a MBO diploma, the Dutch equivalent to college. 51.4% of respondents has finished HBO, University of Applied Science, and 40.7% has a WO or University diploma. One respondent indicated ‘other’ and specified this type of education. The respondent’s answer appeared to belong to the WO/University category and has been included in this category accordingly.

The distributed questionnaire was build-up with as many existing items as possible. The vast majority of the company’s employees are Dutch native speakers, hence the original English items were translated in Dutch. The Dutch translation of the English questions were tested in a pilot study. The pilot study was filled-out by employees of the company outside the original sample. The pilot sample consisted of employees that were working in either one of the two divisions that were not included in the sample. Ambiguities that were found in this pilot study were solved enhancing the reliability of the questionnaire.

Respondents indicated their answer on each question on a five- or seven-point Likert scale. This variance was the result of differing granularity in the Likert scales in the original questionnaires. After each set of questions there was room for comments, these comments were not used in the analysis of this study but were processed in a report for the company. The questionnaire did not only include items that measured the (in)dependent variables. Control variables were included to enhance the internal validity of the study (section 3.2.3).

The questionnaire was distributed among the employees of two divisions of the company. The sample received an email from their Vice-President. In this email the receiver was asked to fill-out an online questionnaire by clicking on the link provided in the email. This link led the respondents to Qualtrics, an online questionnaire tool. This website is secured and provides respondents with an anonymous link to the online questionnaire. The Vice-President was asked to send this email to enhance the response rate and to prevent commotion due to the possible sensitive nature of the study. To further increase the number of respondents, the Vice-President had sent a reminder three weeks after the first invitation. Three weeks

---

2 In the analysis, the answers on the five-point Likert scale have been converted to a seven-point Likert scale.
later the questionnaire was closed. The reason for a somewhat lengthy time frame was the period in which the questionnaire was sent. Due to the holiday season, a substantial number of employees was on annual leave for at least some days during this period and therefore not able to read their email. By activating the link for a total of six weeks, a vast majority has been in the office sometime during these six weeks and was therefore able to read the invitation email.

Before the data retrieved from the questionnaire could be analysed, it was prepared for analysis. Negatively worded questions were reverse coded and the dataset was checked for missing data. There was missing data as almost 24% of the respondents had not provided their tenure. In a T-Test, it was shown however that there was no significant difference between Attitude towards Organization Change for the respondents that did provide their tenure and the ones that did not. As shown in Table 1, the average tenure of the population and the average tenure of the sample are fairly similar, therefore the missing tenure data was completed with the average tenure of the sample³.

3.2 Measures
The questionnaire consisted of 45 items. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with a statement rating their response on a five-, or, seven-point Likert scale, depending on the scale that was used in the original studies. The questionnaire can be found in Appendix III. All constructs were measured on the individual level.

Before multiple hierarchical regression could be performed, the reliability (Cronbach’s alpha) has been assessed and assumptions of multiple regression have been checked. The correlations represent the strength and direction of the associations as depicted in Table 3.

Two of the variables, the dependent variable Attitude towards Organizational Change, and, Perception of Ability and Control, consist of two dimensions. For these variables a Factor Analysis was performed. The results of this preparation for analysis are reported in the next section.

Throughout the research some extra analyses have been performed. These additional analyses were performed to test the robustness of the study or for the purpose of further exploration. These analyses are captured in footnotes, the results can be obtained through the author.

³ When the Hierarchical Multiple Regression was performed, a test was run without the missing tenure data as well. There was no difference between the results of these two Hierarchical Multiple Regressions.
3.2.1 Dependent variable

Attitude towards organizational change: The attitude towards change measure was based on a combination of two existing scales, hence it is a multidimensional construct. A construct is multidimensional when it includes a number of distinct but related dimensions grouped into one single concept (Law, Wong, & Mobley, 1998). After performing Factor Analysis it appeared that there were indeed two components. Factor Analysis showed a KMO-value higher than .6 with a value of .853 and a significant Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity. There were two eigenvalues above 1, indicating two factors. This was indicated by the Scree Plot as well (Appendix VII, Syntax 1).

The items were derived from research of Venkatesh and colleagues (2003) and Dunham and colleagues (1989). The former included 4 items aimed at measuring the respondent’s attitude towards specific change. In earlier research this scale had a reliability of α = .90 (Sundaravej, 2010). In the current study the Cronbach’s alpha was α = .87. The later consisted of 6 items used to gain insight in the individual’s general attitude towards change. The developers of this scale have tested its reliability in different settings obtaining Cronbach’s alpha’s of α = .80, .81 and .84 (Dunham, Grube, Gardner, Cummings, & Pierce, 1989). In later research on attitude towards change in the Islamic world the Cronbach’s alpha was α = .80 (Yousef, 2000). This current study indicated a Cronbach’s alpha of α = .82. The total scale was measured on a seven-point Likert scale (1: totally disagree; 7: totally agree), with a Cronbach’s alpha of α = .84.

3.2.2 Independent variables

Organizational Change Characteristics
The 12 items measuring the organizational change characteristics were derived from the research of Venkatesh and colleagues (2003). All items were measured on a seven-point Likert scale, ranging from totally disagree (1) to totally agree (7).

Performance Expectancy: Performance Expectancy was measured with 4 items and had a Cronbach’s alpha of α = .89. Earlier research indicated a Cronbach’s alpha of α = .89 (Im, Hong, & Kang, 2011) and α = .90 (Kijsanayotin et al., 2009).

Effort Expectancy: the Effort Expectancy scale consisted of 4 items with a Cronbach’s alpha of α = .92. Earlier research found a Cronbach’s alpha of α = .93 (Im et al., 2011) and α = .89 (Kijsanayotin et al., 2009).

Facilitating Conditions: Lastly, Facilitating Conditions, also measured with 4 items, had a Cronbach’s alpha of α = .74, both Kijsanayotin and colleagues (2009) and Im and colleagues (2011) found a Cronbach’s alpha of α = .87.
Social Influence

*Social Influence:* Social Influence was measured with three items measured on a five-point Likert scale. The items have not been adopted from an existing scale. After reliability analysis, the Cronbach’s alpha of Social Influence was $\alpha = .58$. This Cronbach’s alpha is slightly lower than the commonly used threshold of $\alpha = .6$ (Pallant, 2007), however it is acceptable for this study since $\alpha = .58$ is still above the unacceptable level of Cronbach’s alpha $\alpha < .5$ (Pallant, 2007).

Personality Traits

*Perceived Ability and Control:* The Perceived Ability and Control variable consisted of two dimensions. After performing Factor Analysis the KMO value was .751, which is higher than the required minimum of .6. Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant. Kaiser’s criterion assumes that the number of eigenvalues above 1 represent the number of components. In this case there were two eigenvalues of >1, indicating two components. This was supported by the Scree Plot (Appendix VII, Syntax 2).

The first dimension is Self-Efficacy. The questionnaire consisted of three self-efficacy items from Chen and colleagues (2001). Self-Efficacy was measured on a seven-point Likert scale with a Cronbach’s alpha of $\alpha = .75$. Chen and colleagues have developed this scale in 2001 and have tested the reliability in three occasions resulting in a Cronbach’s alpha of $\alpha = .87$, .88 and .85 based on the original scale which consists of 8 items. Locus of Control was measured with 4 items from Levenson’s IPC (Levenson, 1974). Locus of Control was originally measured on a five-point Likert scale (1: totally disagree, 5: totally agree) with a Cronbach’s alpha of $\alpha = .67$. Earlier studies found a reliability score of $\alpha = .405$ and .643 (Kaufmann et al., 1995). Combining these two dimensions, the Perception of Ability and Control scale consisted of 7 items with a Cronbach’s alpha of $\alpha = .747$.

*Innovativeness:* Innovativeness was measured with 5 items adopted from the Jackson Personality Inventory (Jackson, 1976) on a five-point Likert scale. After reliability analysis, the Cronbach’s alpha of Innovativeness was $\alpha = .717$. Mueller and Thomas (2000) state that the Cronbach’s alpha scores are generally acceptable with scores ranging from $\alpha = .53$, .66, .81 and .82 in different countries; Slovenia, China and, the latter two scores, Canada.

The Cronbach’s alpha if item deleted scores did not or marginally increase the Cronbach’s alpha of the variables used in this study, therefore no items were deleted.
3.2.3 Control Variables

Several demographic control variables were included in the analyses to control for alternative explanations and systematic differences between groups. The control variables in this study include generation, gender and tenure.

*Generation:* The respondents were asked to provide their year of birth. During analysis, the respondents were categorized in different generation classifications. The generations were based on Dutch generation research (Bontekoning, 2007):

- 1940-1955: Protest Generation 5%
- 1955-1970: Generation X 52%
- 1970-1985: Pragmatic Generation 39%
- 1985-2000: Screenagers 4%

*Gender:* A second control variable was gender. Respondents were asked to indicate whether they were male or female. 86% of the respondents indicated to be ‘Male’ and 14% ‘Female’.

*Tenure:* In an open question, respondents were asked to indicate the number of years that they have been working for the organization. In line with the categorization as used by the company 33% of the respondents are working for more than 15 years at the organization, 23% of the respondents indicated to work for the organization since 10-15 years, as well as for 7-9 years. 8% of the respondents started working at the organization 4-6 years ago, and 13% is with the company for three years or less.

Almost 24% of the respondents did not provide their tenure. A possible explanation for this reluctance is that the respondents felt more anonymous without the mention of their tenure. A T-Test was performed to check if there was a significant difference in Attitude towards Organizational Change between respondents that did provide their tenure and respondents that did not. After performing the T-Test, it was concluded that there is no significant difference between these groups.

The control variables studied in this research have been studied more often in the field of organizational change (Caldwell, Liu, Fedor, & Herold, 2009). Vakola and colleagues proposed, in accordance with earlier studies, that tenure will be negatively associated with attitude towards organizational change, employees with higher education will demonstrate more positive attitudes towards change, and that there will be no significant difference between males and females (Vakola et al., 2004). After analysis it appeared that there is little differentiation in level of education and function in the current sample.
Therefore, both ‘level of education’ and ‘function’ were no longer treated as control variables, but rather as descriptive statistics.

Before assessing the correlations (see Table 3), some of the above mentioned variables were transformed in dummy variables. Education has been grouped in 0=other, and 1=higher education (University and University of Applied Science). Function is separated in 0=other and 1=consultant. Generation has four categories: 0=Protest Generation, 1=Generation X, 2=Pragmatic Generation, and, 3=Screenagers. Furthermore, 0=male and 1=female for gender.

Other variables that have been recoded into a dummy variable are location and division. Location is a dummy variable with 0=other 1=head office. Lastly, 0=Division1, 1=Division2 for the divisions.

