ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE AND EMPLOYEES RESISTANCE IN FEDERAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, ZARIA

BY

NWIDI PATIENCE ENYIAMAKA ENOBUN

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA

JUNE, 2014

ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE AND EMPLOYEES RESISTANCE IN FEDERAL COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, ZARIA

By

Nwidi Patience Enyiamaka ENOBUN
M.Sc/Admin/0618/2009-2010

Being an M. Sc Thesis Submitted to the School of Postgraduate Studies, Ahmadu BelloUniversity, Zaria in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirement for the Award of the Degree of Master of Science (M.Sc) in BusinessAdministration

Department of Business Administration, Faculty of Administration

June, 2014

Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis titled Organisational Change and Employees Resistance in Federal College of Education, Zaria has been written by me under the supervision of Dr J.K. Yere and Professor Sani Abdullahi. The information derived from the literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and list of references provided. No part of this thesis was previously presented for another degree or diploma at any university.

_____	_____	_____
Name of Student	Signature	Date

Certification

This thesis entitled Organisational Change and Employees Resistance in Federal College of Education, Zaria by Nwidi Patience Enyiamaka Enobun, meets the requirement governing the Award of the degree of Master of Science (M. Sc) Business Administration of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Dr J.K. Yere Chairman, Supervisory Committee	_____ Signature	_____ Date
Prof. Sani A. Abdullahi Member, Supervisory Committee	_____ Signature	_____ Date
Dr Bello Sabo Head of Department	_____ Signature	_____ Date
External Examiner	_____ Signature	_____ Date
Prof. A. A Joshua Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies	_____ Signature	_____ Date

Dedication

I dedicate this Thesis to God Almighty who made this work possible, my husband, Dr Nosa Enobun and my lovely children, Emmanuel, Ese and Efe.

Acknowledgement

I am most grateful to God Almighty for His wisdom, guidance and direction in the pursuit of my studies, without whom, this work would not have been a success.

My most sincere appreciation is to my supervisors, Dr J.K Yere and Professor Sani A. Abdullahi, who contributed greatly towards the successful completion of this work. Their objective criticisms and effective supervision make the work what it is today.

I would like to extend special thanks to the Head of Department, Dr Bello Sabo for his immense contribution towards this work. My special thanks also to M.Sc Coordinator, Mallam S.G. Masoud, Kura Kabir Maitama, Kabir Umar and Marcus Orji. You made a situation that could have become complicated, a lot easier for me. Thank you Sirs.

My gratitude goes to Dr A.M Abu-Abdulsamad, who first of all framed the topic during our research methodology lecture, Dr S. A. Karwai, who first corrected this work when I presented it as a term paper, Dr Shehu Usman, my thesis proposal reviewer, Dr Umar Abubakar, my Internal Defense reviewer, Hajiya Halimah Sani Sambo and all my lecturers who contributed in one way or the other towards the completion of this work. I thank you all.

I also like to acknowledge the management and staff of FCE, Zaria for their assistance in providing me with the data to make this work a success. Finally, my warm appreciation goes to my parents, brothers, sisters and friends for their consistent support, advice and prayers. God bless you all.

Abstract

Resistance to change by employees is a serious challenge confronting many organizations. Several factors have been suggested to explain why employees resist change at the workplace. Some of the factors include job autonomy, self-efficacy and transformational leadership. The main objective of this study is to determine the relationship between organizational change and employees resistance in Federal College of Education, Zaria.. A cross-sectional survey was conducted on a sample of 323 academic staff of the college. Correlation and regression analysis techniques were used to analyse the data collected. The study revealed that; there was significant negative relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change, there was significant positive relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance to change, and there was a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change. The study concluded that academic staff of FCE, Zaria accepted change when it occured. It was recommended that academic staff of FCE, Zaria should not be given total freedom or control over their jobs to avoid negligence of duty. More so, the study recommended that the potential contribution of self- efficacy in minimizing the tendency of academic staff's resistance will have practical implications for selection and recruitment in the college. This is because an individual who is high in self-efficacy is less likely to engage in resistance to change. The study also recommended that the management (leaders) of FCE, Zaria should realize that instead of motivating their employees by punishment or rewards, they should create a vision and inspires subordinates to strive beyond required expectations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF APPENDICES

ABBREVIATIONS

FCE: Federal College of Education

JA: Job Autonomy

SE: Self Efficacy

TRL: Transformational Leadership

ERC: Employees Resistance to Change

M. Sc: Master of Science

SDT: Self Determination Theory

SPSS: Statistical Package for Social Science

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1Background to the Study

The world today is changing at an unprecedented rate, and the environment within which organizations operate is characterized by instability resulting from increased global competition, technological innovation and change, limited resources, deregulations and privatization. Change is an unavoidable phenomenon arising from the dynamics of environment and it is inevitable for an organization that desires to grow, achieve its mission, vision and objectives. Organizations have to adapt to the environment to become competitive and stay ahead or at least keep afloat. Work processes and rules are revised, new equipments are introduced, product lines are dropped and added, and workforce is adjusted as internal and external conditions change.

The question now is why do employees resist change? How do organizational leaders engage employees in the change process and manage the workforce transition associated with these changes? How do they formulate strategies for coaching employees going through major transformations? Understanding the psychological and behavioural roots of employees resistance to change is integral to understanding how to manage and support employees going through major transitions in the workplace.

However, the ability to cope with change as well as the tendency to resist change lies within the individuals who are experiencing the change. In essence, resistance to change is heavily dependent on dispositional characteristics. Situational

characteristics, such as job autonomy, self efficacy, transformational leadership, communication quality and supervisor support, can greatly impact on how employees perceive and react to large-scale changes.

Resistance to change is considered highly complex in nature, and is impacted by aspects of the change at the organization, work unit, and individual level. There is much support for the view that resistance to change is highly influenced by personal demands placed on employees as a result of the change. Furthermore, resistance to change represents opposition against the change, the new and the innovation which can be a person, like any employee of an organization and the whole organization. For a person, resistance to change is a mood, in the human mind which reflects the refusal or indifference at an activity which has the main purpose of changing a present mood. This resistance to change is a normal reaction to a routine because inevitably results to the fear of failure, uncertainty and instability.

