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Very few empirical studies have been conducted within the South African and global context on transformational change in an offender correctional environment, particularly on the human dimension of transformational change. The inadequate attention paid to the elements and dynamics of transformational change, which constitute the human dimension of transformational change has contributed tremendously to the high failure rate in the implementation of transformational change interventions. Empirical studies that seek to validate the above claim have somehow been very limited. Any empirical study that seeks to fill the empirical evidence gap mentioned above by investigating the role that people's perceptions, reactions, experiences, resistance, personal impact, and organisational impact of change play in the management of change implementation processes becomes very important. This is what this study sought to do – to investigate, expose, and explore the impact of transformational change as one of the elements and dynamics of transformational change. It was the main objective of the study to expose managers to both the personal and organisational impact of transformational change. This was intended to ensure that managers understand the impact that transformational change initiatives have on both the employees and the organisation. A literature study was conducted in order to contextualise the impact of change within the South African Department of Correctional Services (DCS). For purposes of gathering data two survey questionnaires were utilised, which is, one for correctional officials and the other for offenders. The results of the study revealed that transformational change has a profound negative psychological and emotional impact on employees from both the intrapersonal and interpersonal perspectives.
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INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

In this era of globalisation, organisations are facing transformational change challenges that is unprecedented in terms of prevalence, speed, magnitude, implications and time needed to manage its implementation, in terms of achieving the performance objectives (Pryor et al., 2008). The transformational change that organisations are experiencing have been necessitated by the desire for global competitiveness as a result of the changing and increasing needs of customers, deregulation, the need to control costs and increase efficiency, as well as the fast pace of technological advancement (Cook et al., 2005; Corbeau and Sijats, 2005; Arnetz, 2005; Palmer et al., 2009; Asbury, 2007).

Despite the increasing prevalence and intensifying pace of change in organisations as a result of the aforementioned factors, organisations still find it difficult to successfully implement and institutionalize their change initiatives (Mourier and Smith, 2001; Nguyen and Kleiner, 2003; Balogun and Hope, 2004; Van Tonder, 2004a, 2006; Bregman, 2009). Several studies point to the fact that the situation has not improved in many organisations in terms of adaptation (Johnston, 2008; Herold, et al., 2008; Todnem, 2005). The low success rate indicates the magnitude of challenges facing managers within the realm of organisational change management.

The organisation and change efforts revolve around
people. Imberman (2009) emphasises that people, as members of organisations, are not passive to organisational change initiatives. The organisation entails structures, strategies, technology, and systems that people work with. Organisational change affects these organisational aspects (Agboola and Salawu, 2011). The changes that organisations experience is an effort to remodel, reengineer or revamp their organisational features, structural dimensions, organisational variables, organisational characteristics and organisational practices, which affect people, namely managers and employees in the organisation (Lombard and Cratford, 2003). Touching these organisational aspects, through the implementation of organisational change efforts is a way of changing things for the better. These invariably touch the people who work with these organisational aspects. Changing these organisational aspects requires that people should as well change their attitudes, beliefs and behaviours (Maurer, 1997). Thus, organisations cannot exist without the people (Nickols, 2010) and changes that take place within organisations cannot affect organisations to the exclusion of the people.

Changes affect people on a personal level, and organisations are made up of people who experience change on a personal level (Herold and Fodor, 2008). Therefore, if changes are to succeed, people as individuals should be engaged so as to minimise their effect on people (Zolno, 2009; Panao, 2010). Research has confirmed that changes affect people more negatively than positively (Van Tonder, 2004a; Worrall and Cooper, 2004). Without people’s concerns about change initiatives, change cannot be sustained because change is enacted and experienced by people (Van Tonder, 2004c; Rodda, 2007; Imberman, 2009; Sloyan, 2009).

Despite the inextricable connection and interdependence between change and people, a majority of managers at various levels of the organisational hierarchy, still do not recognise and understand the importance of addressing the issue relating to the impact of change on people. There are several literatures on organisational change or transformational change (Beer, et al., 1990; Burke, 2002). However, the focus of this treatise revolves around the process of implementing organizational change initiatives. It will also of interest to scrutinize the initiators of the change implementation process (Hambrick, 1989), reactions to the fairness of the change implementation process (Cobb et al., 1995) and the implications for the human dimension of change, which includes the personal impact of change.

**Problem statement**

Several organisations seem to be in a state of flux as far as the management and implementation of change initiatives is concerned within a global business environment. Most organisations have not been very successful in the effective implementation and management of change efforts. These outcomes may be due to the neglect by managers to mitigate the impact of change on people at individual and collective levels through decisive managerial action, possibly due to lack of knowledge on the personal impact of change. This has contributed to the increase resistance to change and subsequently to the high failure rate in change efforts. The low success rate reflects the magnitude of the challenges confronting managers within the domain of organisational change initiatives as reflected in the South African Department of Correctional Services (DCS).

**Objectives**

The main objective of this paper is to address the important issue of the personal impact of change, highlighting the importance of managerial intervention in order to mitigate the impact of change on employees at personal and collective levels with reference to the (DCS). The main idea is to emphasise the importance of managing the human dimension of transformational change in the DCS, with a view to equipping managers with the relevant knowledge that are needed in order to understand the impact that transformational change initiatives may have on employees when not properly managed.

**Significance and contributions of the study**

The findings of the study added empirical evidence to the literature on transformational change management. The article will certainly become of interest to practicing managers in the public services in South Africa, who are charged with the responsibility of initiating, implementing, and sustaining organizational cum transformation change interventions. This treatise will also be of particular benefit to managers in the Department of Correctional Services who are the initiators and implementers of transformational change efforts from the punitive to the rehabilitative philosophy in terms of the treatment of sentenced offenders. The value that this article would add to organisational change literature, would be its emphasis on the significance of the human dimension of organisational change. This paper has highlighted the importance of managerial intervention in mitigating the personal impact of transformational change. This paper has also emphasised the importance of transformational change as a vehicle for enhancing organisational performance.

**LITERATURE STUDY ON THE IMPACT OF TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE**

A research study conducted by Worrall and Cooper (1998) on the perceptions and experiences of UK
managers established that organisational change has a profound negative impact on such qualitative aspects of organisational life as loyalty, morale, motivation and perceptions of job security. Organisational change efforts impact the organisation at three levels, namely the employee level, the work situation level, as well as the organisational level (Kanter, 1989). This suggests that organisational change exerts impact on employees (as individuals and as groups), on the work situation, as well as on the organisation as a total system. This is corroborated by Fedor et al. (2006) who point out that organisational change has an impact on both the employees’ reaction to the change itself as well as the employees’ continuous relationship with the organisation. Change influences the level of trust that employees have in one another, in managers, as well as in the organisation as a whole, which impacts on loyalty and commitment to the organisation.