3.3 Data Analysis
The questionnaire was initially sent to 1036 employees, the reminder had reached 1027 individuals. The difference between the sample sizes can be explained by the time that had passed between the initial invitation and the reminder. In these three weeks employee retention had decreased the total number of employees in the two divisions from 1036 to 1027 individuals. In order to calculate the response rate, the initial sent-out is taken as the frame of reference. The response rate therefore is:

\[(317/1036)*100\% = 30.6\%\].

The sample had an adequate size lying far beyond its recommended minimum number of 98 respondents. In the literature there is an extensive discussion about sample sizes \((n)\), however in this study following formula has been applied: \(n>50+8m\) (Green, 1991).

In this formula, \(m\) represents the number of independent variables. This formula implies that for this study \(50+(8*6)=98\) respondents are needed to generate adequate results. This study contains the completely filled out questionnaires of 317 respondents.

The overall proposed model was evaluated in its ability to predict attitudes towards organizational change, as well as the relative contribution of each set of variables to the prediction of attitudes towards organizational change (Pallant, 2007). However, before the model could be evaluated by means of Hierarchical Multiple Regression the assumptions for multiple regression were tested.
There was no evidence indicating that a multiple regression could not be performed\(^4\). The P-Plot, Scatterplot, Normal Distribution and Coefficients Table can be found in Appendix IV.

The models that were tested in the Hierarchical Multiple Regression are depicted in Table 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Model 1 | Control Variables  
- Gender  
- Generation  
- Tenure |
| Model 2 | Control Variables  
Organizational Change Characteristics  
- Performance Expectancy  
- Effort Expectancy  
- Facilitating Conditions |
| Model 3 | Control Variables  
Organizational Change Characteristics  
Social Influence |
| Model 4 | Control Variables  
Organizational Change Characteristics  
Social Influence  
Personality Traits  
- Perception of Ability and Control  
- Innovativeness |

Table 2 - Models in Hierarchical Multiple Regression

\(^4\) Multicollinearity: Correlation with Attitude towards Organization Change should be \( r > .3 \) and \(< .7 \). This is the case of all correlations. Other criteria for multicollinearity are: Bivariate correlation \(< .7 \), VIF value \(< 10 \), Tolerance \(> .10 \); these criteria have been met. The line in the Normal P-Plot is a reasonably straight diagonal, this means that there are no major deviations from the norm. There was one outlier in the Scatterplot, this is not uncommon in large samples. 1 item has a slightly high Mahalanobis score (>22.46) indicating that there is 1 outlier, this is not a problem with large samples. In Casewise Diagnostics, one case is depicted, however the maximum value for Cook’s distance is <1, therefore the two aforementioned cases do not have to be removed (Pallant, 2007). (See Appendix IV)
4. Results

4.1 Correlations

Part of testing the assumptions for multiple regression entails the correlations between the variables included in this study. The correlation between the independent and the dependent variables determine the strength of the relationship as well as the direction of the relationship.

As can be seen in Table 3, the variable with the strongest relationship with attitude towards organizational change is performance expectancy, $r = .558$, $p < .001$. Regarding attitude towards organizational change, the other organizational change characteristics have a significant positive relationship, albeit slightly weaker, to the dependent variable as well; effort expectancy, $r = .552$, $p < .001$, and, facilitating conditions $r = .521$, $p < .001$. Social influence is as well positively related with attitude towards organizational change, $r = .518$, $p < .001$. The personality traits included in this study are also positively related to attitude towards organizational change. The strongest relationship is with perception of ability and control $r = .402$, $p < .001$, innovativeness is weakly related to attitude towards organizational change $r = .143$, $p < .005$.

These positive relations indicate that, for example, an individual with a high level of performance expectancy is associated with a high level of attitude towards organizational change. A negative relation, indicated by a negative value of $r$, Generation for example, implies that the older one is, this is associated with a lower level of this individual’s attitude towards organizational change. This is barely an example since the relation is not significant.

Something that is rather remarkable is that the minimum score of attitude towards organizational change, innovativeness and perception of ability and control is all ‘3’, which indicates that none of the respondents had a very negative attitude towards the organizational change, was not innovative nor had a very external locus of control or a low self-efficacy.

In this current research attitude towards organizational change has been tested. This is a multidimensional concept, consisting of two dimensions; attitude towards change and attitude towards specific change. The Pearson’s Correlation Matrix for these variables has been added in Appendix V. It appeared that especially attitude towards specific change correlates quite strongly with the organizational change characteristics, social influence, and perception of ability and control. Attitude towards specific change is not significantly related with innovativeness. Furthermore, Function is related to attitude towards specific change, $r = -.327$, $p < .001$. This indicates that individuals that belong to the ‘consultant’ function group have a more negative attitude towards specific change.
Attitude towards change was related to the organizational change characteristics as well, all three the relations are positive and significant at p<.001. This is also the case for social influence as well as for perception of ability and control. Attitude towards change is, unlike attitude towards specific change, also positively related to innovativeness $r = .157$, $p< .001$. Similar to attitude towards specific change, attitude towards change in general is negatively related to function $r = .230$, $p< .001$.

In order to further explore the differences between the dimensions of the dependent variables, three Hierarchical Multiple Regressions have been performed. The results of the regression analysis are discussed in the next section.
Table 3 - Correlation Matrix

| Variable | Person Correlation Sign (2-tailed) | Min | Max | M  | SD  | t   | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
|----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 1.       | Attitude Towards Organizational Change | 3   | 7   | 5.01 | 0.84 | -   | 1.72 | 5.58 | ** | -   | 4.74 | 1.19 | 552 | ** | 6.11 | ** | -   | 4.61 | 1.01 | 5.21 | ** | 5.09 | ** | 6.65 | ** | -   | 4.47 | 0.73 | 5.18 | ** | 4.85 | ** | 4.46 | ** | 4.98 | ** | -   | 5.54 | 0.53 | 1.43 | ** | 0.44 | 0.36 | 0.042 | 1.30 | -   | 5.38 | 0.80 | 4.02 | ** | 2.15 | 2.58 | 2.94 | ** | 2.18 | ** | 1.82 | -   | 3.31 | 0.65 | 1.95 | 0.40 | 1.80 | 0.47 | 0.007 | 0.75 | -0.89 | 0.093 | -0.209 | ** | -0.518 | -   | 0.91 | 0.26 | 0.064 | -1.17 | -0.023 | -0.62 | -0.027 | 0.047 | 0.058 | -   | 0.78 | 0.42 | 0.058 | -3.41 | ** | -3.64 | ** | -2.68 | ** | -3.41 | ** | 0.031 | -1.28 | 1.0162 | -   | 1.42 | 0.65 | 0.094 | -0.74 | -1.11 | ** | -1.07 | -0.021 | -0.01 | 0.015 | 0.047 | 0.86 | -   | 12.16 | 0.956 | 5.65 | 0.40 | 1.80 | 0.47 | 0.007 | 0.75 | -0.89 | 0.093 | -0.209 | ** | -0.518 | -   | 0.49 | 0.50 | 0.098 | 0.027 | 0.065 | 0.065 | 0.072 | 0.069 | 0.054 | 0.084 | 0.165 | ** | 0.044 | 0.042 | -   | 0.78 | 0.40 | 0.000 | -0.056 | 0.078 | 0.003 | 0.022 | 1.04 | -0.68 | 0.259 | ** | 0.054 | 0.046 | 0.032 | 0.165 | ** | -   | 0.14 | 0.35 | 0.10 | -0.026 | -0.070 | -0.642 | 0.050 | 0.004 | 0.001 | -1.64 | ** | -0.066 | 0.161 | ** | -0.101 | 0.025 | 0.048 | -   |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

N=317
4.2 Hierarchical Multiple Regression

Hierarchical Multiple Regression was used to test the hypotheses and to assess the model’s ability to predict attitude towards organizational change (Table 4). The independent variables were divided in sets and added to the regression step-by-step. In the first model, the three control variables were added. The second model consists of the three organizational change characteristics, while in the third model social influence was included. Lastly the two personality traits were added in the fourth model. The footnotes in this section are part of a robustness check.

4.2.1 Attitude towards Organizational Change

In Model 1 the control variables and the dependent variable ‘attitude towards organizational change’ were added, this led to a non-significant model: $F(3,313)=1.007$, $p=.390$.

In Model 2, the organizational change characteristics were entered. The total variance explained by the model as whole was 41.3%, $F(6,310)=36.294$, $p=.000$. When adding ‘social influence’ in Model 3, the model remained significant: $F(7,309)=36.430$, $p=.000$ explaining 45.2%. In Model 4, personality traits were added to the model. In doing so, the model explained 50.1%, $F(9,307)=34.201$, $p=.000$ (Appendix VI, Syntax 1).

Based on this regression analysis the hypotheses as formulated in Chapter 2 can be either confirmed or rejected:

Hypothesis 1, the positive relationship between Performance Expectancy and Attitude towards Organizational Change, was confirmed.

Hypothesis 2, Effort Expectancy and Attitude towards Organizational Change will be negatively related, was confirmed. The questions were formulated positively, therefore a positive value for $b$ in Table 4 indicates little expected effort.

Hypothesis 3, the positive relationship between Facilitating Conditions and Attitude towards Organizational Change, was confirmed.

---

5 Exclude missing values listwise: $N=241$, $F(3,237)=1.320$, $p=.268$, not significant
Exclude missing values pairwise: $F(3,237)=.766$, $p=.514$, not significant.
See Appendix VI Syntax 7 and 8.

6 Adding the items separately, Model 3 became:
S11: $F(7,309)=31.661$, $p=.000$, not significant; $b=.035$
S12: $F(7,309)=32.920$, $p=.000$, significant; $b=.088**$
S13: $F(7,309)=37.361$, $p=.000$, significant; $b=.162***$.
See Appendix VI Syntax 2, 3 and 4

7 Adding Locus of Control and Self-Efficacy separately in Model 4 it explained 50.3%, $F(10,306)=31.013$, $p=.000$. Locus of Control $b=.095*$ and Self-Efficacy $b=.143**$.
See Appendix VI Syntax 12
Hypothesis 4, higher perception of Social Influence will increase the Attitude towards Organizational Change, was confirmed.

Hypothesis 5, Perception of Ability and Control and Attitude towards Organizational Change, was confirmed.

Hypothesis 6, Innovativeness and Attitude towards Organizational Change, was rejected.