The intensity grade of resistance to change differs in terms of person, organisation and society. Moreover, the attitude of resistance to change is more noticeable at the low hierarchical level, because the employees at this level have a small capacity to assimilate the new and will be promoting, indirectly, the routine. However, some studies argue that the persons who resist more to change are top managers and middle managers, because they lose more if the change fails. They added that organizations are continually confronting challenges to remain competitive and successful, which compel them to regularly re-evaluate their strategies, structures, policies, operations, processes and culture.

Managing change effectively is however a main challenge in the change management domain because of massive human involvement. Thus, managers and change agents are eager to know how to encourage and effectively prepare employees for change situations. Change in organisation usually affects employees' attitudes, behaviours and beliefs because of transferring a situation from the known to the unknown. This particular situation can develop to uncertainty, strain and anxiety among employees. Thus, experts and researchers in this field are concerned with how to deal with employees within organizations so that they can actively accept and become involved in change programmes.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Several factors have explained why employees resist change at the workplace. To date, some of these factors considered include, job autonomy (Hornnung & Rousseau, 2007; Jaramillo, Mulki, Onyemah & Pesquera, 2012) self-efficacy (Cho & Chang, 2008; Herold, Fedor & Caldwell, 2007;; Judge, Locke, Durham & Kluger, 1998) and impact of past changes (Jaramillo, Mulki, Onyemah & Pesquera, 2012) among others.

However, one of the major concerns of the Human Resource Management Practitioners (HRMPs) and employers is to make their employees embrace change if they want their organisations to survive and remain competitive. Unfortunately, many cases of turnover and poor attitudes to work have been frequently reported by many surveys and news media. Experience has shown that some academic staff are always willing to leave lecturing job whenever they get opportunities to do so.

Federal College of Education, Zaria is a service delivery organisation. The college has introduced different types of organisational change like, policy change and technological change (to ensure commitment, effectiveness, efficiency and high productivity) in order to reduce employees resistance. This is evidenced in their training and retraining through government sponsorship, prompt salary payment and fringe benefit, prompt promotion of deserving staff, granting and giving housing loans and prompt payment of gratuities to retirees. Despite all these benefits stated above, some employees still arrive at work late and leave early, failure to accept responsibilities and a manifestation of high rate of absenteeism. They show lack of interest in their job, attend to personal matters most often than official matters during official hours.

Based on these problems stated above, there is the need to investigate the influence of organisational change on employees resistance amongst the academic staff of Federal College of Education, Zaria.

1.3 Research Questions

In an attempt to find solutions to the above problems, this research study seeks to provide answers to some questions;

i. What is the relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change at FCE, Zaria?
ii. What is the relationship between self-efficacy and employees resistance to change at FCE, Zaria?
iii. What is the relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change at FCE, Zaria?

1.4 Objectives of the study

The main objective of this study is to assess organizational change and employees resistance among the academic staff of the FCE, Zaria. However, the specific objectives of this study are to:

i. Determine the relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change at FCE, Zaria;

ii. Examine the relationship between self-efficacy and employees resistance to change at FCE, Zaria and,

iii. Assess the relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change at FCE, Zaria.

1.5 Hypotheses of the study

Based on the objectives of the study, the following hypothetical statements were formulated in the course of the research.

$H_{O1.}$ There is no significant relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change at FCE, Zaria.

$H_{O2.}$ There is no significant relationship between self-efficacy and employees resistance to change at FCE, Zaria.

H_{O3}. There is no significant relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change at FCE, Zaria.

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study is expected to make contributions to the general body of knowledge theoretically and practically. From the theoretical perspective, if the findings of this study hold, they will offer empirical evidence on the influence of job autonomy on

employees resistance to change, thus enriching the existing literatures. Several studies have been carried out to investigate various predictors of employees resistance to change (Piderit, 2000: Naimatullah, 2009). Although empirical studies have investigated various factors determining employees resistance to change in the workplace, yet, most of these studies centred on such variables as organisational trust, job stress, psychological contract breach, perceived organizational politics, organizational support and organisational justice. This implies that other workgroup and organisational factors have been given less attention. Hence, this study shall fill in this gap by incorporating other workgroup and organisational determinants of workplace on employees resistance to change (i.e. job autonomy) in FCE, Zaria.

Furthermore, the present study also contributes to the existing body of knowledge by offering empirical support on the role of self-efficacy and transformational leadership in determining employees resistance to change in FCE, Zaria if the findings are true. Accordingly, using self-efficacy theory, (Bandura, 1997) the present study shall offer understanding as to how these theories are applicable in explaining employees resistance to organisational change.

The present study will also be of vital importance especially for the management of FCE, Zaria in several ways. First, employees resistance to change is prevalent and costly to both FCE, Zaria and its employees. Clear understanding of determinants of employees resistance will help management of FCE, Zaria to minimise the occurrence of workplace resistance to change by employees. Second, the potential contribution of self-efficacy in minimizing the tendency of employee's resistance will have practical implications for selection and recruitment. For example,

the management in FCE, Zaria could reduce the likelihood of workplace resistance among employees by recruiting employees with high self-efficacy. As demonstrated by the previous research, an individual who is high in self-efficacy is less likely to engage in resistance to change (Rodda, 2010).

Last, this study will also help the management (leaders) of FCE, Zaria to realize that instead of motivating the employees by punishment or rewards, they should focus on getting the employees to take interest in achievement, growth and development by using charisma and inspiration, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration (Bass & Avolio, 1997).