Regarding the impact of organisational change on employees, Decker et al. (2001) pointed out that organisational change impacts employees at all levels of the organization, namely individual, team, and organisational levels. At intrapersonal level, organisational change creates challenges for employees in that employees go through a variety of emotions which range from negative emotions (fear, anxiety, uncertainty, doubts, frustration, bitterness, anger, sadness, confusion, tiredness, misery, nervousness, profound thinking, depression, stress, resentment and hostility) to positive emotions (happiness, pride, peacefulness, inspiration, motivation, and excitement).

According to Walston and Chadwick (2003), Van Tonder (2004b), Lines (2005) and Svensen et al. (2007), change events in organisations are normally perceived as leading to the experience of stress in the sense that they are perceived to be potentially threatening or harmful. Van Tonder (2004c) emphasises that the intensity of the impact of change efforts on individual employees in terms of their internal world cannot be underestimated, in that employees may experience change either as a catastrophe or as a loss. Fear, shock, confusion, anger, grief, depression and withdrawal are extreme emotions that point to some degree of disruption inside a person, which is what organisational change scholars refer to as intrapersonal or psychological disruption, which employees go through as a result of an externally induced change. Change threatens people in the head, heart and gut, thereby leading to arousal of fears, doubts and gut feelings about the change (Worrall and Cooper, 2004). This psychological disruption leads to intrapersonal conflict.

At interpersonal level, organisational change affects employee relationships at both employee level (with other employees) and managerial level (with managers) (Van Tonder, 2004b). At the level of relationships between the employee and other employees, organisational change leads to loss of relationships. This emanates from intrapersonal conflict, which translates into interpersonal conflict. An employee who goes through uncertainty, anger, depression and stress is bound to project these emotions of dysfunctionality over to other employees. These impact negatively on work relationships, as the employee begins to be alienated from other employee; as the employee begins to be insolent and insubordinate; as the employee begins to be irritable over trivialities; and as the employee begins not to comply with set time frames in terms of work submission (Caldwell et al., 2004). For the foregoing reasons, organisational change erodes trust within the organisation (Kiefer, 2005; Vakola and Nikolau, 2005; Smollan, 2006), leading to the development of blame culture that damages the employment relationships, particularly employer-employee relations.

Van Tonder (2004c) adds that the experience of stress, lowered self-esteem, disorientation, increasing mistrust, loss of focus or direction and control, anxiety, uncertainty, insecurity, sadness, outrage, diminished loyalty, lack of commitment, and fear are some of the consequences of organisational change. Organisational change impacts negatively on trust and job satisfaction (Lee and Teo, 2005). Allen et al. (2007) also cite uncertainty as one of the major consequences of organisational change. It is for this reason that managerial intervention becomes necessary in order to mitigate the impact of change on employees (Van Tonder, 2004b).

Major changes within organisations are a major source of occupational stress. A climate of constant change within an organisation is a major source of disaffection and stress (McHugh, 1997). Vakola and Nikolau (2005) point to a negative correlation between occupational stressors and attitude of employees towards change. Highly stressed employees display decreased commitment to work and increased reluctance to accept organisational change initiatives.

In the light of the above, organisational change becomes an intrusive and disruptive force when it comes to intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships, as it leads to intrapersonal conflict (which is destructive to the individual as a person and as an employee) and interpersonal conflict (which disrupts work relationships. Given the above, Szamosi and Duxbury (2002) are correct to emphasise that organisational change is a pheno-menon that intrigues, excites, scares, mystifies, and challenges people as individuals or groups in all organizations. For this reason, it becomes necessary for managers to adequately dispel these situations, for if they fail to do so, employees are likely to experience a variety of affective reactions (Lundberg and Young, 2001; Ford and Ford 2010). This is where managerial action becomes critical (Van Tonder, 2004b).

Regarding the impact of organisational change on the work situation and the organisation at large, Van Tonder (2004b) points out that the prospect of job losses and increased workloads, particularly in organisational
restructuring change interventions such as down-sizing and prospect of loss of rank or status (demotion) creates a feeling of job insecurity such that employees’ morale and job satisfaction levels are severely affected (Schabracq et al., 2003). The decline in employee morale and job satisfaction levels eventually affects their performance at individual, team, and organisational levels. For this reason, it can be argued that organisational change compromises organisational effectiveness and efficiency in terms of work performance (Ackerman and Anderson, 2001). No organisation can afford this in the light of the importance of the notions of enhancing service delivery (for service delivery organisations) and increasing profits (for profit making organisations).

Furthermore, it needs to be highlighted that besides the emotional impact and the work situation impact that organisational change triggers, there is also the financial impact. The high failure rate in the implementation of organisational change efforts, as indicated by Beer and Nohria (2000), Mourir and Smith (2001), Smith (2002; 2003), Balogun and Hope (2004), Hattingh (2004), Van Tonder (2004b, 2006), Kavanagh and Ashkanasy (2006), Todnem (2007) and Van Tonder (2009), who points to the financial impact as well. The implementation of organisational change initiatives involves the use of financial, human, information and physical resources. The utilisation of all these resources brings along financial implications for organisations. As such, high failure rate in the implementation of organisational change initiatives means that high percentage of financial resources is wasted. It goes down the drain because organisations are unable to accrue the benefits for which organisational change interventions were implemented. Hence, if one looks at the impact of organisational change captured in the foregoing literature, one may construe that the impact of organisational change is a painful exercise for employees as individuals, teams and workforce of an organisation, as well as for the entire organisation (Van Tonder, 2004b).

METHODOLOGY

This research adopted a two-pronged approach, which incorporated a literature study and a quantitative empirical study. Methodologically, the study applied a mixed approach in that three types of research designs, namely the exploratory design, the survey design, and descriptive design were utilised. They each played a distinct and complementary role in the conducting of this research. The exploratory approach was used in the literature study phase to gain background insight into the research problem with a view to elucidating the research problem. The survey research design was utilised in order to enable the researcher to conduct a quantitative study of the sampled population (Kline, 2004). The descriptive research approach was applied in order to minimise errors and optimise reliability.

Sample, sampling method and population

At the time of administering the questionnaires, there were approximately 7593 correctional officials working in the seven management areas constituting the Department of Correctional Services in the KwaZulu-Natal Province and 13, 520 sentenced offenders, from which a 13.17% sample for correctional officials and an 8.14% sample for sentenced offenders were drawn for the study. A random, purposive and probability sample of 1000 correctional service officials and 500 offenders were used. The sample was selected from a population of correctional officials and offenders in the KwaZulu-Natal Region of the Department of Correctional Services (DCS), which was utilised as the case organisation.