Hypothesis 6 was the only rejected hypothesis. This implies that there is no linear relation between one’s attitude towards organizational change and innovativeness. As a result, a curvilinear relationship between innovativeness and attitude towards organization change was tested. The curvilinear relationship itself is not significantly related to attitude towards organizational change, the fifth model however was significant $F(10,306)=30.882$ (Appendix VI, Syntax 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>-.132</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>-.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Expectancy</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Expectancy</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Conditions</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Traits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Ability and Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.224</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness*</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>-.385</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td>35.291</td>
<td>36.430</td>
<td>32.201</td>
<td>30.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta R^2$</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.452</td>
<td>.591</td>
<td>.502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 - Hierarchical Multiple Regression: Attitude towards Organizational Change

The dependent variable consists of two dimensions; attitude towards specific change and attitude towards change. It is suggested in the literature that the dimensions of a construct have to be assessed separately in order to obtain a more complete picture (Edwards, 2001). Hence the model’s applicability to the two dimensions separately has been examined.
4.2.2 Attitude towards Specific Change

Hierarchical Multiple Regression was as well used to assess the model’s ability to predict attitude towards specific change (Table 5). The same models were applied as described in subsection 4.2 and Table 2.

In Model 1 the control variables and the dependent variable ‘attitude towards specific change’ were added, this led to a non-significant model: $F(3,313)=.958, p=.413$.

In Model 2, the organizational change characteristics were entered. The total variance explained by the model as whole was 56.4%, $F(6,310)=66.767, p=.000$. When adding ‘social influence’ in Model 3, the model explained 58.5% of the total variance: $F(7,309)=62.048, p=.000$. In Model 4, personality traits were added\(^8\) to the model. In doing so, the model explained 59.2%, $F(9,307)=49.433, p=.064$ (Appendix VI, Syntax 5).

Model 5 included the curvilinear relation between innovativeness and attitude towards specific change. Again there was no significant relation with attitude towards specific change. The model was significant, $F(10,306)=44.534, p=.380$ (Appendix VI, Syntax 10).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.013†</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.013†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Change Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Expectancy</td>
<td>.455**</td>
<td>.412***</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.410***</td>
<td>.409***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Expectancy</td>
<td>.144**</td>
<td>.131*</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.124*</td>
<td>.127*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Conditions</td>
<td>.244***</td>
<td>.100*</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.160***</td>
<td>.162**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td>.167***</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.161***</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.157***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Traits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Ability and Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td>.131*</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.128*</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness(^8)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.463</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Value</td>
<td>.958</td>
<td>66.767***</td>
<td>62.048***</td>
<td>49.433***</td>
<td>66.534***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.564</td>
<td>.584</td>
<td>.592</td>
<td>.593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.555</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=317

\(^8\) Adding Locus of Control and Self-Efficacy separately in Model 4 it explained 59.2% $F(10,306)=44.368, p=.000$, not significant. Locus of Control $b=.085$ and Self-Efficacy $b=.043$. See Appendix VI Syntax 13

Table 5 - Hierarchical Multiple Regression: Attitude towards Specific Change
4.2.3 Attitude towards Change

Lastly, Hierarchical Multiple Regression was used to assess the model’s ability to predict attitude towards change (Table 6), again with the same models as described earlier.

In Model 1 the control variables and the dependent variable ‘attitude towards change’ were added, this led to a non-significant model: $F(3,313)=1.325$, $p=.266$. In Model 2, the organizational change characteristics were entered. The total variance explained by the model as whole was 13.7%, $F(6,310)=8.211$, $p=.000$. When adding ‘social influence’ in Model 3, the model explained 16.9% of the total variance: $F(7,309)=8.967$, $p=.001$. In Model 4, personality traits were added to the model. In doing so, the model explained 23.6%, $F(9,307)=10.509$, $p=.000$ (Appendix VI, Syntax 6).

The addition of a curvilinear relation between innovativeness and attitude towards change in general led to a significant Model 5 $F(10,306)=9.487$, $p=.499$ (Appendix VI, Syntax 11). However also this time without a significant relation between innovativeness$^2$ and attitude towards change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>-.175†</td>
<td>-.09†</td>
<td>-.123</td>
<td>-.086</td>
<td>-.130†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Change Characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Expectancy</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Expectancy</td>
<td>.151*</td>
<td>.062*</td>
<td>.139*</td>
<td>.061*</td>
<td>.121*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Conditions</td>
<td>.142*</td>
<td>.067*</td>
<td>.077*</td>
<td>.068*</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td>.170**</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.148**</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.145**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality Traits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Ability and Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td>.294***</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.290***</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness$^2$</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Value</td>
<td>1.325</td>
<td>8.221***</td>
<td>8.967***</td>
<td>10.509***</td>
<td>9.487***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R$^2$</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.236</td>
<td>.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AR$^2$</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 - Hierarchical Multiple Regression: Attitude towards Change

The outcomes of the three Hierarchical Multiple Regressions are summarized in Table 7 on the next page.

---

9 Adding Locus of Control and Self-Efficacy separately in Model 4 it explained 24.3%, $F(10,306)=9.817$, $p=.000$. Locus of Control $b=.101$† and Self-Efficacy $b=.209***$. See Appendix VI Syntax 14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude towards Organizational Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1: Performance Expectancy</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Effort Expectancy</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Facilitating Conditions</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: Social Influence</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: Perception of Ability and Control</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: Innovativeness</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness^2</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^p<.10  
*p<.05  
**p<.01  
***p<.001

Table 7 - Summary of Hypotheses

The Effort Expectancy questions were positively formulated therefore the positive relationship, as it was found, is a confirmation of the hypotheses.
5. Discussion and Conclusion

5.1 Discussion

Studies show that positive attitudes towards change are crucial for the success of change programs (e.g. Eby, Adams, Russel & Gaby, 2000; Jacobs, van Witteloostuijn, & Christe-Zeyse, 2013). Moreover, organizations are increasingly required to improve their ability to enhance employees’ support for or acceptance of change initiatives (Choi, 2011). The focus of this study is therefore on the conditions under which employees support organizational change. The model as described in this research takes both personality traits and organizational change characteristics into account as well as social influence. These three groups of concepts were proposed to be related to an individual’s attitude towards organizational change. Attitude towards organizational change is a multidimensional concept consisting of attitude towards change and attitude towards specific change. Most research in the organizational behaviour field does not specifically separates these two constructs from one another, however “as is widely acknowledged, it is important to separate general attitudes from specific attitudes” (Choi, 2011, p. 493).

The question on which this research is based is:

‘To what extent do organizational change characteristics, social influence and personality traits influence an individual’s attitude towards organizational change?’

I found that attitude towards change and attitude towards specific change are indeed two different dimension that form an individual’s attitude towards organizational change. The attitude towards organizational change was found to be influenced by factors on three levels 1) the often studied personality traits, 2) the less applied social influence, 3) and the organizational change characteristics. Attitude towards organizational change correlates strongly with the organizational change characteristics, social influence and perception of ability and control. Both the organizational change characteristics and social influence were stronger related to the attitude towards specific change than to the general attitude towards change. The personality trait perception of ability and control was however stronger related to attitude towards change in general than to attitude toward specific change. For all three attitude towards change constructs no relation was found with the personality trait innovativeness.

To the best of my knowledge the organizational change characteristics had not been studied in the organizational change context yet. In this current study it was found that these organizational change characteristics are in fact positively related to attitudes towards organizational change and can therefore be very well applied to an organizational change context. For the model as a whole applies that the interplay of organizational change characteristics, social influence and personality traits explain 50.2% of an
individual’s attitude towards change. This suggest that also the complete model as proposed in this study is applicable to an organizational change setting.

Additionally, it is worth mentioning that the scores on attitude towards specific change and attitude towards change from consultants are significantly lower than the scores from non-consultants; managers and administrative staff. These lower scores might be the result of the physical distance to the source of change. The further away one is from the source of change, the slower one is in adopting to a change. This is caused by a decreasing access to information (Allaway, Berkowitz, & D'Souza, 2003). This argument can be applied to explain the difference in attitude towards specific change and attitude towards change for consultants and non-consultants. Consultants are located at the clients site and therefore not present at one of the offices. The offices are the places were the managers reside, the change agents in this organization, as well as the administrative staff. The physical distance can cause a stagnated information flow. Less information can be related to a more negative attitude towards (specific) change, however ‘function’ is not found to be significantly related to attitude towards organizational change.

The relation between the three change constructs and the organizational change characteristics, social influence, and personality traits, as has been touched upon above, will be further discussed in the next section.

Organizational Change Characteristics

This study included three organizational change characteristics: performance expectancy, effort expectancy, and facilitating conditions. Performance expectancy and facilitating conditions were strongly positively related to attitude towards organizational change, effort expectancy was moderately positively related to attitude towards organizational change.

Facilitating conditions was as well strongly related to attitudes towards specific change. Performance expectancy and effort expectancy were moderately related to attitude towards specific change. Effort expectancy and facilitating conditions were weakly related to attitude towards change in general. Performance expectancy, however, was not significantly related to attitude towards change.

The relations between effort expectancy, as well as facilitating conditions, and the three types of attitude towards change are as what was expected from the literature review. This means that also in the context of organizational change the effort one has to put in changing is related to the attitude towards organizational change. Effort expectancy is stronger related to an individual’s attitude towards specific change than to one’s attitude towards change in general.
Individuals take time to form a view about the effort associated with a change (Venkatesh et al., 2012). The perceived effort an individual has to put in changing something in specific is more concrete than the perceived ease of changing in general. Hence a perception is easier formed when it comes to a change in specific because an individual can better estimate what this change will entail. Compared to change in general, an individual can have thoughts about the effort it will cost to change, however these perceptions are related to the attitude in a weaker way because the individual cannot be sure what the change requires exactly.

The same applies to facilitating conditions. The availability of support and resources is, just like effort expectancy, an individual perception (Venkatesh et al., 2012). Attitude towards change is a general concept and therefore an individual has little to no specific knowledge on the facilitating conditions available for change in general. Individuals rely on more general information in the absence of such specific knowledge. When more specific information becomes available, such as what type of change is being initiated, individuals will alter their judgement accordingly (Venkatesh, 2000). As a result the perception of the availability of facilitating conditions, however the same applies to the perception expected effort, becomes more precise. Hence the perception of the availability of facilitating conditions is stronger related to attitudes towards specific change than to attitudes towards change in general.

The third and last organizational change characteristic is performance expectancy. Performance expectancy was solely significantly related to attitude towards organizational and specific change and not to attitude towards change. Because no significant relation with attitude towards change was found the ‘perception argument’ as explained above is not sufficiently applicable to explain the absence of a significant relation between performance expectancy and attitude towards change.