1.7 Scope of the Study.

This study is limited to Academic Staff of Federal College of Education, Zaria. The employees covered within the context of this study are selected academic staff of the college whose names appeared on the Staff Nominal Roll as at August 31, 2012. The justification for limiting our scope to FCE, Zaria is that the issue of organizational change and employees resistance are prevalent and costly to both the college and the employees, more especially the academic staff. They are costly to the college because they lead to lack of commitment and low productivity. On the academic staff, they cause fear of unknown, fear of job loss, power and status.The study also covered the period from 2007-2012. This is because it was the period that several changes took place in FCE, Zaria.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

Information gathering of this nature is rigorous. Respondent's procrastinated on the provision of the necessary information required of them because they could

not perceive any immediate benefits to them. Some respondents also complaint of being fed up answering questionnaire all the time. This challenge was, however, overcome through the patience and persistence of the researcher in going to the various offices of the academic staff of FCE, Zaria. Accessibility of academic staff was also very difficult.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This chapter reviews some related literatures and conceptual framework of various authors and authorities on the subject matter. It lays emphasis on the concept of employees resistance, job autonomy, self efficacy and transformational leadership. The chapter also reviews and examines the existing empirical evidence on the relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change, self efficacy and employees resistance to change, and transformational leadership and employees resistance to change in order to establish the gaps in the literature and also to serve as a basis for validation of the findings of the study. Also, the chapter reviews the theoretical framework underlying the study. The main theories discussed are self determination theory, self efficacy theory and transformational leadership theory.

2.2 Conceptualization

2.2.1 Employees Resistance to Change

Many researchers have tried to define resistance to change, which resulted in different conceptualizations. Reviewing these, Carr, Hard and Tahant (2006) define resistance to change as mainly an effort to maintain the status quo. It is a behaviour put up to protect an individual from the perceived effects of real or imagined threat. Greatz, Rimmer, Lawrence and Smith (2006) define Resistance to change as barriers arising from organizational politics, inappropriate use of power, challenges to cultural norms and institutionalized practices, lack of understanding, inappropriate timing, inadequate resources, incorrect information or employee suspicion of honourable

management intentions. Harvey and Brown (2001) also define resistance to change as a reaction to methods used in implementing a change rather than any inherent human characteristics. They claim that people tend to resist changes that do not make sense to them or that are forced on them against their will. Resistance does not necessarily surface in standardized ways. Resistance can be overt (open and intentional), implicit (not stated but understood), immediate or deferred (Naimatullah, 2009). Which ever form it takes, it is usually viewed as a negative force, especially by the management because it can occur irrespective of the value of the change effort proposed.

In addition, Piderit (2000) defines resistance as a negative attitude towards change. He stated that there are three different underlying dimensions in the definitions of resistance to change: Behavioural, cognitive, and affective dimensions. The behavioural dimension involves actions or intentions to act in response to the change (complaining about the change, trying to convince others that the change is bad) (Oreg, 2006: Cumming & Worley, 2009). The cognitive dimension of resistance to change is more focused on an individual's beliefs and thoughts about the change, that is, what one thinks about the change (Is it necessary, Will it be beneficial?) (Oreg, 2006: Piderit, 2000). The last dimension, the affective dimension, involves how one feels about the change (angry, anxious) (Oreg, 2006; Piderit, 2000). Therefore, resistance to change is defined as a set of negative responses to change along the behavioural, cognitive, and affective dimension (Piderit, 2000).

Graetz *et al* (2006) however, contend that resistance to change can also serve positive purposes such as firing change initiators to reconsider hasty plans or marshalling employees' support for new vision. They put forward four schools of

thought to explain why employees resist change. They include Psychological, Systems, Institutional and cultural models of resistance to change.

The Psychological Model of Resistance claims that individuals by nature challenge any type of change. The central idea here is that sources of resistance to change reside in basic human characteristics, such as perceptions, personalities, and needs (Oreg, 2003). The notion of dramatic change for most people is downright scary and the natural response is resistance. Typical causes of this include uncertainty, lack of tolerance, differences in opinion concerning the need for change and threatened self-importance. While Systems Model of Resistance views resistance to change as a system concept that reflects organizational members' discomfort with the process modifications that are likely to disadvantage them. This implies that what people resist is not change per se but losing something they like, such us status, money or comfort (Dent, 1999).

Institutionalized resistance to change focuses on behaviours that have become embedded in an organization's legitimate structures, decision making processes and resources allocation (Graetz *et al*, 2006). Organisations by their very nature are conservative and actively resist change. This model therefore explains the resistance of organizational members to change that they perceive as unnecessary. Organization's Culture on the other hand is a pattern of beliefs and expectations that are common to members of a social unit and subsequently set the behavioural standards or norms for all new employees. Because culture is intrinsically inflexible, determined and shared by members of an organization, and has profound influence on behaviour, any attempt to change its core assumptions might be met with resistance.

Therefore, managing resistance requires bringing these background conversations into the foreground to examine and work through them.

However, several researchers, e.g, Dool (2006); Oreg, (2006); Wanberg & Banas, (2000) have noticed that the experience of resistance to change decreases the general positive feeling about, and attitude toward (diverse aspects of) the job. Rush, Schoel & Bernard (1995) argued that employees with more resistance to change, experience more stress about the situation which lowered their performance (Rush, Schoel & Bernard, 1995). Taking above researches into consideration, this study opines that employees experiencing more resistance to change perform less in their jobs.

2.2.1.1 Forms and Causes of Resistance to Change

There are a variety of forms by which resistance can manifest itself. It can range from quite harmless covert manifestations -like rumours and gossip, a 'wait and see' policy, protest letters to the management and trade union activity- to harmful overt manifestations -like sabotage of work processes and aggression against management (Coch & French, 1948). The harmful manifestations of resistance can have severe effects on the well being of organisational members. Structural resistance can, for example, lead to high staff turnover, reduced effectiveness and efficiency of the organisation, conflicts, increased absenteeism, lateness, reduced organisation commitment and a smaller chance to survive in the environment (Metselaar, 1997: Lewis, 2011).

In order to understand the emergence and manifestation of resistance to change, it is necessary to know the causes of this phenomenon. In the literature many

subdivisions are given of the causes or reasons of resistance to change. First of all, according to Kotter (2006) there are four major reasons why people resist change: because they are afraid of losing something of value; because they misunderstand or mistrust the change and the implications of it; because they believe that the change is of no use; or simply because they have a low tolerance for change. In these cases, the sources of resistance exist in both the personality and the environment (Coghlan, 1993). Second, Metselaar (1997) made a distinction between primary and secondary causes of resistance. Primary causes of resistance are antecedents of resistance which are directly related to the contents of the change. This is the case when for example the change process has detrimental effects on the work conditions. Also, the impact a change has on the methods and jobs of the employees, the number of employees affected by the change, or the range of activities altered are considered as primary causes of resistance. Secondary causes of resistance can be defined as barriers that directly or indirectly hinder the acceptance or implementation of the change. Examples include lack of time, material, or financial means to implement the change, the absence of a clear change plan, and a lack of experience or know how among the people that have to implement the change (Metselaar, 1997).