Research procedure

The procedure that was followed in executing the research necessitates the seeking of permission to conduct research, the pilot study, administering the research instruments and scoring the responses. The empirical data was collected by means of two survey questionnaires, that is, one for correctional officials and the other for offenders. A 4-point and 6-point Likert type response scales were utilized in the two questionnaires to measure the personal and organizational impact of the DCS change initiatives. The scales did not make any provision for respondents to provide “neutral”, “uncertain”, or “undecided” responses. Tables 1 and 2 give examples of the response scales used.

Statistical analysis

The completed questionnaires were analysed, using the SPSS statistical package. The statistical analysis was conducted in two phases. Phase 1 focused on data analysis to provide proof that the two questionnaires used as measuring instruments were reliable and valid for the purpose of this study. In terms of sample statistics, frequency analysis was utilised to describe the sample obtained, as suggested by Kerlinger (1992). The responses on both questionnaires were subjected to factor analysis according to the procedure suggested by Schepers (1992) in order to determine the factor structure of the two measuring instruments. To determine the adequacy and sphericity of the intercorrelation matrix, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO), measure of sampling adequacy (MSA) and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity were conducted. A reliability analysis was also conducted on the measuring instruments with the purpose of calculating a reliability coefficient (Cronbach Alpha).

Response rate

Table 3 presents the composition of the sample and response rate in terms of both correctional officials and offenders. It is critical to note the return rate of 71.3% and the frequency rate of 98.2% for valid responses were recorded for correctional officials. For the offenders’ sample, the return rate of 58.2% and the frequency rate of 97.6 for valid responses were recorded.

Structural integrity of measuring instruments

Face validity: The inspection of the individual items on both questionnaires, as represented by the examples of the items from the two questionnaires given in Table 3, reveals high face validity. Content validity: The contents of the questionnaire are relevant to the research questions dealing with the impact (both organisationally and personally) of the DCS change efforts. Construct validity: Based on results of face validity and content validity, it can be concluded that the two questionnaires utilised in the study measured what they were designed to measure in terms of the impact of the DCS transformational change.
Table 1. Example of four-point response scale.

| Question | During the transformation process I experienced … (Please place an X in the appropriate category) | NOT at all | Some of the time | On a regular basis | MOST of the time |
|----------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| 5.4.1    | A partial or complete loss of faith in senior management                                         |            |                 |                   |                 |
| 5.4.2    | Strained relationships at work                                                                   |            |                 |                   |                 |
| 5.4.3    | Self-doubt, reduced self-confidence, etc.                                                        |            |                 |                   |                 |
| 5.4.4    | Increase in smoking or alcohol consumption habits                                                |            |                 |                   |                 |
| 5.4.5    | Increase in levels of intolerance, irritation, impatience                                         |            |                 |                   |                 |

Table 2. Example of six-point response scale.

| No.   | The impact/consequences of the transformation from a punitive to a rehabilitative approach in the DCS... |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5.2.1 | Is hardly noticeable                                                                                     |
| 5.2.2 | Morale has decreased                                                                                     |
| 5.2.3 | Efficiency is declining                                                                                  |
| 5.2.4 | Service to clients that is offenders is improving                                                       |
| 5.2.5 | Productivity is declining                                                                                |
| 5.2.6 | Quality of work is declining                                                                            |

Table 3. Frequency table of participating management areas/regional office of the obtained sample.

| Management area | Correctional officials | Offenders |
|-----------------|------------------------|-----------|
|                 | Frequency | %age   | Cum. %age | Frequency | %age   | Cum. %age |
| Durban          | 113       | 15.3   | 15.3      | 79        | 27.1   | 27.1      |
| Glencoe         | 51        | 7.1    | 22.4      | 21        | 7.0    | 34.1      |
| Ncome           | 86        | 12.0   | 34.4      | 71        | 25.9   | 60.0      |
| Waterval        | 144       | 19.7   | 54.1      | 90        | 29.3   | 89.3      |
| Kokstad         | 101       | 13.8   | 67.9      | 30        | 10.0   | 99.3      |
| Empangeni       | 17        | 2.4    | 70.3      | -         | -      | -         |
| Pietermaritzburg| 196       | 27.2   | 97.5      | -         | -      | -         |
| Regional Office | 5         | 0.7    | 98.2      | -         | -      | -         |
| Valid           | 700       | 98.2   | 284       | 97.6      |        |           |
| Missing         | 13        | 1.8    | 2.4       |           |        |           |
| Total           | 713       | 100.0  |           | 291       | 100.0  |           |

Source: Authors fieldwork.

Reliability analysis

Two statistical techniques are most commonly used to help assess the appropriateness of data for factorability, namely, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy (Kaiser, 1970) and the Bartlett’s test of sphericity (Bartlett, 1954). Therefore, in the case of this study, the suitability of data for factor analysis was assessed using the KMO measure of sampling adequacy and the Bartlett’s test for sphericity. The results of the assessment of the suitability of data for factor analysis are captured in Table 4 (for correctional officials) and 5 (for offenders).

From Table 4, it is clear that the data sets in respect of correctional officials complied with the requirements of sampling adequacy and sphericity and could thus be subjected to factor analysis. A result of 0.6 and higher is always required from the measure of sampling adequacy (MSA) for it to be acceptable for factor analysis purposes (Hair et al., 2003; Hair et al., 2006; Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007). The KMO measures obtained for all variables were above 0.6. In fact, the KMO MSA values for the variables in respect of correctional officials were well above 0.8, which is highly significant.

For the offender variables, it is evident from interrogating Table 5 that the data sets complied with the requirements of sampling adequacy and sphericity. The KMO MSA values obtained ranged between .85 and .95, which indicate high significance. All KMO values exceeded the recommended cut-off value of 0.6 (Hair et al., 2006). Lastly, the Bartlett’s test of sphericity values (that is, Sig. values) should be .05 or smaller. Therefore, it is significant to note that the Bartlett’s test values for both correctional officials and offenders reached statistical significance (p=0.000), thereby supporting the factorability of the correlation matrices. Therefore, based on the KMO measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s
sphericity test values, it is concluded that the data gathered were found suitable for factoring. Using these KMO MSA and Bartlett’s sphericity test results, it is further concluded that both questionnaires used in the study had a good content validity because they covered all the major aspects of the content that are relevant.

Since the data sets were found to be suitable for factoring, factor analysis was conducted through exploratory factor analysis techniques. The extraction method utilised was the Principal Component Analysis (PCA), and the rotation method used was the Direct Oblimin with Kaiser Normalisation. Table 6 gives reliability statistics from reliability analysis. The statistics reflect a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .930 for 14 items for the personal impact of the DCS change variable from the perspective of correctional officials. The personal impact was measured from the side of correctional officials only.