An individual’s general attitude towards change is based on a cognition; it represents an individual’s thoughts about the necessity and favourability of change (Piderit, 2000; van den Heuvel & Schalk, 2009). The absence of a significant relation between performance expectancy and attitude towards change implies that it does not matter whether or not an individual thinks he will perform better due to the change, if he perceives that it is not necessary to change. Hence the perceived necessity of a change mitigates the influence of expected performance due to the change.

This result suggests that the perception of performance is slightly different from the two aforementioned perceptions regarding attitude towards change. The formation of a general expectation about performance after some change is apparently not related to an individual’s attitude towards change; this in contrast to effort expectancy and facilitating conditions. A difference between the three concepts is that performance is supposedly influenced by the change in contrast to the perception of effort expectancy
and facilitating conditions which are concerned with the change process. This different nature of the concepts might explain the difference in the results.

Social Influence

Social influence was strongly related to both attitude towards organizational change and attitude towards specific change. Social influence was weakly related to attitude towards change in general. This indicates that the co-workers’ (both peers and managers) attitude towards organizational change as perceived by the individual is positively related to all three attitude towards change concepts. This part of the social influence construct is just like the organizational change characteristics a perception. Hence the same argument can apply arguing that co-workers’ attitude towards a specific change is a rather concrete attitude and hence is easier to assess for the individual as compared to a co-workers’ general attitude towards change.

The second part of social influence is the embed in the social network by means of (in)formal contact with a change agent. The information flow between an individual and a change agent is of a more specific nature when it is about a change in specific. This social interaction therefore is related to attitude towards specific change. The information exchange is of a less concrete nature for change in general, hence a weaker relation was found (Allaway et al., 2003).

Social influence can cause a change in mind or thoughts due to interaction with others (Eckhardt et al., 2009). Earlier research established a relationship between social influence and the behavioural intention to use a technology (e.g. Venkatesh et al., 2003), however research on IT adoption is rather inconclusive as both significant and not significant results were found in several studies (Eckhardt et al., 2009). This is caused by the somewhat broad concept of ‘important others’ as used in this field of study, since the perception of who these important others are and the perception of their opinion can possibly differ (Eckhardt et al., 2009). Hence, in this research the attitude of peers and managers are separated which led to the suggestion that there is a significant relation between social influence and attitude towards organizational change.

Personality Traits

This study included two personality traits: perception of ability and control and innovativeness. Perception of ability and control was strongly related to attitude towards organizational change and attitude towards change in general. Perception of ability and control was also significantly related to attitude towards specific change, however this relation was rather weak.

As has been suggest in Choi’s meta-analysis “we need to be cautious in interpreting the research findings regarding the role of personality in shaping employees’ attitudes toward organizational change”
(Choi, 2011, p. 493). Studies as have been performed by Chen and Wang (2007) amongst others, reported a positive relationship between attitude towards change and personality traits. However this does not mean that employees with certain personality traits will support any proposed change. Personality traits do have an effect on an individual’s attitude towards change in general but this effect can be mitigated in the context of specific change (Devos, Vanderheyden, & Van den Broeck, 2001). Personality traits have less influence in a specific change context, because in this context an attitude towards change is largely determined by situational variables (Choi, 2011). A situation of specific change can be seen as a ‘strong situation’. In strong situations, personality matters less than in weak situations (Cooper & Withey, 2009). A strong situation is a situation in which “everyone knows what to do and why and how to do it” (Cooper & Withey, 2009, p. 63). In weak situations there is more ambiguity and hence room for personality traits to influence a response or attitude (Cooper & Withey, 2009). An individual’s attitude toward specific change can therefore differ, depending on the situation and an individual’s experience with changes.

This changing nature of an attitude due to experience is in fact more applicable to states, which are able to change over time as well, than to the rather stable personality traits (Choi, 2011). Hence, attitude towards specific change might be stronger related to states rather than traits.

Scholars have researched innovativeness related to entrepreneurial behaviour as well as entrepreneurial behaviour related to resistance to change. In these studies it was often found that entrepreneurs have an innovative personality and are open to change (Bird, 1989). Therefore it was proposed in this study that there is a relation between innovativeness and attitude towards organizational change. Against expectation, neither one of the three change constructs was significantly related to the personality trait innovativeness. This suggest that, at least for this sample, an innovative personality is not directly related to attitude towards organizational change.

Literature advocates that innovativeness is related to a behavioural component as innovators try to change the way things are by doing things differently (Kirton, 1976). In this often applied study, innovation is placed on one end of a continuum with adoption, the willingness to do things better, placed on the other end (Mueller & Thomas, 2000). This suggests that an individual makes some sort of choice to do things in a different way or to do things better. In this study the change was not voluntary but rather obligatory. If changing is not a choice, it might be the case that there is no relation between innovativeness and either one of the three attitude towards change constructs. Earlier research however suggests that in an information technology context, an innovative personality is relevant (Agarwal & Prasad, 1998). In this particular case innovativeness was related to actual behaviour rather than to an attitude.

A third possible explanation for the mismatch between innovativeness and attitude towards organizational change is the nature of the trait. The same discussion as in the self-efficacy literature
(Bandura, 2006) applies to the innovativeness field. Researchers do suggest that a general innovativeness construct holds low predictive power in specific contexts (Goldsmith & Hofacker, 1991; Agarwal & Prasad, 1998) and a domain specific construct will be better applicable. It might be that for this research an innovativeness concept more specifically related to an organizational change context is more applicable.

These results give insight in factors that are related to attitude towards organizational change, however it does not give tools to actually enhance an individual’s attitude towards organizational change. Five additional interviews were held to gain such information (Appendices VIII, IX & X). The interviewees are employees from the company in the Netherlands and represent different parts of the organization. They are all involved in the change process, either as change agent or as employee. It is worth noting that the change agents were subject to the same change as the employees. The interviewees had indicated in the questionnaire that they were willing to be interviewed. These five interviewees were chosen based on their function and role in the organization in order to obtain an as diverse sample as possible.

The interviews touched upon different topics such as the communication and involvement during the change process (see Appendix VIII for the topic list). Interviewees were asked if they had seen a change in the implementation of the various changes over the two years, it appeared they had not. Hence, the quotes incorporated in the next section represent the interviewees’ opinion on different topics over the past two years.

In the interviews it was pointed out that especially the way in which communication about the change took place was too much focused on sending information rather than creating a dialogue. Most of this communication was received via email.

R1: “There were many emails. The focus was on sending information, at one point in time you just lose track”
R2: “At the moment most communication is via email”
R5: “Communication was very process focussed via email”

According to one of the implementers email was chosen deliberately as means of communication.

R3: “Most communication was via email. Sometimes communication was intensified by sending more emails to a specific target group”. “No, we did not change our communication strategy”

However a second implementer acknowledges that this might not have been the best way of informing employees.

R5: “It does not help to send emails from the top ordering people to do things a certain way”
Because of this sending of information, the interviewees did not feel empowered or involved in the change process.

R4: “In general employees are not very involved in the change process”
R1: “People feel better if they are included”
R2: “Managers do not see the distance between the consultants and the organization”
R3: “We have noticed that people who are not involved internally have more difficulties to change”

The latter two quotes are in line with the finding that consultants have on average a lower score on the attitude towards organizational change measure. This on average more negative attitude towards organizational change, as compared to non-consultants, can have occurred due to the perceived lack of involvement and the large perceived extent of one-way communication. Moreover, employees were often unsure about what a particular change would mean for them personally or for the organization as a whole.

R1: “I missed a vision and a direction”
R2: “There was no clear implementation strategy”
R4: “It would have helped if it was explained what the change will mean to people”

One of the implementers said to involve his employees in the change process for exactly this reason.

R5: “It helps to give a forecast of changes to come”

In the past decade, the company has been subject to more major changes and transformations, such as amongst others an earlier acquisition. This continuous change might help the managers to increase their expertise on change management.

R5: “My management team is used to change, we like it”. “If you like change, you know how to implement it”.

However the many changes in the past, and the perceived mistakes that have been made during the recent transformation have had their influence on the employees.

R1: “People now want to see it before they believe it. It feels like one of the many changes. Employees become sceptical. Not everyone is innovative and flexible, but even the ones that are do feel a lack of ownership”
R4: “People are not impressed by the changes anymore. I also became laconically”

This does not mean that the employees have rather negative attitude, as also appeared from the data were the lowest score was ‘3’ on an ascending scale from 1 to 7. Even though they think mistakes have been made, and a new approach would be suitable, there are as well good points to be found in the transformation and the company.
R1: “There are many opportunities in this company”. “You can get involved in the organization”. “The Management Foundation is a good model”.
R2: “It is a good story”. “Very clear and powerful”. “The Management Foundation is very good”
R3: “It was a step in the right direction”
R4: “The framework is good”. “The new organization is very good”
R5: “This is a very unique culture”

The change and the sometimes negative consequences of the change have had their impact on the employees. However, the interviewees felt that if they would know why some things needed to change, they would probably understand it even if this change would not be necessarily better for them personally.

R2: “My attitude changed over time. Now I am more aware of the ‘why’ and therefore it’s easier to accept. Some people needed to be fired”
R4: “The organization has to be honest about the mistakes they have made. If there would have been a good mixture of capable people and people that dare to be vulnerable it will create understanding”
R5: “The middle part of the change process went very well, at the start however we were not honest enough, this did not help the change”

Besides the need for honesty, clarity, and involvement the interviewees mentioned more points for improvement regarding future implementation of change. According to the interviewees it all starts with the management; the management needs to know where they want to go and how to reach their goals.

R1: “The management needs to be empowered to get used to their new role. This will also create a clear vision”
R3: “You have to make sure that you have the managers on your side”
R4: “Managers need to know more about the internal structures. There needs to be a clear goal”
R5: “I have noticed now that managers start to share their best practices, that does not mean that we all have to do the same things, you have to pick the way of working that suits your management style. However the sharing is a good thing”

When the managers are empowered and there is clear goal and vision, the next step would be to communicate this goal and vision to the organization. This way, employees will be more involved, understand the reasons for the necessity of change, especially when the results are a bit negative, and they can convey this vision themselves.

R1: “Organize kick-off or a team meeting so you can involve employees. You have to communicate about the how and why otherwise it will not stick”.
R4: “A step-by-step program would be very helpful”
R2: “A training is necessary. You have to help people to understand what change means for them. Involve employees. A personal approach is necessary, you need someone who can tell the story. You have to be open and transparent”

R5: “You have to involve people, let them tell the story”. “Let people know that the door is open and that you make their opinion a priority”. “If employees want a more personal approach, you have to make it more personal”

R3: “Sometimes you have to be firm”

In sum, ways of enhancing the attitude towards organizational change according to the interviewees are to set a clear goal and vision from the start of the change process, and one has to be consequent in conveying this message. They acknowledge that sometimes a change will not be a personal gain, however as long as it is explained why something is necessary and what it will mean to them personally, overtime, the interviewees say they can still have a positive attitude towards the organizational change.