In addition, Greenberg and Baron (2002) stated the key factors that are known to make people resist change in organisations, the so-called individual barriers, are:

- Economic insecurity: because any changes on the job have the potential to threaten the livelihood of the employees, for example, loss of job or reduced pay, some resistance to change are inevitable.

- Fear of the unknown: Employees derive a sense of security from doing things the same way. They know who their co-workers will be and to whom they are supposed to listen and answer from day to day. When these well-established, comfortable patterns are disrupted, unfamiliar conditions are created which is a state of affairs often rejected.

- Threats to social relationships: People working in organisations usually form strong bonds with their co-workers. Many organisational changes, for example, the reassignment of job responsibilities, threaten the integrity of friendship groups that provide valuable social rewards.

- Habit: Habitual jobs that are well learned are easy to perform. A new or changed job requires people to develop new skills. This is clearly more difficult than continuing to perform the job as it was originally learned.

- Failure to recognise need for change: Unless the employees of the organisation recognise and fully appreciate the need for change, any vested interests they may have in keeping things the same may overpower their willingness to accept change.

The organisational barriers Greenberg and Baron (2002) give are:

- Threats to existing balance of power: If changes are made with respect to the people in charge, it is likely that this will entail a shift in the balance of power between individuals and organisational sub-units. Resistance against change then comes from the units or individuals that fear losing their advantageous position as a result of the change.

-Previously unsuccessful change efforts: If people or organisations have lived through a past disaster regarding organisational change, they are understandably reluctant to endure another attempt.

- Work group inertia: due to the development of strong social norms within groups, possible pressures to perform jobs in a certain way can exist. When change is introduced, these established normative expectations are disrupted which can lead to resistance.

Simply put, causes of resistance to change either lie in the organisation or in the individual. This research aims at examining the relationship between organisational change (job autonomy, self efficacy, transformational leadership) and employees resistance to change.

2.2.1.2 Methods Used in Managing Resistance to Change

Behaviour modification means changing or modifying behaviour through the use of contingent rewards or punishment. It assumes, for instance that behaviour that appears to lead to a positive consequence or reward tends to be repeated, while behaviour that leads to negative consequence or punishment tends not to be repeated (Desler, 2007). Management must be able to spot resistance early to be able to respond before it takes hold. It must be on the lookout for undesirable behaviours. Mooketsi (2009) suggests the following methods for overcoming resistance to change:

i. Education and Communication: This method could be used when resistance is noted to have arisen from lack of information and analysis. Effective use of this method may encourage the employees to help in the implementation of change.

ii. Foster Open Communication: Employees usually have a lot of questions that need clarification. Subordinates and Management should be able to converse together. Open communication minimizes wrong perceptions and rumours.

iii. Participation and Involvement: This approach is useful to buy employees in into the change process. People who participate in fostering a change will be committed to its implementation. Formidable resistance is unlikely to come from employees that took part in the process. Useful information is usually provided that will be integrated to improve and ease the process of implementation of desired change.

iv. Facilitation and Support: This may be useful when employees are resisting because of adjustment problems. Management should guide them to ease the transition.

v. Negotiation and Agreement: This is desirable when dealing with unions and any group that has the power to influence.

vi. Manipulation and Co-optation: This can be used when other methods have failed or are expensive.

vii. Implicit and Explicit Coercion: This may be used when there is time constraint. When the change must be implemented within a short period of time to save the organization

The study opines that the role of management is crucial in every change process. Management is the art of getting things done through people in organizations. Managers are to give organizations a sense of purpose and direction; they can

motivate ordinary people to do extra-ordinary things. Effective managers should be capable of relating individuals, groups, and formal structures to the needs of the organization.

Dube (2009) suggests that managers could utilize the following to ensure smooth change process:

i. Perception: Managers should be able to interpret sensory inputs effectively and ensure that employees perceive the organizations objective correctly. They need to understand workers' grievances and complaints and empathize with problems confronting various departments. It is necessary to facilitate good communication between managers and subordinates.
ii. Learning: Individuals in the organizations should be encouraged to acquire new knowledge, skill and attitude. Learning helps people to understand better and influence behaviour.
iii. Motivation: this focuses on the totality of individual's dispositions and motives to behave in a certain way. Managers should endeavour to know the drives and forces that can influence employees' behaviour. Employees are motivated partly by the need to earn a living and also by human needs for job satisfaction and security of tenure. All these should be factored into the process of change.

iv. Support is very essential for effecting a smooth change. People undergoing change need material, moral and emotional support. Undergoing change is a lot like walking a tightrope for the first time. It will go smoothly if you have someone to help you get started, someone waiting at the other end to encourage progress, and a safety net underneath in case you fall (Goetsch & Davis, 2006).

However, this study posited that people are primary inhibitors of change in organizations and it is important to pay attention to them. Managers should listen to hear what is being said and observe what is not being said. Employees who are listened to and heard are likely to participate more in change process than those who are not. Everyone who is affected by change should be involved in making it happen. It can be difficult when people feel that change is being imposed on them. Employees should therefore be involved in planning and implementing change. They should be given opportunity to express their concerns and fears. Getting problems into the open from the onset would allow them to be dealt with while shoving them aside or ignoring them will transform little problems into big ones. The study however sees resistance as refusal to give in, accept or comply with change.

2.2.2 Organisational Change

The concept of organisational change has been defined in a number of ways by different scholars. For example, Greenberg and Baron (2002) define organisational change as planned or unplanned transformations in the structure, technology and / or people of an organisation. While Eisenbach, Watson, & Pillai, (1999) define organizational change as a shift from the known to the unknown, by changing the status quo. Unless there are compelling reasons for a change, employees generally do not support change (Cummings & Worley, 2009).