Table 7 shows the reliability statistics from the reliability analysis conducted, and points to a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .893 from 18 items for the organisational impact of the DCS change on the part of correctional officials. For the offenders, Table 7 shows a Cronbach alpha coefficient of .842 from 13 items for the organisational impact of the DCS change.

From Tables 6 and 7, it is significant to note that the Cronbach alpha coefficients indicate that the two measuring instruments have acceptable reliability and consistency in terms of measuring both the personal impact and the organisational impact of the DCS change that they were designed to measure. Change takes place at both individual and organisational levels. For this reason, change has a personal impact as well as an organisational impact. “Impact of change” denotes the effect that change has on or the consequences that change has for, the employees, the work situation, the organisation as a total system, and the community.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Personal impact of transformational change at the DCS

The perceived personal impact of the DCS change is viewed from the perspective of correctional officials only. The frequency table displayed in Table 8 points to the fact that the DCS change has had a significant impact at personal level on the part of correctional officials.

According to Worrall and Cooper (1998), organisational change efforts impact the organisation at three levels, namely the employee level, the work situation level, as well as the organisational level. This suggests that organisational change exerts impact on employees, on the work situation, as well as on the organisation as a total system. This is corroborated by Fedor et al. (2006) who point out that organisational change has an impact on both the employees’ reaction to the change itself as well as the employees’ continuous relationship with the organisation. In terms of this study, the organisational impact of the DCS change was viewed from the perspective of both correctional officials and offenders. The study findings point to the fact that at correctional official personal level, the majority of respondents pointed out that the DCS change has led to an increase in stress levels compared to stress levels before the commencement of the implementation of DCS change effort. This finding is not surprising, as it is a vindication of earlier findings and arguments that organisational change causes stress for employees. As Dahl (2010, 2011) puts it, change increases the probability of increased stress for.

Table 4. KMO MSA and Bartlett’s sphericity test results: Correctional Officials.

| Factor                        | KMO measure of sampling adequacy | Barlett’s test of sphericity |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
|                               | Approx. Chi-square | df | Sig. p-value |
| Perceived organisational impact of DCS change | .920   | 5415.486 | 210 | .000 |
| Perceived personal impact of DCS change  | .849   | 2667.377 | 120 | .000 |

Source: Authors fieldwork.

Note: p = .000; KMO MSA > .6.

Table 5. KMO MSA and Bartlett’s sphericity test results: Offenders.

| Factor                        | KMO measure of sampling adequacy | Barlett’s test of sphericity |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
|                               | Approx. Chi-square | df | Sig. p-value |
| Perceived organisational impact of DCS change | .844   | 894.478 | 78  | .000 |

Source: Authors fieldwork.

Table 6. Reliability statistics.

|                      | Cronbach alpha coefficient | No. of item |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Correctional Officials | .930                   | 14          |

Table 7. Reliability statistics.

|                      | Cronbach alpha coefficient | No. of item |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|
| Correctional Officials | .893                   | 18          |
| Offenders             | .842                   | 13          |
employees. According to Walston and Chadwick (2003), Lines (2005) and Svensen et al. (2007), organisational change initiatives are usually perceived as leading to the experience of stress amongst the employees. This is based on the fact that organisational change efforts are perceived to be potentially threatening, harmful or dangerous, as they are perceived as representing an injustice and a barrier to the attainment of individual goals (Van Tonder, 2004a).

In this regard, Van Tonder (2004c) emphasises that the intensity of the impact of change efforts on individual employees in terms of their internal world cannot be underestimated. Fear, shock, confusion, anger, grief, depression and withdrawal are extreme emotions that point to some degree of psychological disruption inside the person. It is this psychological disruption that leads to the development and experience of stress by employees as a result of the change. Worrall and Cooper (2004) point out that change threatens people in the head, heart and emotions, thereby leading to arousal of fears, doubts and apprehension feelings about the change. This research also uncovered that as a result of the DCS change, correctional officials experienced self-doubt and reduced self-confidence, increase in smoking or alcohol consumption habits, increase in levels of intolerance, irritation and impatience and increasing difficulty to relax. These empirical findings represent psychological and emotional disruption at intrapersonal level on the part of correctional officials. It is this psychological disruption that leads to the development and experience of stress by employees as a result of the change effort.

Given the consequences of the DCS change efforts, one can argue that transformational change initiatives may sometimes have impact negative on people as individual, which may not be so good for the well-being of the employees. The outcome may result in change in eating habits or reduced appetite and increase in stress symptoms such as headaches, lower back pain, neck pain, feelings of exhaustion and frequent colds. These findings are supported by Dahl (2010) who posited that organisational change could be associated with profound risks of employee health problems. As a result of the DCS change initiatives, correctional officials experienced a partial or complete loss of faith in senior management; strained relationships at work; an increase in levels of intolerance, irritation and impatience; an increase conflicts and disagreements; a reduced need for social contact; strained relationships at home; an increase in distrust of top management; and an increased need for privacy or solitude. These findings vindicate earlier

| Statement                                                                 | No. valid | No. missing | Frequency percentage | For | No. valid | No. missing | Against |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------------|-----|-----------|-------------|---------|
| A partial or complete loss of faith in senior management.                 | 671       | 42          | 64.7                 | 671 | 42        | 35.3        |
| Strained relationships at work.                                           | 672       | 41          | 72.5                 | 672 | 41        | 27.5        |
| Self-doubt, reduced self-confidence, etc.                                 | 662       | 51          | 57.7                 | 662 | 51        | 42.3        |
| Increase in smoking or alcohol consumption habits.                        | 663       | 50          | 41.5                 | 663 | 50        | 58.5        |
| Increase in levels of intolerance, irritation, impatience.                 | 665       | 48          | 58.0                 | 665 | 48        | 42.0        |
| Increasing difficulty to relax.                                           | 665       | 48          | 65.0                 | 665 | 48        | 35.0        |
| Change in eating habits (e.g. reduced appetite).                          | 663       | 50          | 52.3                 | 663 | 50        | 47.6        |
| Reduced levels of sexual activity and/or appetite.                        | 644       | 69          | 47.4                 | 644 | 69        | 52.6        |
| Increase in experienced physiological symptoms such as headaches, lowe back pain, neck pain, feelings of exhaustion, frequent colds, other. | 666   | 47          | 66.0                 | 666 | 47        | 34.1        |
| Increase in experienced conflict and disagreements.                       | 665       | 48          | 70.1                 | 665 | 48        | 29.9        |
| A reduced need for social contact.                                        | 668       | 45          | 57.6                 | 668 | 45        | 42.4        |
| Strained relationships at home.                                           | 666       | 47          | 56.3                 | 666 | 47        | 43.7        |
| Increase in distrust of top management/consultants and other officials driving the transformation process. | 661   | 52          | 66.9                 | 661 | 52        | 33.1        |
| An increased need for privacy/quiet time /solitude.                       | 664       | 49          | 64.8                 | 664 | 49        | 35.2        |
| Stress levels have increased compared to stress levels before the transformation. | 670   | 43          | 51.5                 | 670 | 43        | 48.5        |
| Correctional officials are also experiencing trauma as a result of the implementation of the transformation. | 662   | 51          | 62.8                 | 662 | 51        | 37.2        |

Total no. of respondents: 713. Source: Authors fieldwork.
arguments that organisational change initiatives do affect the work lives of employees (Immediate Online Access, 2009).