**Strengths and Limitations**

As every research, this study is not without limitations. The first limitation has to do with the relation between an attitude and the actual behaviour. Attitude towards organizational change is a relevant individual attitude in explaining acceptance and it can affect an individual’s reaction towards change (Lee et al., 2009). Attitudes towards change are therefore a good predictor of future behaviour (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980). This especially accounts for voluntary change. In this case study the change was however mandatory. For this reason one can argue that when the attitude towards organizational change is rather positive this does not necessarily mean that an individual will change accordingly, because the less voluntary the change is the less an attitude towards change predicts actual change behaviour (Kijsanayotin et al., 2009). Besides this, researchers have suggested that actual behaviour is in general better predicted by specific attitudes rather than general attitudes (Choi, 2011).

This later remark is averted due to the multidimensional nature of the attitude towards organizational change concept in which also attitude towards specific change is included. The first point implies that this study will not be a good predictor for the adoption of an organizational change behaviour due to its mandatory change context. Employees with a rather negative attitude towards an organizational change will still change accordingly because it is desired by the organization. This does not mean that a negative attitude has no impact on the organization. A negative attitude towards organizational change can have an effect on, amongst others, an employee’s well-being. Since employees are key in determining the success of an organizational change, a negative attitude can via this route indirectly still influence organizational performance (Yousef, 2000).
The items that measure both the organizational change characteristics and social influence are determined by the extent to which they are being perceived. Perceptions are rather subjective and therefore do not measure if there actually is a performance increase when adopting to a change. The results suggest for example that effort expectancy is positively related to attitude towards organizational change. It is however questionable if it is possible for change agents to influence a perception in order to enhance an attitude towards organizational change.

A third limitation is related to data collection. The study has a cross sectional design which means that the data gathering took place at one point in time. Earlier research has suggested that in particular the influence of effort expectancy differs across time. Effort expectancy is found to be of greater importance at the initial phases of change when the change is still new and there are hurdles to overcome (Venkatesh et al., 2003). This implies that the fairly strong relation between effort expectancy and attitude towards organizational change as it was found now can weaken when measured again. A longitudinal design therefore would have been more appropriate.

Besides limitations, this study also comes with its strengths. The study is built on data retrieved from a relatively large sample. Due to its sample size the results are rather robust. A second strength of this study is the multidimensionality of the attitude towards organizational change concept. The results of this study suggest that it is worthwhile to study both the concept and its dimensions. Moreover the examination of attitude towards organizational change as well as its two dimensions separately has provided a deeper insight in determinants and components of an individual’s attitude towards organizational change.

The integration of constructs from the innovation adoption literature and the organizational change field in one model sheds a new light on antecedents of an individual’s attitude towards change. The inclusion of interviews as well provides extra insights in the development of these individual attitudes in practice.

Suggestions for Future Research
In this study it was pointed out that there is a difference between attitudes towards specific change and attitudes towards change in general. Other research is needed to retest and further explore these findings. Future research will determine whether or not this study can be generalized to other organizations, sectors or countries. Specific change as defined in this study is specific to the company in which the study has been performed. More research is needed to test the robustness of this model in the light of different types of specific organizational changes. Hence confirmatory studies are desirable.
Previous research has often associated the Big Five personality traits with resistance to change (e.g. Oreg, 2003). This research tried to extent this research by including innovativeness, however no significant relation was found between innovativeness and either one of the three change constructs. This was somewhat against expectations. Future research could extend the current model by including the Big Five personality traits instead of or aside innovativeness, as scholars suggest that innovativeness is related to the Big Five personality traits (Marcati et al., 2008). Research will reveal if there is indeed a direct link between innovativeness and attitude towards organizational change while omitting entrepreneurial behaviour.

Zhou, Lu and Wang found that even though individuals are willing to change, this does not mean that individuals adopt accordingly (2010). The actual change was out of scope for this research, however it would be interesting to research factors that will help individuals to put their attitude in practice. The Theory of Planned Behaviour could therefore be an addition to the model as proposed in this study (Ajzen, 1991). Especially since this theory also includes traits as self-efficacy and locus of control (Ajzen, 2002). The social influence aspect of the current model could be extended with network theory to further assess an individual’s embeddedness in the social network. This will add to the discussion about the influence of information sharing as has been touched upon in this research (Sykes, Venkatesh, & Gosain, 2009). Positive attitudes are underexposed in most organizational change studies. This is a shame because there are individuals that see change as an opportunity rather than as a threat (Svensen et al., 2007). Hence it would be worthwhile to find out if and how these positive individuals can positively influence their peers.

Managerial Implications
It is only natural to resist change. Seen through an evolutionary lens, humans have been conditioned to look for security in constancy as past generations did not have to deal with many significant changes across their lifespan (McConnell, 2010). The dynamics of organizational changes are therefore a challenge for organizations, employees and change managers (van den Heuvel & Schalk, 2009). The findings of this study suggest that there are factors that can enhance an individual’s attitude towards organizational change. These factors are of influence on three levels; the individual, the social, and the organizational level. The former includes the personality trait perception of ability and control, with dimensions from locus of control and self-efficacy. This personality trait is related to an attitude towards organization change, however personality traits are rather difficult to alter. A change agent can influence the organizational change characteristics by conveying that an individual 1) will perform better after the change than before, 2) does not have to put a lot of effort in changing, 3) is enabled to change. A manager can through facilitating (in)formal contact between change agents and employees positively impact the social influence. The results of this study suggest that when these factors are in place an individual is more
likely to have a positive attitude towards the organizational change. This is an upward spiral; through social influence an individual’s positive attitude has a positive influence on the attitude of its co-workers. This interrelated formation of attitudes is worth acknowledging because unless the majority of the employees perceives that the organization is able to change successfully, change implementations are at risk (Schweiger & DeNisi, 1991).

5.2 Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to research the extent to which innovation characteristics, social influence and personality traits explain an individual’s attitude towards organizational change. The fit of the proposed model was tested with Hierarchical Multiple Regression. The empirical findings of this study suggest that solely the control variables, generation, gender, and tenure, and the organizational change characteristics predict more than 41% of the variance of the attitude towards organizational change. When adding social influence to the model the variance explained increases to over 45%. The final model including the control variables, the organizational change characteristics, social influence, and the personality traits was able to explain 50.2% of an individual’s attitude towards organizational change.

This means as well that about 50% of an individual’s attitude towards organizational change can be explained by other factors. Besides the two personality traits included in the current study, other personal factors that are often associated with attitude towards organization change are risk tolerance (Judge et al., 1999; Oreg, 2003) and affects towards the change, such as cynicism about or openness to organizational change (Choi, 2011), or the Big Five personality traits (Judge et al., 1999). Studies suggest that these and other personal dispositions influence attitudes towards organizational change irrespectively of the type of change (Bareil et al., 2007). Situational factors such as justice, work overload or poor relations at work are as well associated with negative attitudes towards organizational change (Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005). The meta-analysis from Choi (2011) provides some other often used factors that can determine an attitude towards organizational change such as ‘readiness for change’ and ‘commitment to change’. These constructs are just a few constructs, among many others that could explain the remaining 50% of an individual’s attitude towards organizational change.

In this study attitude towards organizational change is a multidimensional construct. However, there is an ongoing debate on the utility of such a construct. Researchers in favour of a multidimensional construct praise its simplicity, breadth, and generality, while opponents criticize the lack of accuracy, precision, and specificity. Both sides are understandable, therefore it has been recommended to integrate these approaches rather than adopt one (Edwards, 2001). For this reason the model fit of the two dimensions of
attitude towards organizational change were assessed separately in addition to the fit with attitude towards organizational change as described above.

The model as proposed was able to explain 59.3% of an individual’s attitude towards specific change. The total variance explained for this model is higher than the variance explained for attitude towards organizational change. The relative importance of each set of concepts is however rather similar. The model fit with attitude towards change in general was poorer. The model accounted for 23.7% of the variance that explains an individual’s general attitude towards change. The relative importance of the sets of concepts was distributed slightly different. In accordance with previous research (e.g. Devos et al., 2001) the personality traits were able to explain a relative large part of the variance explained of attitude towards change as compared to the two other attitude towards change constructs.

Concluding, in this study it was found that there is indeed a difference between general attitudes and attitude towards specific change in the context of organizational change. Attitude towards organizational change, as a multidimensional concepts, is strongly related to the organizational change characteristics, social influence and perception of ability and control. Perception of ability and control was stronger related to attitude towards change than to attitude toward specific change, while social influence and the organizational change characteristics were stronger related to attitude towards specific change and attitude towards organizational change. Innovativeness was not found to be related to the attitude towards change constructs.

Individual attitudes towards an organizational change can either make or break a change process with detrimental consequences for organizational survival. The difference between attitude towards change and attitude towards specific change implies for change agents that they will want to enhance their employees’ attitudes towards organizational change for every novel change. A change agent can enhance the support for a change initiative on an individual level by: emphasizing performance benefits of the change, facilitate support for change, and, lowering the effort associated with the change. Individual attitudes are influenced by attitudes of colleagues. The importance of social interaction therefore should not be underestimated. Social interaction can be an advantage; sharing honest and unambiguous information about the change is beneficial for attitudes towards the organizational change as individuals appreciate being involved in the change process.
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## Appendix I – Operationalization Table