More so, Chonko (2004) defines organisational change as a shifting from one stage to another or it is concerned with breaking down existing structures and creating new ones. While, Bernerth (2004) defines organisational change as a transformation between two points in time with the key ability to compare the organisation before and

after the transformation. Furthermore, Kotter (2006) opined that significant organisational change occurs, for example, when organisation changes its overall strategy for success, adds or removes a major section or practice and or wants to change the very nature by which it operates.

Carr *et al* (2006) claim that change connotes a significant disruption in established behaviour and/or expectation and could lead to discontinuity, destruction and replacement of familiar social structures and relationships. It could alter set patterns of behaviour, define relationships with others, work procedures, and job skills. All these might present individuals with new situations, new problems and challenges, ambiguity and uncertainty. On an organizational level, it could lead to adding new persons, modifying a program, like change of mission, policies, procedures, restructuring operations, layoff, new technologies, mergers, collaborations and total quality management. Some experts refer to it as organizational transformation (Harvey & Brown 2001). Invariably, change might affect authoritative allocation of both human and material resources and encourage competition which heats up the political climate in organizations.

The politics of change is very critical and sensitive. Because change threatens the status quo, it inherently implies political activity. New employees who have invested less in status quo and managers who are slightly removed from the main power structure might tolerate the process. However, some high up individuals in the organizations might perceive it as a threat to their skills, status, positions and behavioural patterns and construe the process as undermining their competence. Coincidentally, this latter group is a major player in change.

Proposing a change in an organization can affect several aspects beyond the initial conception. Change in structure may affect the culture of the organization as well as the attitude that individuals have towards work. New structures mean new reporting relationships, new tasks and job descriptions for employees. All these may trigger resistance from those who feel disadvantaged by the new arrangement. The multi-dimensional nature of the effects of change poses challenges to managers and calls for effective management in its implementation.

The manager could change four basic aspects of the company: its strategy, technology, structure and employees (Desler, 2007). Strategic change affects the way the company creates and markets its products or services. It covers the purpose and mission of the organization, its corporate philosophy on such matters as growth, quality, innovation and values concerning employees and customers, competitive positioning and strategic goals for achieving and maintaining competitive advantage and for product-market development (Armstrong, 2009). Structural change focuses on reorganizing the chart and structural elements of the organisation. This may involve replacing, dismissing or adding personnel.

Technological changes are mostly concerned with automation of processes. Influences of information and communication technology have made this change not only desirable but also an on-going process as the dynamism of technology continues to dictate the competitive strength of business organizations. Employees may be changed through learning activities such as training, education and development programs. They need new orientation to ensure that the organization keeps pace with changes in the environment.

2.2.2.1 The Pincipal Model of Change Management

The principal models of change management stem from the work of Kurt Lewin in the 1940's who developed the planned approach to change. Graetz et al (2006) state that Lewin's approach to organizational change is grounded in a general system of ideas termed 'field theory'. This theory stipulates that organizations are constantly exposed to two forces of those that maintain stability and those that break it down. The normal state for organizations is one of equilibrium in which the forces for stability are dominant. To achieve change, the organization would need to reduce the forces for stability or increase the forces for change. Lewin's change model involves three steps: unfreezing, moving and refreezing. Unfreezing contains a reduction in the field forces that maintain an existing organizational culture and method of operations. It involves breaking psychological attachment to the past by using information that demonstrate the existence of problems (Graetz *et al*, 2006). The principle is that the equilibrium needs to be destabilized (unfrozen) before old behaviour can be discarded (unlearnt) and new behaviour can be successfully adopted.

Burnes (2004) expands on Lewin's ideas and explains that the key to unfreezing is to recognize that change, whether at the individual or group level is a profound psychological dynamic process. The second stage is moving which entails the creation of cognitive recognition in the workplace of the need for change, and the establishment of new norms of behaviour around a particular set of new structures and processes (Graetz *et al*, 2006). Essentially, this means moving from a less acceptable to a more acceptable set of behaviours. The third level, refreezing, basically involves cultural reinforcement of the new learnt behaviours. The focus of refreezing is to

ensure that the new behaviours are to some degree, congruent with the rest of the behaviour, personality and environment of the learner in order not to lead to a new round of disconfirmation (Burnes, 2004). It is implied here that Lewin saw successful change as a group activity because unless group norms and routines are transformed, changes in individual's behaviour will not be sustained (Graetz *et al*, 2006). It is pertinent to note that the concept of refreezing might not apply to many modern day organizations that are encouraged to thrive on chaos and constant change. Thriving resonates with actual experiences because the period of time between phases of planned change had dwindled to zero.

Current managers have to deal with a much more turbulent environment that is full of uncertainties and face constant change bordering on chaos. Managers need to make prudent organizational change decisions by envisaging how employees are likely to react to them. Implementation of change is an interplay between change paths and change planning tools. The paths are the products of a particular blend of personal, cultural, organizational and environmental characteristics that make each organization's experience of change different.

Therefore, the study views organisational change as the movement of organisation from its present state towards some desired future state to increase its effectiveness.

2.2.3 Job Autonomy

Jonge (1996) defines job autonomy as the discretion the worker is expected to exercise in carrying out the assigned task activities. While, Hackman and Lawler (1971) define job autonomy as the extent to which employees have a major say in

scheduling their work, selecting the equipment they will use, and deciding on procedures to be followed. Hackman and Oldham (1980) also define job autonomy as the degree to which the job provides substantial freedom, independence and discretion to the individual in scheduling the work and in determining the procedures to be used in carrying it out. Breaugh (1985) argued that job autonomy and employee independence are distinct constructs and should be conceptualized as such. Also, Farh & Scott, (1983) opined that an ambiguity is seen in the last part of the definition. They pointed out that if the job performer determines the procedures to be used, it is hardly possible that two people could be regarded as doing the same job. In that way, job autonomy cannot be viewed as independent of other job characteristics, for example, skill variety. In practice, job autonomy boils down to the question: 'Who in the end determines the work situation?' The only facets, or elements, which have been delineated, are work scheduling work procedures (Breaugh, 1985).