Mitigating the intrapersonal, interpersonal and personal impact of change

The findings of impact of the DCS transformational change captured as earlier mentioned have both intrapersonal and interpersonal context. In the first place, transformational change has disastrous consequences for people as individuals in terms of their psychological and emotional well-being and as such, there is an urgent need for managers to mitigate the intrapersonal impact of transformational change. In addition, transformational change has a significant effect on the health of people and both managers and employees need to be aware of this risk of employee health problems associated with transformational change. More than that, there is a need for a greater focus on assisting employees as individuals to cope with change and, employees can only be able to be assisted with coping with change if managers have an innate knowledge and understanding of the intrapersonal impact of transformational change.

In terms of the interpersonal impact, a need for active managerial involvement and participation in the implementation of transformational change initiative is critical, as it will serve to enhance the confidence of employees in their managers. This is what Van Tonder (2004a) refers to as managerial intervention, which is a critical vehicle for enhancing managerial visibility required to boost employees' interest in the change efforts. In addition, conflicts at work should be resolved as speedily as possible in order to have a smooth and progressive change implementation process.

The personal impacts of the DCS change have important implications for practice. Although this study point to the fact that organisational change has negative consequences for employees in terms of stress, their health in general, and intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships, what is more disturbing are the suggestions of Doyle (2002) and Van Tonder (2008) that managers in organisations are not fully aware of the disastrous consequences of stress for organisations, employees, their families and society at large.

The implications of the findings are that change needs to be taken seriously, because it has both psychological and emotional impact that could be for employees at personal level. Organisational change initiatives have a personal psychological and emotional impact based on the fact that they instil uncertainty, fear, shock, anger, anxiety, depression, stress and trauma on people, thereby impacting negatively on their health. Once the health of employees is negatively affected, work performance is also affected negatively, thereby leading to decrease in productivity (Seun, 2010). What these findings suggest is that the personal impact of change has negative consequences in terms of employee health and organisational performance. It is for this reason that it becomes important for managers to intervene in order to mitigate the personal impact of organisational change.

The positive and negative human reactions to organisational change efforts are felt at all levels of the organization, namely individual, team and organisational levels (Wyatt Company, 1993; Jones, 2004; Nuzum, 2007; Herold et al., 2008). This suggests that the managerial responsibility of managing organisational change initiatives should also extend to managing the impact of organisational change efforts on the people (Nickols, 2010). Managing the personal impact of change implies that managers should help people through the change process. This means that managers must help people cope with change.

Another implication emanating from the analysis of the personal impact of the DCS change is that employees as individuals are impacted by organisational change initiatives in different ways and to differing degrees. This is in line with earlier findings by Terry and Callan (1997) that the experience of organisational change was different for managers and supervisors, with managers experiencing higher levels of threat than supervisors. This suggests that even at lower levels of the organisational hierarchy, experiences of organisational change efforts are different for non-managerial employees as well.

As a last but critical point, it needs to be emphasised that although this study and others before it point to the fact that organisational change has disastrous consequences for employees in terms of stress, their health in general, and intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships, what is more disturbing is the suggestion by Doyle (2002) and Van Tonder (2008) that managers in organisations are not fully aware of the disastrous consequences of stress for organisations, employees, their families, and society at large. Hence, management should increase their awareness level. Transformational change does not only have an impact at personal level, it also has an impact on the organisational wellbeing.

Organisational impact of transformational change

From the perspective of both correctional officials and offenders, the frequency table on the organisational impact of the DCS change captured in Table 9 points to the fact that the DCS change efforts has had a positive impact on the functioning of the DCS.

The empirical evidence points to the fact that the DCS change has had positive impact on the functioning of the Department. The frequencies point to the fact that the DCS change efforts have impacted positively on the image of the DCS on internal and external stakeholder relations, on staff morale, on productivity, as well as on efficiency. The study has revealed that members of the public were happy with the performance of the
Table 9. Frequency table: Organisational impact of the DCS change.

| Statement                                                                 | Frequency | Percentage | Valid percentage |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------------|
| Service to clients that is offenders is improving.                        | 489       | 68.6       | 72.8             | 64.7             |
| Service to clients that is offenders is deteriorating.                    | 182       | 25.6       | 30.6             | 27.1             | 35.3             |
| Quality of work is improving.                                             | 421       | 59.0       | 44.0             | 63.7             | 51.2             |
| Quality of work is declining.                                             | 240       | 33.7       | 42.0             | 36.2             | 48.8             |
| Clients such as offenders are happy with the Department's performance.    | 432       | 60.6       | 35.4             | 64.4             | 40.6             |
| Clients such as offenders are unhappy with the Department's performance.  | 239       | 33.5       | 51.9             | 35.6             | 59.5             |
| Relationships with external stakeholders are improving.                   | 478       | 67.1       | 52.6             | 63.1             | 60.9             |
| Relationships with stakeholders are deteriorating.                        | 193       | 27.1       | 33.7             | 36.4             | 39.1             |
| The transformation objectives are being achieved.                         | 440       | 61.7       | 46.8             | 65.9             | 54.7             |
| The transformation objectives are not being achieved.                     | 228       | 32.0       | 38.9             | 34.1             | 45.4             |
| The image of the Department is improving.                                 | 503       | 67.8       | 56.8             | 72.3             | 65.7             |
| The image of the Department is deteriorating.                             | 185       | 25.9       | 29.6             | 27.7             | 34.4             |
| The transformation would leave a lasting impression.                      | 484       | 67.9       | 57.8             | 72.7             | 66.9             |
| The transformation will soon be forgotten.                                 | 181       | 25.4       | 28.4             | 27.2             | 23.5             |

| Valid Frequency | 696 | 284 |
| Missing Frequency| 17  | 7   |
| Total Frequency  | 713 | 291 |

Source: Authors fieldwork.