### Dependent variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Calculation of scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude towards organizational change</td>
<td>Attitude towards specific change (20-23)</td>
<td>(20) Het introduceren van de X way of working is een slecht idee</td>
<td>Items were measured on a Likert-scale from 1-7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Individuals overall affective reaction to a specific change</td>
<td>(21) De introductie van de X way of working heeft mijn werk interessanter gemaakt</td>
<td>Average score on question 20 to 23, with higher scores indicating a positive attitude towards the specific change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive attitude towards change (33-38)</td>
<td>(22) De X way of working is leuk</td>
<td>Item 20 is reversed coded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and the internal orientation towards proposed change</td>
<td>(23) Ik vind de X way of working een fijne manier van werken</td>
<td>Average score on question 33-38, with a higher score indicating a more negative cognitive attitude towards change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Robbins &amp; Judge, 2007)</td>
<td>(33) Door verandering heb ik minder controle over wat er gebeurt op mijn werk</td>
<td>All items are reverse coded to fit the attitude towards specific change items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(34) Ik verzet mij tegen nieuwe ideeën</td>
<td>Average score on items 20-23 and 33-38 indicates one’s attitude towards organizational change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(35) Ik hou niet van verandering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(36) Verandering frustreert mij</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(37) Werk gerelateerde veranderingen irriteren mij</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(38) Ik ben terughoudend in het proberen van nieuwe ideeën</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Independent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Calculation of scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitating Conditions</strong>&lt;br&gt;&quot;The degree to which an individual believes that an organizational and technical infrastructure exists to support use of the system“&lt;br&gt;Venkatesh et al., 2003, p. 453</td>
<td>Facilitating conditions (16, 17, 19)&lt;br&gt;Compatibility (18)</td>
<td>(16) Ik heb de benodigde middelen om de X way of working in praktijk te brengen&lt;br&gt;(17) Ik heb de benodigde kennis om de X way of working in praktijk te brengen&lt;br&gt;(18) De X way of working is verenigbaar met mijn huidige manier van werken&lt;br&gt;(19) Een specifiek persoon of groep is beschikbaar om assistentie te verlenen wanneer ik moeilijkheden ervaar met het toepassen van de X way of working</td>
<td>Items were measured on a 7 point Likert-scale.&lt;br&gt;Average score was calculated with a score of 7 indicating the perception of more facilitation conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Expectancy</strong>&lt;br&gt;&quot;The degree to which an individual believes that using the system will help him or her to attain gains in job performance“&lt;br&gt;Venkatesh et al., 2003, p. 447</td>
<td>Perceived usefulness (6)&lt;br&gt;Relative advantage (7,8)</td>
<td>(6) Ik vind de X way of working handig in het uitvoeren van mijn werk&lt;br&gt;(7) Door het toepassen van de X way of working kan ik mijn taken sneller volbrengen dan ik kon voor de introductie van de X way of working&lt;br&gt;(8) In vergelijking met de situatie van voor de introductie van de X way of working, verhoogt de X way of working mijn productiviteit</td>
<td>Items were measured on a 7 point Likert-scale.&lt;br&gt;The average score of the items was calculated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effort Expectancy</strong>&lt;br&gt;“The degree of ease associated with the use of the system“&lt;br&gt;Venkatesh et al., 2003, p. 450</td>
<td>Perceived ease of use (9,10,11,12)</td>
<td>(9) Ik vind de X way of working duidelijk&lt;br&gt;(10) Voor mij is het makkelijk om bekwamen te raken in de X way of working&lt;br&gt;(11) Ik vind de X way of</td>
<td>Items are measured on a 7 point Likert-scale.&lt;br&gt;The average score was calculated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Influence</strong></td>
<td><strong>Innovativeness</strong></td>
<td><strong>Perception of Ability and Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The perceived attitude of one’s co-workers and one’s embeddedness in the organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>“A tendency to be creative in thought and action”</strong></td>
<td><strong>One’s perceived ability to influence his or her own life and the belief that he or she is capable of</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contact with change agent (13)</td>
<td>Experimentation (30, 32)</td>
<td>Locus of Control (24, 25, 26, 27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude of co-workers (14, 15)</td>
<td>Creativity (28, 29, 31)</td>
<td>“One’s perceived ability to influence events in his or her own life”</td>
<td>Rotter, 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(12) Het aanleren van de X way of working is makkelijk voor mij</td>
<td>(28) Ik verras mensen vaak met mijn nieuwe ideeën</td>
<td>(24) Wanneer ik een plan maak, ben ik er zeker van dat ik het plan kan laten slagen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13) Ik heb contact met een member die invloed heeft op de implementatie van de X way of working</td>
<td>(29) Mensen vragen mijn hulp met het uitvoeren van creatieve taken</td>
<td>The self-efficacy items were measured on a 7...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
performing a particular behaviour

Self-efficacy (39,40,41)
“The believe that one has the capability to perform a particular behaviour” Bandura, 2006

(26) Wanneer ik krijg wat ik wil is dat omdat ik er hard voor heb gewerkt
(27) Of ik succesvol ben in het leven hangt af van mijn eigen kunnen
(39) Wanneer ik een moeilijke taak onder ogen krijg, weet ik zeker dat ik de taak kan volbrengen
(40) Ik ben in staat om elke situatie te overwinnen
(41) Zelfs wanneer het even tegen zit, functioneer ik goed

Average score on items 24-27 and items 39 to 41 was calculated. A high score indicates an internal locus of control and a high self-efficacy: a high perception of ability and control

Control Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Calculation of scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>Year of birth</td>
<td>(2) In welk jaar bent u geboren?</td>
<td>Year of birth, categorized in generations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0: 1940 tot 1955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1: 1955 tot 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2: 1970 tot 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3: 1985 tot 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>(1) Wat is uw geslacht? _Man _Vrouw</td>
<td>Nominal dummy variable 0=male 1=female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td>Years of employment</td>
<td>(5) Hoe veel jaar bent u, bij benadering, werkzaam voor deze organisatie?</td>
<td>Employment in years Ordinal scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept</td>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>Items</td>
<td>Calculation of scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Unit</td>
<td>Business unit</td>
<td>(42) Bij welke Divisie bent u werkzaam?</td>
<td>Nominal dummy variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_Divisie I</td>
<td>0=DivisionI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_Divisie II</td>
<td>1=DivisionII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>City in which the official office is located</td>
<td>(43) Wat is uw officiële basiskantoor?</td>
<td>Dummy variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_1</td>
<td>0=other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_2</td>
<td>1=head office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Highest education</td>
<td>(3) Wat is uw hoogst afgeronde opleiding?</td>
<td>Dummy variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_Middelbare school</td>
<td>0=other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_MBO</td>
<td>1=higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_HBO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_Post HBO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_WO Bachelor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_WO Master</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_MBA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_PhD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_Overig, namelijk:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Current function</td>
<td>(4) Wat is uw huidige functie?</td>
<td>Dummy variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_Administratief medewerker</td>
<td>0=other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_Consultant of Technisch medewerker</td>
<td>1=consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>_ (Senior) Vice-President</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beste Member,

Op dit moment is Evelien Bulder bij werkzaam in het kader van haar afstudeeropdracht op het gebied van verandermanagement. Ons type organisatie is veel aan verandering onderhevig, zowel intern als in relatie tot de manier waarop wij ons extern positioneren. Wij willen graag de resultaten van het onderzoek van Evelien gebruiken om ons te helpen veranderingen op een zo goed mogelijke manier te kunnen begeleiden. Daar hebben we jouw hulp bij nodig. Ik verzoek je vriendelijk via onderstaande link een anonieme questionnaire in te vullen die de gevraagde inzichten zullen opleveren. Het invullen van de questionnaire kost ongeveer 5 minuten. Ik dank je bij voorbaat voor de medewerking.

Link naar de questionnaire: https://tilburgss.co1.qualtrics.com/SE/?SID=SV_7Pujo7q349jVK2V

Met vriendelijke groet, Kind Regards,
Appendix III – Questionnaire

Beste collega,

Mijn naam is Evelien Bulder en ik ben op dit moment aan het afstuderen bij X. Voor mijn studie Organisatiewetenschappen aan de Universiteit van Tilburg doe ik onderzoek naar verander management. Omdat X recentelijk een significante verandering heeft ondergaan, wil ik u vragen om deze questionnaire in te vullen. De questionnaire gaat zoals gezegd over verander management en heeft als onderwerp de mate van succes van de recente organisatie verandering. De vragenlijst zal ongeveer 5 tot 10 minuten in beslag nemen. Uw antwoorden worden vertrouwelijk behandeld en zullen uitsluitend gebruikt worden voor mijn master thesis. Gegenormaliseerde resultaten van dit onderzoek zullen worden gepresenteerd aan X. Hierin worden uw antwoorden volledig geanonimiseerd waardoor individuele deelnemers niet zijn te herleiden.

Hartelijk dank voor uw medewerking!
Evelien Bulder

Indien u vragen of opmerkingen heeft kunt u altijd contact met mij opnemen via:
evelien.bulder@X.com of 06 14 80 82 21

-----

De meeste vragen in deze questionnaire zijn als stellingen geformuleerd. Voor elke stelling kunt u aangeven in hoeverre u het met de stelling eens bent.

De antwoordcategorieën variëren van 'helemaal mee oneens' tot 'helemaal mee eens', op een schaal van 1 tot 5 of van 1 tot 7. U kunt slechts één antwoord aanklikken.

Indien nodig, is er onder elke vraag ruimte voor het plaatsen van eventuele opmerkingen en/of specificaties van uw antwoord(en).

Hieronder staat een voorbeeld, u hoeft deze niet in te vullen.

Ik ben een koffie drinker
Ik sport graag

Eventuele opmerking kunt u hieronder kwijt

-----

De questionnaire gaat nu beginnen. Eerst zullen er een aantal algemene vragen volgen.

-----
1. Wat is uw geslacht?
   _Man
   _Vrouw

2. In welk jaar bent u geboren?
   ____

3. Wat is uw hoogst afgeronde opleiding?
   _Middelbare school
   _MBO
   _HBO
   _Post HBO
   _WO Bachelor
   _WO Master
   _MBA
   _PhD
   _Overig, namelijk: ________________

4. Wat is uw huidige functie?
   _Administratief medewerker
   _Consultant of Technisch medewerker
   _Manager
   _Director
   _(Senior) Vice-President

5. Hoe veel jaar bent u, bij benadering, werkzaam voor deze organisatie? (Inclusief dienstjaren bij ….)
   ____
   _____

De volgende vragen zullen gaan over verandering. In deze vragen wordt regelmatig verwezen naar de X way of working. Dit is de X way of working zoals deze is uitgelegd in de Y.

*Afbeelding verwijderd*
U kunt hierbij denken aan dingen als:

*Voorbeelden verwijderd*

Wanneer er in de vraag wordt gerefereerd aan de X way of working hoeft u alleen de processen en tools in gedachten te houden die voor uw functie van toepassing zijn.

Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met onderstaande stellingen (1-7)

6. Ik vind de x way of working handig in het uitvoeren van mijn werk
7. Door het toepassen van de X way of working kan ik mijn taken sneller volbrengen dan ik kon voor de introductie van de X way of working
8. In vergelijking met de situatie voor de introductie van de X way of working, verhoogt de X way of working mijn productiviteit

Eventuele opmerking kunt u hieronder kwijt

Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met onderstaande stellingen (1-7)

9. Ik vind de X way of working duidelijk
10. Voor mij is het makkelijk om bekwaam te raken in de X way of working
11. Ik vind de X way of working makkelijk in gebruik
12. Het aanleren van de X way of working is makkelijk voor mij

Eventuele opmerking kunt u hieronder kwijt

Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met onderstaande stellingen (1-7)

13. Ik heb contact met een member die invloed heeft op de implementatie van de X way of working
14. Ik denk dat mijn directe leidinggevende positief is over de X way of working
15. Over het algemeen zijn mijn directe collega's negatief over de X way of working

Eventuele opmerking kunt u hieronder kwijt
-----
Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met onderstaande stellingen (1-7)

16. Ik heb de benodigde middelen om de X way of working in praktijk te brengen
17. Ik heb de benodigde kennis om de X way of working in praktijk te brengen
18. De X way of working is verenigbaar met mijn huidige manier van werken
19. Een specifiek persoon of groep is beschikbaar om assistentie te verlenen wanneer ik moeilijkheden ervaar met het toepassen van de X way of working

Eventuele opmerking kunt u hieronder kwijt

-----
Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met onderstaande stellingen (1-7)

20. Het introduceren van de X way of working is een slecht idee
21. De X way of working maakt mijn werk interessanter
22. De X way of working is leuk
23. Ik vind de X way of working een fijne manier van werken

Eventuele opmerking kunt u hieronder kwijt

_____  
De volgende vragen zullen gaan over u als persoon en hoe u bepaalde situaties ervaart.
_____  
Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met onderstaande stellingen (1-5)

24. Wanneer ik een plan maak ben ik er zeker van dat ik het plan kan laten slagen
25. Ik heb controle over wat er gebeurt in mijn leven
26. Wanneer ik krijg wat ik wil is dat omdat ik er hard voor heb gewerkt
27. Of ik succesvol ben in het leven hangt af van mijn eigen kunnen

Eventuele opmerking kunt u hieronder kwijt

_____
Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met onderstaande stellingen (1-5)

28. Ik verras mensen vaak met mijn nieuwe ideeën
29. Mensen vragen mijn hulp met het uitvoeren van creatieve taken
30. Ik haal meer voldoening uit werk waarbij ik out of the box moet denken dan uit werk waarbij ik continu hetzelfde moet doen
31. Ik ben geen creatief persoon
32. Ik vind het leuk om te experimenteren met verschillende oplossingen voor één vraagstuk

Eventuele opmerking kunt u hieronder kwijt

_____

Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met onderstaande stellingen (1-7)

33. Door veranderingen heb ik minder controle over wat er gebeurt op mijn werk
34. Ik verzet mij tegen nieuwe ideeën
35. Ik hou niet van verandering
36. Verandering frustreert mij
37. Werk gerelateerde veranderingen irriteren mij
38. Ik ben terughoudend in het proberen van nieuwe ideeën

Eventuele opmerkingen kunt u hieronder kwijt

_____

Geef aan in hoeverre u het eens bent met onderstaande stellingen

39. Wanneer ik een moeilijke taak onder ogen krijg weet ik zeker dat ik de taak kan volbrengen
40. Ik ben in staat om elke situatie te overwinnen
41. Zelfs wanneer het even tegen zit functioneer ik goed

_____ 

U bent bijna aan het einde gekomen van de vragenlijst!
Er volgen nu nog een aantal vragen over uw X locatie.
Deze vragen worden uitsluitend gebruikt voor validatie doeleinden van dit onderzoek. Ze worden dan ook **niet** terug gekoppeld naar X en **niet** verwerkt in het rapport aan X.

___

42. Bij welke Divisie bent u werkzaam?
   _ Divisie I
   _ Divisie II

43. Wat is uw officiële X basiskantoor?
   _1
   _2
   _3
   _4
   _5
   _6

___

U bent aan het einde gekomen van de vragenlijst.
Bedankt voor uw tijd!
Indien u nog opmerkingen over deze vragenlijst heeft kunt u die hieronder kwijt

___

Voor mijn onderzoek wil ik ook graag members interviewen. Het doel van dit interview is om meer inzicht te krijgen in veranderingen in organisaties en hoe zij succesvol(ler) kunnen worden uitgevoerd. Mocht u benaderd willen worden voor een interview dan kunt u hieronder uw gegevens (naam en telefoonnummer en/of email adres) achter laten.

Ook deze informatie wordt vertrouwelijk behandeld en individuele reacties zullen niet herleidbaar zijn!
### Appendix IV – Assumptions for Regression

#### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.399</td>
<td>.251</td>
<td>5.577</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MeanPE</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>4.631</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MeanEE</td>
<td>.123</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>2.925</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MeanFC</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MeanPAC</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>5.292</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: MeanATOC

---

REGRESSION
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
/MISSING PAIRWISE
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS CI(95) R ANOVA COLLIN TOL ZPP
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT MeanATOC
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC SI_7 MeanPAC
/SCATTERPLOT=(*ZRESID ,*ZPRED)
/RESIDUALS HISTOGRAM(ZRESID) NORMPROB(ZRESID)
/CASEWISE PLOT(ZRESID) OUTLIERS(3)
/SAVE MAHAL COOK.
Appendix V – Correlations

Attitude towards Specific Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Person Correlation</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude Towards Specific Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Expectancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.699**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effort Expectancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>.598**</td>
<td>.611**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.552**</td>
<td>.500**</td>
<td>.665**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.524**</td>
<td>.465**</td>
<td>.440**</td>
<td>.498**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.136*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Ability and Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>.215**</td>
<td>.258**</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>.218**</td>
<td>.182**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.985</td>
<td>-.117**</td>
<td>-.923</td>
<td>-.962</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.327**</td>
<td>-.341**</td>
<td>-.394**</td>
<td>-.268**</td>
<td>-.341**</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.128**</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>-.968</td>
<td>-.074</td>
<td>-.111**</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>-.021</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>-.209**</td>
<td>-.518**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.161**</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>-.922</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>-.078</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.259**</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.155**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>-.042</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.164**</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.161**</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

N=317

CORRELATIONS
/VARIABLES=MeanATSC MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC SI_7 Inno_7 MeanPAC EduDummy FunctDummy Generation Tenure LocationRdam BU_Dum GenDum
/PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
/MISSING=PAIRWISE.
Attitude towards Change

Correlations

/CORRELATIONS
/VARIABLES=MeanATC, MeanPOS, MeanPE, MeanEE, MeanFC, SI_7, Inno_7, MeanPAC, EduDummy, PunctDummy, Generation, Tenure, LocationRdam, BU_Dum, GenDum
/MISSING=PAIRWISE.
Appendix VI – Hierarchical Multiple Regression

**Syntax 1** Hierarchical Multiple Regression – Dependent Variable: Attitude towards Organizational Change

REGRESSION
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
/MISSING MEANSUBSTITUTION
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT MeanATOC
/METHOD=ENTER GenDum Generation Tenure
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC
/METHOD=ENTER SI_7
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPAC Inno_7
/SCATTERPLOT=(*ZRESID ,*ZPRED)
/RESIDUALS NORMPROB(ZRESID)
/SAVE PRED ZPRED ADJPRED MAHAL COOK LEVER ZRESID DRESID SDRESID SDBETA

**Syntax 2** Hierarchical Multiple Regression – Dependent Variable: Attitude towards Organizational Change and SI1

REGRESSION
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
/MISSING MEANSUBSTITUTION
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT MeanATOC
/METHOD=ENTER GenDum Generation Tenure
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC
/METHOD=ENTER SI1_7
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPAC Inno_7.

**Syntax 3** Hierarchical Multiple Regression – Dependent Variable: Attitude towards Organizational Change and SI2

REGRESSION
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
/MISSING MEANSUBSTITUTION
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT MeanATOC
/METHOD=ENTER GenDum Generation Tenure
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC
/METHOD=ENTER SI2_7
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPAC Inno_7.
Syntax 4 Hierarchical Multiple Regression – Dependent Variable: Attitude towards Organizational Change and SI3

REGRESSION
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
/MISSING MEANSUBSTITUTION
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT MeanATOC
/METHOD=ENTER GenDum Generation Tenure
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC
/METHOD=ENTER RS13_7
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPAC Inno_7.

Syntax 5 Hierarchical Multiple Regression – Dependent Variable: Attitude towards Specific Change

REGRESSION
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
/MISSING MEANSUBSTITUTION
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT MeanATSC
/METHOD=ENTER GenDum Generation Tenure
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC
/METHOD=ENTER SI_7
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPAC Inno_7
/SCATTERPLOT=(*ZRESID,*ZPRED)
/RESIDUALS NORMPROB(ZRESID)
/SAVE PRED ZPRED ADJPRED MAHAL COOK LEVER ZRESID DRESID SDRESID SDBETA

Syntax 6 Hierarchical Multiple Regression – Dependent Variable: Attitude towards Change

REGRESSION
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
/MISSING MEANSUBSTITUTION
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT MeanATCCPOS
/METHOD=ENTER GenDum Generation Tenure
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC
/METHOD=ENTER SI_7
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPAC Inno_7
/SCATTERPLOT=(*ZRESID,*ZPRED)
/RESIDUALS NORMPROB(ZRESID)
/SAVE PRED ZPRED ADJPRED MAHAL COOK LEVER ZRESID DRESID SDRESID SDBETA
Syntax 7 Hierarchical Multiple Regression – Exclude Missing Values Listwise

REGRESSION
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
/MISSING LISTWISE
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT MeanATOC
/METHOD=ENTER GenDum Generation Tenure
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC
/METHOD=ENTER SI_7
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPAC Inno_7.

Syntax 8 Hierarchical Multiple Regression – Exclude Missing Values Pairwise

REGRESSION
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
/MISSING PAIRWISE
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT MeanATOC
/METHOD=ENTER GenDum Generation Tenure
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC
/METHOD=ENTER SI_7
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPAC Inno_7.

Syntax 9 Hierarchical Multiple Regression – Inverted U-shape Dependent Variable: Attitude towards Organizational Change

EXECUTE.
REGRESSION
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
/MISSING MEANSUBSTITUTION
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS CI(95) R ANOVA CHANGE
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT MeanATOC
/METHOD=ENTER GenDum Generation Tenure
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC
/METHOD=ENTER SI_7
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPAC Inno_7
/METHOD=ENTER Inno_7U
/SCATTERPLOT=(ZRESID,ZPRED).
Syntax 10 Hierarchical Multiple Regression – Inverted U-shape Dependent Variable: Attitude towards Specific Change

REGRESSION  
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N  
/MISSING MEANSUBSTITUTION  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS CI(95) R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT MeanATSC  
/METHOD=ENTER GenDum Generation Tenure  
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC  
/METHOD=ENTER SI_7  
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPAC Inno_7  
/METHOD=ENTER Inno_7U  
/SCATTERPLOT=(*ZRESID ,*ZPRED).

Syntax 11 Hierarchical Multiple Regression – Inverted U-shape Dependent Variable: Attitude towards Change

REGRESSION  
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N  
/MISSING MEANSUBSTITUTION  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS CI(95) R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT MeanATCCPOS  
/METHOD=ENTER GenDum Generation Tenure  
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC  
/METHOD=ENTER SI_7  
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPAC Inno_7  
/METHOD=ENTER Inno_7U  
/SCATTERPLOT=(*ZRESID ,*ZPRED).