However, DeCotiis and Koys (1980) define job autonomy as self-determination with respect to work procedures, goals and priorities. Finally, Breaugh's (1985) defines job autonomy as the degree of control or discretion a worker is able to exercise with respect to some work facets or elements (i.e., work method, work schedules, the pace of work, work goals, workplace, work evaluation, working-hours, kind of work and amount of work (Ganster, 1989 and Warr, 1987).

In sum, the study sees autonomy as a job characteristic mostly described in terms of self-determination, discretion and freedom. Job autonomy can therefore be theoretically defined as the worker's self-determination, discretion or freedom, inherent in the job, to determine several task elements.

2.2.3.1 Multi Level Job Autonomy

In addition to the different elements of job autonomy, the literature reveals several levels, or dimensions, of job autonomy (Aronsson, 1989a, 1989b; Ganster & Fusilier, 1989). In order to understand this multi level job autonomy, the study will venture into the hierarchy within organizations and the corresponding personnel structure.

According to Veld, (1981**)** both management and employees will attempt to exercise control. The management wants to ensure that a predictable level and type of performance is attained and maintained; most employees want opportunities to determine their work (Child, 1984). Frequently, a worker has various opportunities to carry out his tasks in different ways, depending on the outcome of the interplay of forces between management and employees. In this situation, two levels of job autonomy can be distinguished. (1) an external level; and (2) an internal level. It should be noted, however, that job autonomy is still restricted to direct task elements.

The external level of job autonomy concerns the employee's opportunities to determine several inputs and outputs requirements of his tasks. In other words, this level of job autonomy refers to the norms of a part of the production process; that is, the worker's job. This is called ‘contextual aspect’ of job autonomy, for example, to pause in the work whenever the employee wants and to determine the amount of work. On the other hand, the internal level is based on the opportunities within given job standards, which will be called the "content aspects" of job autonomy. Examples of these content aspects are to evaluate the work yourself and to determine the method of working yourself.

In a similar vein, Bailyn (1985) distinguished between strategic autonomy (the freedom to set one's own agenda) and operational autonomy (the freedom, once a problem has been set, to attack it by means determined by oneself, within given constraints). Bazerman (1982) argued as well that two critical levels of work-related control ('job autonomy') should be distinguished: (1) control over outcomes, and (2) control over activities**.** The former is defined as the degree to which outcomes are contingent on performance; the latter refers to the discretion to use methods and activities chosen in carrying out the job, which is analogous to Breaugh's work method autonomy. Another - quite similar - distinction was made by Aronsson (1989a, 1989b), namely control over and within a work situation'. Control over a situation means power to change the existing rules, while control within a situation means to be master of several work aspects within the existing situation.

Taken together, the whole spectrum of a worker's job autonomy consists of (1) external opportunities (i.e., contextual autonomy, strategic autonomy, control over outcomes, or control over work), and (2) internal opportunities (i.e., content autonomy, operational autonomy, control over activities, or control within work).

2.2.4 SELF EFFICACY

Bandura (1997) defines self efficacy as a construct which describes the confidence of individuals in their own abilities. Self efficacy is defined as the belief in one’s capabilities to perform a particular behaviour and successfully execute certain actions to attain goals (Bandura, 1997; Gist & Mitchell, 1992). Research has shown that individuals gradually accumulate their self-efficacy through prior cognitive, social, and physical accomplishments as well as through learning (Bandura, 1997).

Self-efficacy thus grows with hard work achievements as opposed to personality and traits, which are relatively stable characteristics.

Gist and Mitchell (1992) define self-efficacy as an individual's judgment of their capacity to perform in a given situation. Self-efficacy is thought to determine motivational behaviours such as goals, effort, and persistence (Bandura, 1997). This is particularly true when the situation in question is novel or uncertain in nature (Judge, Thoresen, Pucik & Wellbourne, 1999). Therefore, individuals with higher self-efficacy in the context of a change implementation will be more likely to believe that they can deal with the new performance expectations resulting from the change in roles and responsibilities, and thus, will have more positive reactions to the change in general. In addition, self-efficacy serves a motivational purpose, directing task persistence and behaviour. Individuals who have high self-efficacy for a specific change will be more likely to commit to making the change a success (Wanberg & Banas, 2000).

Change-related training and participation in the change process may serve as ways to increase change-related self-efficacy. In fact, Bandura's original social learning theory (1977) pinpointed enactive mastery as a way to increase self efficacy.Verbal persuasion, such as what might be achieved through effective and targeted communications about the change initiative, may also increase change related self-efficacy.

Wanberg and Banas (2000) define self-efficacy as employees' perceived abilities to complete their job responsibilities, despite the change. Several empirical studies have examined self-efficacy as a precursor to change readiness or acceptance.

Judge *et al* (1999) examined self-efficacy in the context of change, and found that self-efficacy was positively related to coping with change.

Scholz, Gutiérrez-Doña, Sud, and Schwarzer (2002) stated that self efficacy, or "can do"-cognition, or in other words, perceived competence, mirrors a sense of control over one's environment. It reflects the belief of being able to control challenging environmental demands by means of taking adaptive action. Gist and Mitchell (1992) posited that self-efficacy is a judgment of task capability and it is an important motivational construct. Bandura (1995) explained that efficacy beliefs influence how people think, feel, motivate, and act.

According to Bandura (1995), sources of efficacy beliefs come from four main influences: (1) *Mastery Experiences*, or personal attainments, (2) *Vicarious Experiences*, or modeling, obtained through social models, i.e. through coaching or seeing people similar to themselves succeed by perseverant effort, (3) *Social persuasion*, which strengthens one's efficacy belief, and (4) *Physiological and emotional state*, in which positive mood enhances perceived self efficacy, while negative mood diminishes it.