Department of Correctional Services. This is corroborated by Seun (2010) who emphasises that organisational changes helps to improve the image of organisations if/when it is well-introduced and effectively implemented.

The respondents also indicated that efficiency within the Department of Correctional Services was improving as a result of the implementation of the DCS change initiatives. This finding is in line with an earlier finding by Seun (2010) that organisational change does improve organisational efficiency. Findings in the DCS study also point to the fact that productivity was improving and that the quality of work was also improving; and the service to the offenders was improving. In the same vein, the study findings demonstrate that the majority of correctional officials believed that the DCS change objectives were being achieved.

The improvements in productivity, the quality of work, and services to offenders are also related to the notion of efficiency improvement, dealt with by Seun (2010), which is regarded as one of the benefits brought about by organisational change. The empirical finding and argument that organisational change improves organisational performance is also supported by the Canadian Society for Chemical Engineering (2004) which contends that organisational change is a phenomenon that is part of organisational life, which provides opportunities for improving organisational/business performance if it is properly implemented.

The reference by both the Canadian Society for Chemical Engineering (2004) and Seun (2010) to the notion of the proper or effective implementation of organisational change initiatives points to the importance of managers making sure that organisational change efforts are effectively implemented if business or organisational performance in terms of productivity, efficiency and quality of work is to be enhanced. With regard to external stakeholder relations, the study findings have revealed that the majority of correctional officials believed that the image of the Department of Correctional Services was improving as a result of the DCS change efforts. The implication of this finding is that more than 50% of correctional officials believed that in the area of external relations, the Department of Correctional Services was doing very well. According to them, these achievements were attributed to the implementation of the DCS transformational change initiatives. These findings represent major impact of the DCS change efforts that is worth recognising because it shows how far the change can go in terms of its organisational impact. These findings indicate that organisational change can be used as a vehicle to enhance organisational reputation.

Offenders also agree that the DCS change efforts
impacted positively on the performance of the Department as an organization, which is a vindication of earlier findings by authors such as Aronowitz & Di Fazio (1999), Canadian Society for Chemical Engineering (2004), Jones (2004), Flash (2007), and Seun (2010) that organisational change does enhance organisational performance in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. This suggests that no organisation, no matter what its business is, can and will improve the quality of its products and services if it does not implement changes, whether at individual level, team level or organisational level.

It is also significant to highlight the important notion of a trust relationship, which is critical to the success of any organisation in terms of its operations geared towards the provision of either goods or/and services. The fact that the DCS change has led, according to correctional officials to the development, improvement and strengthening of trust between offenders and correctional officials is an indication that offenders’ confidence in the Department of Correctional Services as a rehabilitative organisation was improving. Given this, one can argue that this is one important aspect that the Department, and management should build on it in terms of strengthening the institutionalisation of the DCS change initiatives as a vehicle for improving its business performance. According to Paterson and Cary (2002), there is a relationship between employees' trust of managers and employees' acceptance of the change. Managers are one of the most significant and powerful levers when it comes to the implementation of change initiatives. Similarly, offenders, as members of the Department of Correctional Services community, are happy that there is development and improvement of trust between offenders as recipients of rehabilitative programmes and correctional officials as implementers of rehabilitative programmes. From this, one can conclude that the existence of cordial and trustworthy relationships between the implementers of change initiatives and the recipients of change initiatives is critical if there is to be any success in the implementation of change initiatives. For Smollan (2006), employees’ trustworthiness of managers does influence employees’ reactions to organisational change. Based on these, one can conclude that offenders’ trustworthiness of managers is important for offenders to accept the rehabilitative programmes. The issue of the importance of trust relationships is further corroborated by Immediate Online Access (2009) argument that trust is a critical foundation of co-operative relationships between people. This suggests that co-operative relationships are a must if change efforts are to be effectively implemented.

**IMPLICATIONS FOR ORGANISATIONS**

From these research findings, in respect of the organisational impact of the DCS change vindicate earlier empirical findings and arguments regarding the tremendous impact that organisational change exerts on the organisation in terms of its constituent elements and functioning thereof, as well as the general functioning of the organisation. The implication of this is that there is a relationship between organisational change and organisational functioning, that organisational change has a direct impact on the functioning of the organisation in terms of its human and non-human elements. These findings are in line with earlier findings and arguments by King and Anderson (2002) that organisational change is a phenomenon that significantly influences organisational performance.

Organisational transformation perspectives framed by Levy and Merry (1986), Blumenthal and Haspeslagh (1994), and King (1997) suggest that organisational transformation takes place at both individual and organisational levels. The findings of this study vindicate this view that organisational transformation occurs at the level of the organisation as well. It alters the way the organisation is functioning. As King and Anderson (2002) indicate, change is a phenomenon that influences organisational performance significantly. The fact that both correctional officials and offenders have observed improvements in the functioning of the Department of Correctional Services internally and externally as a result of the introduction and implementation of the DCS change implies that organisational change does alter or influence the functioning or performance of organisations in very significant ways.

The findings about the organisational impact of the DCS change efforts further imply that organisations that are serious about their core business should introduce and embrace change. If they do not, they face extinction as they will become irrelevant in the global business environment. This suggests that organisations that do not introduce and embrace change do so at their own peril. It is either they embrace and implement change for purposes of improving organisational performance or stay static and not change and face extinction. The findings of this study indicate that without change, organisations may not excel in terms of their performance.

**RESEARCH LIMITATIONS**

The following are the limitations of this study:

(1) Time constraints was one of the limitation of the study, which is why the study was also restricted to only one of the six regions constituting the Department of Correctional Services in the Republic of South Africa, namely the KwaZulu-Natal Region. Even in KwaZulu-Natal, not all correctional centres/institutions were included as part of the sample for the study. This would surely affect the generalisation of the findings, though the sample was considered adequate and representative within the context of the KwaZulu-Natal Region.
(2) Limited resources made it impossible for the researchers to conduct a comprehensive empirical study which included other regions of the Department of Correctional services. Due to this constraint, the target population utilized for the study was quite small, considering the size of the Department of Correctional Services as an organisation. Incorporating a broader sample could have been advantageous from the perspective of sample representativity and generalisation of findings.

(3) Another limitation of the study relates to responses given by the research participants in terms of their responses to the various questionnaire items. The respondents may not have given their true views and perspectives on their perception and experience of the DCS change due to various reasons, including the fact that anything that is said to be official is sometimes treated with skepticism. This may have affected reliability.

(4) Another limitation was that the questionnaire for the offenders was written in English. Considering the fact that a majority of the offenders in the KwaZulu-Natal Region are IsiZulu speakers, who may likely misunderstand the English language that was used in the questionnaire items. This may have possibly affected their responses to questionnaire items. It is as well likely that some respondents from both samples might have misinterpreted and misconstrued certain questionnaire items while completing the questionnaires.