Syntax 12 Hierarchical Multiple Regression – Self-Efficacy and Locus of Control Dependent Variable: Attitude towards Organizational Change

REGRESSION  
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N  
/MISSING MEANSUBSTITUTION  
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE  
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)  
/NOORIGIN  
/DEPENDENT MeanATOC  
/METHOD=ENTER GenDum Generation Tenure  
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC  
/METHOD=ENTER SI_7  
/METHOD=ENTER Inno_7 MeanPoC MeanSE.
**Syntax 13** Hierarchical Multiple Regression – Self-Efficacy and Locus of Control Dependent Variable: Attitude towards Specific Change

REGRESSION
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
/MISSING MEANSUBSTITUTION
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT MeanATSC
/METHOD=ENTER GenDum Generation Tenure
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC
/METHOD=ENTER SI_7
/METHOD=ENTER Inno_7 MeanPoC MeanSE.

**Syntax 14** Hierarchical Multiple Regression – Self-Efficacy and Locus of Control Dependent Variable: Attitude towards Change

REGRESSION
/DESCRIPTIVES MEAN STDDEV CORR SIG N
/MISSING MEANSUBSTITUTION
/STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA CHANGE
/CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
/NOORIGIN
/DEPENDENT MeanATCCPOS
/METHOD=ENTER GenDum Generation Tenure
/METHOD=ENTER MeanPE MeanEE MeanFC
/METHOD=ENTER SI_7
/METHOD=ENTER Inno_7 MeanPoC MeanSE.
Appendix VII – Factor Analysis

**Syntax 1** Factor Analysis Attitude Towards Organizational Change

```plaintext
FACTOR
/VARIABLES ATCS_INTRES ATCS_FUN ATCS_NICE ATCC_CONTROL ATCC_IDEAS
ATCC_DISLIKE ATCC_FRUSTR ATCC_IRRITATE ATCC_TRY RATSC_BAD
/MISSING PAIRWISE
/ANALYSIS ATCS_INTRES ATCS_FUN ATCS_NICE ATCC_CONTROL ATCC_IDEAS
ATCC_DISLIKE ATCC_FRUSTR ATCC_IRRITATE ATCC_TRY RATSC_BAD
/PLOT EIGEN
/CRITERIA MINEIGEN(1) ITERATE(25)
/EXTRACTION PC
/CRITERIA ITERATE(25) DELTA(0)
/ROTATION OBLIMIN
/METHOD=CORRELATION.
```

**Syntax 2** Factor Analysis Perceived Ability and Control

```plaintext
FACTOR
/VARIABLES LOC_PLAN LOC_CONTROL LOC_WORK LOC_ABILITY SE_TASK SE_SITUATION
SE_FUNCTION
/MISSING PAIRWISE
/ANALYSIS LOC_PLAN LOC_CONTROL LOC_WORK LOC_ABILITY SE_TASK SE_SITUATION
SE_FUNCTION
/PLOT EIGEN
/CRITERIA MINEIGEN(1) ITERATE(25)
/EXTRACTION PC
/CRITERIA ITERATE(25) DELTA(0)
/ROTATION OBLIMIN
/METHOD=CORRELATION.
```
Appendix VIII – Topic list

Bedankt voor het invullen
Heb je opmerkingen over de vragenlijst? Waren er dingen die je miste?

1. Voorstellen
Wie ben ik
Waar gaat het onderzoek over: Conceptueel Model laten zien
Zou jij je misschien voor kunnen stellen? Wat doe je hoe lang werk je hier?

2. Doel van het interview
Het doel van dit interview is om een meer organisatie specifiek beeld te krijgen en wat meer achtergrond over hoe werknemers/members de veranderingen van de afgelopen jaren hebben ervaren.

Vertellen wat er gaat gebeuren met de gegevens, benadrukken dat de persoon niet herleidbaar gaat zijn.

Heb je er bezwaar tegen als ik het interview op neem? START OPNAME

3. Vooraf
Ruim 2 jaar geleden is bekend gemaakt dat X Y ging overnemen.
Had je toen enige verwachtingen over wat er zou gaan gebeuren?
Had je het vermoeden dat er veel zou veranderen?
Hoe dacht je dat die veranderingen zouden worden ingevuld?

4. Uiteindelijk
- Hoe vind je dat het uiteindelijk is gegaan?
- Zijn er dingen die je hebt gemist?

5. Traject
De afgelopen jaren zijn veranderingen geleidelijk aan ingevoerd, zie je verschil in de aanpak hier van?
Heb je het hier veel met collega’s over? Hoe? Vlakt dat af, blijft dat zo gaan?
Heeft dat invloed op jouw gevoelens?
Merk je verschil tussen collega’s hoe zij hier mee omgaan? Hoe denk je dat dat komt?
6. Toekomst
Het is natuurlijk niet uitgesloten dat er meer dingen gaan veranderen gezien de omgeving waarin X opereert.
Wat zou jij anders willen zien in een volgende verandering?

7. Afsluiting
We zijn aan het einde gekomen.
Zijn er nog dingen die je kwijt zou willen?

Bedanken
Appendix IX – Transcripts

*Transcripts have been removed*
### Appendix X – Coding Scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent/Topic</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Communication** | - good communication about the takeover  
- many emails about Management Foundation training  
- too many emails  
- mistakes in communication creates extra negativity  
- communication was consequent via email  
- people are waiting for the next email  
- much communication on the new change however doesn’t see much  
- use more means of communication than just email  
- more explanation; how to do certain things  
- too much information at once without the extra step | - the details are not mentioned, it is very abstract  
- don’t ask difficult questions in the Netherlands  
- openness and transparency is not in place  
- a lot of communication via email  
- a personal approach is necessary | - repetition of your message  
- repeat your messages in different ways; email, webinars, etc.  
- no difference in means of communication  
- it might have been intensified  
- be clear  
- confront people when necessary  
- email is not always the best way to communicate  
- face to face meetings might be good | - team lead was very pushy  
- no clear line in communication  
- some parts were hardly mentioned  
- very formal communication  
- no communication about mistakes; this creates suspicion | - communication was very process focusses via email.  
- most changes are communicated via email and live meetings.  
- you are too busy and there is too much pressure for email and to attend live meetings  
- it doesn’t help to send emails from the top to order people to do things a certain way. |
| **Involvement** | - own senior change management consultants were not involved  
- involvement creates less resistance | - let people that are enthusiastic about parts of the change tell that story | - people who are not internally involved have more difficulties to change | - in general, employees are not very involved in the change process | - make sure it is personal, take your time to explain the context so that individuals can implement the change |
| Implementation | - implementation was not sufficient  
- pressure on billability, was the wrong focus  
- too much focus on regulations from B with a Y culture, a cultural change is necessary  
- everyone is trying to get used to the new organization  
- lack of vision and direction  
- lack of explanation of the ‘why’  
- need the extra step  
- not every manager knows how to work in the new way | - the dream was recognized in the implementation  
- quick implementation  
- do what we ask you to do  
- very rigorous  
- managers were very ambitious to finish the change in time  
- some things are necessary and they will be implemented  
- some people needed to be fired  
- managers do not see the distance between consultants and the organization  
- coherence is not made clear  
- there was no clear implementation strategy | - this is how we do it, no discussion possible  
- very high paced  
- naturalness to accept decisions from headquarter  
- you have to  
- there are degrees of freedom in the how to  
- there is no readymade training for implementation  
- we have found a suitable implementation process  
- implementation takes time and repetition  
- a manager has to set an example | - explain what the changes means for people | - from day 1 a lot of clarity  
- high pace  
- it was very top down; these are our fundamentals, you can find them in the foundation and that is how we are going to do it.  
- in the Netherlands, we just started.  
- it helps to give a forecast of changes to come  
- it is all about preparation  
- show that your team is important and that you do something with their comments  
- you talk with other implementers more and more.  
- most employees say: |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotions</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - employees became sceptical  
- need more reassuring  
- feels like one of the many changes  
- there are also positive people  
- I need to see it to believe it  
- not everyone is innovative and flexible but even the ones that do feel a lack of ownership | - organize a kick-off/team meeting  
- be consequent in your approach  
- more involvement  
- empower management to get used to their new role  
- lack of vision  
- involve employees |
| - not sceptical but conservative however open-minded  
- creates trust  
- I was less willing to change at times  
- I am more aware of the why and therefore it’s easier to accept  
- I believe in the model  
- I feel support from B  
- the dream is fantastic  
- I felt different stages in my attitudes  
- it can be scary  
- it is good to be close to the customer | - a training is necessary  
- invest in engagement  
- need to build more trust  
- help people to understand what the change means for them  
- involve employees  
- be open and transparent  
- a personal approach  
- help in how to sell new things |
| - if you feel involved there are nice solutions  
- have faith in the company’s expertise  
- I thought the process would be too quick, but it is not.  
- sometimes you have to be firm | - everyone needs to focus on their own behaviour  
- it can be even stricter  
- make sure to have the managers on your side |
| - I wondered how reliable my manager was  
- I became laconically  
- people are not impressed by the changes anymore  
- be honest about your mistakes  
- people are resistant because of personal reasons | - managers need to know more about the internal structures  
- an honest approach  
- a step-by-step program  
- have clear goals  
- more attention for informal personal attitudes  
- more long-term  
- a mixture of capabilities; vulnerable and capable people in order to create understanding |
| - my management team likes change, they are used to a permanent cycle of change.  
- if you like change you know how to implement it  
- I like that implementers start to share more between themselves | - let change owners contact the team and explain it live.  
- the organization is very clear in its way of working, however ‘how’ is up to you. In the Netherland we have to get used to this and we have to organise everything less central.  
- when we have more stability we have to work on our culture and mind-set so things can run more smoothly |

why didn’t you implement this all at once?
| Positive          | - Management Foundation is a good model  
|                  | - there are many opportunities in this company  
|                  | - you can get involved in the organization  
|                  | - it’s a good story  
|                  | - very clear and powerful  
|                  | - the management foundation is very good  
|                  | - It was necessary  
|                  | - It was a step in the right direction  
|                  | - The framework is good  
|                  | - new organization is very good  
|                  | - it is up to you how you implement things  
|                  | - it is good to see that the employees are not too sensitive to group pressure but can think for themselves  
|                  | - this is a very unique culture, bosses are open to conversations with their employees  
|                  | - the middle part of the change went rather smoothly  
|                  | - we have to be honest from the start  
|                  | - if employees want more personal touches you have to make it more personal |