Self-efficacious people are prepared to take responsibilities and face challenges, will persevere in the face of difficulties and possess sense of control over environment in which they function than the inefficacious people (Bandura, 1977; 1995). Bandura and Wood (1989) maintained that individuals who show strong sense of self-efficacy set increasingly challenging goals, possess cognition that environment is controllable, and exhibit effective analytic thinking, which subsequently affect organizational attainments. Bandura (1997) explained that people who believe

strongly in their problem-solving capabilities remain highly efficient in their analytic thinking in complex decision-making situations, which ultimately fosters performance accomplishments, than the inefficacious people. Spreitzer (1995) also posited that competence, or self-efficacy, is an important component of feelings of empowerment, along with self-determination, meaning, and impact. Past findings show that self-efficacy is associated with employees resistance to change. For example, self-efficacy plays role in employees' attitude in accepting changes (McDonald & Siegall, 1996). Self-efficacy plays role in occupational stress of employees, in which individuals with low self-efficacy show more emotional exhaustion when their job autonomy is higher (Grau, Salanova, & Peiro, 2001), and self-efficacy holds influence on individuals' expectations of the outcomes (Compeau & Higgins, 1995).

Alternatively, work autonomy promotes the nurturing of self-efficacy belief in employees. Benson and Lawler (2005) stressed that the positive effects of employee involvement on organizational performance come from the increased utilization of the knowledge and skills of employees, which then increases efficacy of workers, and subsequently motivates them to exert extra effort, resulting in less resistance to change. Similarly, Parker and Wall (1998) argued that increased autonomy can promote the acquisition and use of knowledge, improving intellectual flexibility, likely to develop broader role orientations, and greater propensity to use initiative or be proactive, and thereby reducing resistance to change. This phenomenon is referred to as "efficacy-resistance spiral" (Van, Mierlo, Rutte, Vermunt, Kompier, & Doorewaard, 2006), which refers to a reciprocal relationship between efficacy and

employees resistance to change, in which perceptions of self-efficacy result in high task performance, in turn results in increased perceptions of self-efficacy, and so on.

Self-efficacy has been found to predict employees resistance to change (Judge & Bono, 2001). They opined that self-efficacy, or one's estimate of one's fundamental ability to cope, perform, and be successful, will contribute to positive self-evaluation and thus efficacious people are likely to deal effectively with difficulties and persist in the face of challenges and subsequently reduce resistance from the employees.

2.2.5 Transformational Leadership

Change leadership, transactional leadership and transformational leadership are the types of leadership that can be successful when leading change (Gregory, 2007). The first one, change leadership, focuses on the specific present change where the leader handles it from a tactical point of view. Transactional leadership is based more on reinforcement and exchanges between the leader and the follower, in which the followers are rewarded for meeting specific goals or performance criteria. Rewards and positive reinforcement are provided or mediated by the leader. Thus, transactional leadership is more practical in nature because of its emphasis on meeting specific targets or objectives. An effective transactional leader is able to recognize and reward followers accomplishment in a timely way. However, employees of transactional leaders are not necessarily expected to think innovatively and may be monitored on the basis of predetermined criteria.

On the contrary, transformational leadership is more of a long-term relationship between the management and the employees. The relationship has been created during a longer period of time with many interactions and its nature is more strategic and

organizational (Caldwell, Herold & Fedor, 2008). Additionally, transformational leadership usually works better when working with major changes rather than routine changes (Eisenbach, Watson & Pillai, 1999).

The idea of transformational leadership is to, instead of motivating the employees by punishments or rewards, focus on getting the individual to take interest in achievement, growth and development by using charisma and inspiration, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration (Bass & Avolio, 2003). One of the most important aspects of transformational leadership is to motivate the employees to identify themselves with the leader's vision and to put the interest of the group and organization before self-interests. For a transformational leader there are three different phases of change; recognizing the need for change, creating a new vision, and then establishing the change (Eisenbach *et al*, 1999). They posited that there are three important factors that can be identified in transformational leadership: charisma and inspiration, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration.

2.2.5.1 The Three Aspects of Transformational Leadership.

Nahavandi (2012) and Eisenbach *et al* (1999) explained that *Charisma/ inspiration* as a part of the leadership creates a strong emotional bond between the leader and the follower. This strong bond creates loyalty and trust for the leader as the follower becomes inspired to implement the leader's vision. Creating this charismatic emotional bond will counteract the physiological and emotional resistance to change. By *intellectually stimulating* the followers and encouraging them to come up with creative solutions the leader can motivate them to solve problems. The intellectual stimulation leads to new solutions and innovations and at the same time it empowers

the followers. Each follower needs to get *individual consideration*, which the leader can provide by treating the individuals differently but with equality. The follower will then feel special, encouraged and motivated and he or she will perform better. When a leader is acting in this way it is also easier to match each follower's skills and abilities to what the organization needs (Nahavandi, 2012).

Transformational leaders are admired, respected, and trusted (Bass, Avolio, Jung & Berson, 2003). Transformational leadership is associated with a more enduring leader-follower relationship. It is based more on trust and commitment than contractual agreements (Sosik, 2005). Bass, (1997) maintained that transformational leadership involves encouraging others with whom they work to develop and perform beyond standard expectations. Transformational leaders inspire others with whom they work by viewing the future with optimism, projecting an idealized vision, and communicating that the vision is achievable (Benjamin & Flynn, 2006). In addition, Brown and Moshavi (2002) emphasize that transformational leadership as typically more effective in public organizations than in private companies and is more commonly practised at lower organizational levels than higher ones. One key characteristic of followers who appreciate transformational leaders are their regulatory orientation - the manner in which they pursue goals and value goal attainment. An individual ' s regulatory orientation that may influence people ' s preferences for leadership style is their regulatory focus (Benjamin & Flynn, 2006).

In sum, change leadership, focuses on the specific present change, transformational leadership creates a vision and inspires subordinates to strive beyond

required expectations. While transactional leadership focuses on extrinsic motivation for performance of job tasks.

2.3 Empirical Studies on the Relationship between Organisational Change and Employees Resistance to change

2.3.1 Empirical Studies on Job Autonomy and Employees Resistance to change

A number of researches have been conducted on the relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change. For example, Jaramillo, Mulki, Onyemah and Pesquera (2012) conducted a study on the influence of job autonomy and employees resistance to change. Two hundred and thirty- three (233) sales people from Spain participated in the study. Structural Equation Modeling Technique was used to analyse the data. The finding of the study revealed a significant relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change. This implies that job autonomy is one of the most predictor of employees resistance to change.