(5) Another limitation relates to bias because of the fact that one of the researchers is a senior manager of the Department of Correctional Services in KwaZulu-Natal. Therefore, the correctional officials, as research participants, might have consciously or subconsciously concealed their true views and perspectives regarding their perceptions and experiences of the DCS change efforts, for fear of being viewed as generally anti-transformation or specifically anti-DCS change. This may affect the reliability of their responses.

Practical implications of the study

The results of the study highlighted the importance of mitigating the impact of transformational change on employees in order to ensure that employees cope with the change. The importance of mitigating the personal impact of transformational change underlines the importance of managerial intervention in order to guide employees through the change.

Conclusion

In their efforts to overcome the challenge of the high failure rate in the implementation of transformational change interventions, managers will have to address the issue of the negative impact of transformational change on employees. They point to what Van Tonder (2004b) has highlighted that the decline in employee morale and job satisfaction levels eventually affects their performance at individual, team and organisational levels. They vindicate the argument put forward by Vakola and Nikolaiou (2005) that there is a negative correlation between occupational stressors and attitude of employees towards change; and that highly stressed employees display decreased commitment to work and increased reluctance to accept transformational change initiatives.

Transformational change initiatives have a personal psychological impact based on the fact that they instil uncertainty, fear, shock, anger, anxiety, depression, stress and trauma in people, thereby impacting negatively on the health of employees. Once the health of employees is negatively affected, work performance is also affected negatively, thereby leading to decrease in productivity. What these findings suggest is that the personal impact of change has negative consequences in terms of employee health and organisational performance. It is for this reason that it becomes important for managers to intervene in order to mitigate the personal impact of organisational change. This suggests that the managerial responsibility of managing organisational change initiatives should also extend to managing the impact of organisational change efforts on the people. Managing the personal impact of change implies that managers should help people through the change process. This means that managers must help people cope with change.

REFERENCES

Ackerman AL, Anderson D (2001). Beyond Change Management. Jossey-Bass/Pfeiffer, San Francisco.

Agboola AA, Salawu RO (2011). Managing deviant behaviour and resistance to change. Int. J. Bus. Manage. 6(1):235-242.

Allen J, Jimmieson NL, Borda P, Immer BE (2007). Uncertainty during organisational change: Managing perceptions through communication. J. Change Manage. 7(2):187.

Arnetz BB (2005). Subjective Indicators as a Gauge for Improving Organizational Well-Being. An Attempt to Apply the Cognitive Activation Theory to Organizations. Psychoneuroendocrinology 30:1022-1026.

Aronowitz S, DiFazio W (1999). The new knowledge work. In: Ahier J & Esland G (Eds), Education, training and the future of work. London: Routledge and The Open University 1:76-96.

Asbury S (2007). It is the transformers who need transforming. Manage. Today 23(5):37.

Balogun J, Hope HV (2004). Exploring strategic change. 2nd ed. London: Prentice Hall.

Bartlett MS (1954). A note on the multiplying factors for various B approximations. J. R. Statist. Soc. 16(Series B):296-298.

Beer M, Eisenstat RA, Spector B (2009). Why change programs don’t produce change. Harvard Bus. Rev. pp.158-166.

Beer M, Nohria N (2000). “Cracking the Code of Change”. Harvard Bus. Rev. pp.133-141.

Blumenthal B, Hapeshlagh P (1994). Toward a definition of corporate transformation. Sloan Manage. Rev. pp. 101-106.

Bregman P (2009). How to counter resistance to change. Harvard Business Press. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 08 August 2012.

Burke WW (2002). Organisation change. Theory and practice.
Kanter RM (1989). When giants learn to dance: Mastering the challenges of strategy, management, and careers in the 1990s. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Kavanagh MH, Ashkanasy NM (2006). “The impact of leadership and change management strategy on organizational culture and individual acceptance of change during a merger”. Br. J. Manage. 17:S81-S103.

Kerlinger FN (1992). Foundations of Behavioral Research. (3rd Edition) Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

Kieler T (2005). Feeling bad: antecedents and consequences of negative emotions in ongoing change. J. Organ. Behav. 26(8):875.

King WR (1997). Organisational transformation. Inform. Syst. Manage. pp.63-65.

King N, Anderson N (2002). Managing innovation and change: A critical guide for organizations. 2nd ed. New York: Guildford.

Kline RB (2004). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling. 2nd ed. New York: Guilford.

Lee G, Teo A (2005). Organizational restructuring: Impact on trust and worker satisfaction. Asia Pac. J. Manag. 22:23-39.

Levy A, Merry U (1986). Organisational transformation: Approaches, strategies, theories. New York, NY: Praeger.

Lines R (2005). The structure and function of attitudes towards organizational change. Hum. Resour. Dev. Rev. 4(1):8-32.

Lombard C, Craftoff A (2003). Competency requirements for first-line managers to deal with resistance to change. S. Afr. J. Hum. Resour. Manage. 1(1):42-53.

Lundberg CC, Young CA (2001). A note on emotions and consultation. J. Organ. Change Manage. 14(6):530-538.

Maurer R (1997). Transforming resistance. HR Focus, October, 74(10):9-10.

McHugh M (1997). The stress factor: Another item for the change management agenda? J. Organ. Change Manage. 10:345-362.

McIver P, Smith M (2001). Conquering organisational change: How to succeed where most companies fail. Atlanta: CEP Press.

Nickols F (2010). Change management 101 A Primer. Dated 29/09/2010. Retrieved from: http://home.att.net/~nickols/change.htm on 26 May 2011.

Nuzum V (2007). The individual experience of organizational change. Bay Area Organizational Development Network Newsletter. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 30 January 2012.

Palmier I, Dunford R, Akin G (2009), Managing organizational change: A multiple perspectives approach. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.

Panao A (2010). Mastering the deadly art of change. The Japan HR Society. Retrieved from: http://www.japnic.com/japan-inc-blog on 16 June 2012.

Paterson JM, Cary J (2002). Organizational justice, change anxiety, and acceptance of downsizing: Preliminary tests of AET-Based model. Motivation Emotion 26(1):83-103.

Pryor MG, Tanaja S, Humphreys J, Anderson D, Singleton L (2008). Challenges facing change management theories and research. Delhi Bus. Rev. 9(1):1-20.

Rodda J (2007). A multilevel examination of employee reactions to organizational change. PhD Dissertation. DePaul University, Chicago.

Schabracq MK, Winnubst JAM, Cooper CL (2003). Handbook of health psychology. Baffins Lane: John Wiley & Sons pp.127-146.

Scheper HS (1992). Toetskonstruksie: Teorie en Praktyk. Johannesburg: Rau Drupers.

Seun O (2010). The impact of organizational change. Dated 29/09/2010 and Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 30 January 2012.

Sloyan RM (2009). Trust, sensemaking and individual responses to organizational change. Doctoral Dissertation. Benedictine University.

Smith ME (2002). Success rates for different types of organisational change. Perform. Improv. 41(1):26-33.

Smith ME (2003). Changing an organisation’s culture: Correlates of success and failure. Leadersh. Organ. Dev. J. 24(5):249-261.

Smithian RK (2006). Datebook, minds, hearts and deeds: Cognitive, affective and behavioural responses to change. J. Change Manage. 6(2):143-158.

Svensen E, Neset G, Eriksen HR (2007). Factors associated with a positive attitude towards change among employees during the early

Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Caldwell SD, Herold DM, Fedor DB (2004). Toward an understanding of the relationships among organizational change, individual differences, and changes in person-environment fit: A cross-level study. J. Appl. Psychol. 89(5):868-882.

Canadian Society for Chemical Engineering (2004). Managing the health and safety impacts of organizational change. Retrieved from http://www.chemeng.ca on 24 September 2011.

Cobb AT, Wooten KC, Folger R (1995). Justice in the making: Toward understanding the theory and practice of justice in organizational change and development. In: Woodman R and Pazmore W (Eds), Research in Organizational Change and Development, JAI Press, Greenwich, CT, 8:243-95.

Cook S, Macaulay S, Coldicott H (2005). Change management: Using the four intelligences for successful organizational change. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 04 May 2012.

Corbeau J, Sijats J (2005). Case Study: Implementation of a change process within Smaliland Airport. Vaxjo University.

Dahl MS (2010). Organizational change and employee stress. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com. on 06 July 2010.

Dahl MS (2011). Organizational change and employee stress. Manage. Sci. 57(2):240-256.

Decker D, Wheeler GE, Johnson J, Parsons RJ (2001). Effect of organisational change on the individual employee. Health Care Manager 19(4):1.

Doyle M (2002). “From Change Novice to Change Expert: Issues of Learning, Development and Support”. Personnel Rev. 31(4):465-481.

Fedor DB, Caldwell S, Herold DM (2006). The effects of organizational changes on employee commitment: A multilevel investigation. Personnel Psychol. 59(1):1.

Flash G (2007). Organization change and its impact. Managing organization change. Satisfying motivational needs and achieve meaningful work. Retrieved from: http://www.dlpcc.wordpress.com on 09 February 2011.

Ford JD, Ford LW (2010). Stop blaming resistance to change and start using it. Organ. Dyn. 39(1):24-36.

Haberman M (2010). Resistance to change: Does it doom us to failure? Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 23 May 2011.

Hair JF, Anderson RE, Tatham RL, Black WC (2003). Multivariate Data Analysis 5th ed. India: Pearson Education.

Hair JF, Anderson RE, Tatham RL, Black WC (2006). Multivariate data analysis. (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hambrick DC (1989). “Putting top managers back in the strategy picture”, Strateg. Manage. J. Vol. 10, Special Issue, Summer.

Haridi N (2011). Impact of change on workforce productivity and engagement. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 23 June 2011.

Hattingh B (2004). Ups and downs of mergers, acquisitions. Business Day, July 19, 1st ed. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 26 June 2011.

Herold DM, Fedor DB (2008). Change the way you lead change: Leadership strategies that really work. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Herold DM, Fedor DB, Caldwell S, Liu Y (2008). The effects of transformational and change leadership on employees’ commitment to a change: A multilevel study. J. Appl. Psychol. 93(2):346.

Imberman MD (2009). Organizational change and organizational justice: Assessing the impact on organizational commitment, change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviour, and attitude toward future change. Ph.D Dissertation. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, 2011/09/08. Alliant International University, Los Angeles, California.

Immediation Online Process (2009). Employees’ perception of organizational change: The mediating effects of stress management strategies. Public Personnel Management. 22 March 2009.

Johnston G (2008). Change management – Solutions to the high failure rate. Change scares people. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 09 May 2012.

Jones D (2004). Leaders need to understand the impact of change. Dated 20/04/04 and Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 30 May 2010.

Kaiser HF (1970). A second generation Little Jiffy. Psychometrika 35:401-415.
phase of a downsizing process. Scandinavian J. Psychol. 48:153-159.
Szamosi LT, Duxbury L (2002). Development of a measure to assess organizational change. J. Organ. Change Manage. 15(2):184-201.
Tabachnick B, Fidell L (2001). Using multivariate statistics. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Tabachnick B, Fidell L (2007). Using multivariate statistics. (5th ed). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Terry DJ, Callan VJ (1997). Employee adjustment to large scale organisational change. Aust. Psychol. 32(3):203-210.
Todnem R (2005). Organisational change management: A critical review. J. Change Manage. 5(4):369.
Todnem R (2007). Ready or not ... J. Change Manage. 7(1):3-11.
Vakola M, Nikolaou I (2005). Attitudes towards organisational change. What is the role of employees’ stress and commitment? Employee Relat. 27(2):160-174.
Van Tonder CL (2004a). Organisational change: Theory and practice. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
Van Tonder CL (2004b). Organisational change: Theory and practice. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
Van Tonder CL (2004d). “Organisational transformation”: Wavering on the edge of ambiguity. SA J. Ind. Psychol. 30(3):53-64.
Van Tonder CL (2006). Change risk and ignorance: Attempting to cross chasms in small steps. SA J. Hum. Resour. Manage. 4(3):1-11.
Van Tonder CL (2008). Stacking the dominoes... courting catastrophe at the “edge-of-chaos”. Proceedings of the 9th IFSAM World Management Conference, Shanghai, People’s Republic of China, 26-28 July.
Van Tonder CL (2009). Organization identity as managerial concern. In: Delener N, Fuxman L, Victor Lu F, Putnova A & Rivera-Solis LE (Eds.), Readings book: Eleventh International Conference of the Global Business and Technology Association (GBATA) pp.1171-1177.
Walston SL, Chadwick C (2003). Perceptions and misperceptions of major organisational changes in hospitals: Do change efforts fail because of inconsistent organisational perceptions of restructuring and reengineering? Int. J. Public Admin. 26(14):1581.
Worrall L, Cooper CL (2004). Managers, hierarchies and attitudes: A study of UK managers. J. Manage. Psychol. 19(1):41-68.
Zolno S (2009). Who’s ready for whole system change? Whole field assessment and the change readiness checklist. Pfeiffer Annual: Training. John Wiley & sons.