In a related study, Hornnung and Roussean (2007) included 299 hospital employees to examine the influence of job autonomy and employees resistance to change. Structural Equation Modelling technique was used to analyse the data. The result of the study demonstrated that job autonomy minimizes the tendency of employees resistance to change.

Another study on the relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change was carried out in western context by Adalgi, Battistel, Francesco and Odoardi (2013). Two hundred and seventy (270) employees from the public sector participated in the study. The finding of the study revealed a significant positive

relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change.This implies that the higher the job autonomy the less the resistance to change.

Also, Siegel (2008) conducted research on the relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change. Two hundred and nineteen (219) personnels from Southeastern University participated in the study. The data for the study were analyzed with regression, independent-sample *t*-tests, and descriptive statistics using SPSS v15. The finding stated a significant relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change. This implies that job autonomy raises employees willingness to work harder for the organization and reduces resistance to change.

2.3.2 Empirical Studies on Self-Efficacy and Employees Resistance to Change

Several researches have been carried out on the relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance to change. For example, Kura, Shamsudin and Chauhan (2013) carried out a research on the influence of self efficacy and employees resistance to change. Data was collected from 217 teaching staff from various higher education institutions in Nigeria. Data was analysed using Partial Least Square (PLS) Path Modeling. The finding showed a significant relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance. This implies that the higher the self efficacy in employees the less the resistance to change.

Another research on the relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance to change was conducted by Kumar and Uzkurt (2011) in Turkey. The study was conducted with data from two hundred and seventy one (271) personnels. Cronbach Alppha Score was used for analysis of data. The study showed a significant

relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance to change. This implies that individuals with high self efficacy exhibit less level of resistance to change.

Moreover, another study was conducted by Rodda (2010) on the relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance to change. Data for the study was collected from five different United State-based plants of three billion dollars, 500 manufacturing organisation head-quartered in the U.S. The organisation employs over 14000 personnels working in more than 30 countries. Likert-type scale was used for analysis of data. The finding of the study showed a significant relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance to change. This implies that self efficacy is highly related to employees resistance to change due to its ability to motivate action and increase confidence in performance. Thus, it reduces resistance to change.

Also, another research was conducted by Schwaninger (2008) on the relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance to change. The study was carried out in Thailand. Eighty-six teachers (86) participated in the study. Multinominal Ordered Probit Regression was used for analysis of data. The study revealed that self efficacy has negative relationship with employees resistance to change. This implies that self efficacy is not a good predictor of change.

Moran and Hoy (2013) also conducted a research on the relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance to change. Two hundred and twenty five (225) teachers from three state universities, two in Ohio and one inVirginia participated in the study. Correlation matrix was used for the analysis of this study. The finding revealed that there is a strong relationship between self efficacy and employees

resistance to change. This implies that there is a positive relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance to change

2.3.3 Empirical Studies on Transformational Leadership and Employees Resistance to Change

Many researches have also been conducted on the relationship between transformational leadership style and employees resistance to organisational change. For example, Oreg and Berson (2011) conducted a research on the relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change. The research was conducted in schools in Isreal. Seventy-five (75) principals and 586 teachers in Isreal participated in the study. Hierachical Linear Modelling was used to analyse the data. The finding revealed a significant relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change. This implies that transformational leadership is one of the most significant predictor of employees resistance to change.

Another study by Dubs, Eriksson, Felldin and Hanson (2012) on the relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change was carried out in England. The studied company is SAAB Support and Services where the contact person Helena Wäreby provided information from her own experience during a telephone interview. The finding stated a significant relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change. This implies that the higher transformational leadership the lower the employees resistance.

Also, another study on the relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change was carried out in western context by Tseng and Kang (2008). The study was conducted in Taiwan at the National Police

Administration employing 500 full-time employees. Structural Equation Modeling was used for analysis. The finding revealed there is a strong relationship between transformational leadership style and employees resistance to change. This implies that transformational leadership style inspires followers to share a vision and empower them to attain the vision by providing the necessary resources to develop their full potentials thereby reducing resistance to change by employees.

Another research was conducted in China by Carter, Achilles, Armenakis, Hubert, Feild and Mossholder (2012) on the relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change in the United State of America. Two hundred and fifty one (251) employees and their 78 managers were used as participants. Analysis of data was done using Hierachical Linear Modeling (HLM). The finding revealed that the quality of relationships between leaders and employees determine the level of resistance to change. This implies that the higher the relationship between transformational leaders and the employees, the less the resistance to change by employees.

Also, Faghihi and Sayyed (2012) conducted a research in Isfahan Municipality, Iran on the relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change. One hundred and five (105) employees were used as participants. Structural Equation Model (SEM) was used for the analysis of the study. The finding indicated that there was positive significant relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change. This implies that transformational Leadership is another predictor of employees resistance to change.

2.4 Theoretical Framework for the Study

An attempt was made to hinge this study based on three theories:

2.4.1 Self-Determination Theory (SDT)

This theory suggests that the social environment influences intrinsic motivation through its impact on need satisfaction or perceptions of competence, autonomy and relatedness (Grouzet, Vallerand, Thill & Provencher, 2004). These needs are seen as universal necessities and studies suggest that they are among the most salient needs and those most closely associated with event-based effect (Sheldon, Elliot, Kim & Kasser, 2001). Moreover, the focus of SDT is not the individual differences in the strength of these needs, but the degree to which these needs are satisfied. Among these needs, the need for autonomy is deemed as being more essential than the need for competence and relatedness. According to Gagne and Deci (2005) SDT postulates that when people experience satisfaction of the needs for relatedness and competence with respect to behaviour, they will tend to internalize its value and regulation, but the degree of satisfaction of the need for autonomy is what distinguishes whether identification or integration, rather than just introjection, will occur. Thus, autonomy is deemed necessary for value and regulation to be internalised in order for the subsequent enactment of the behaviour to be experienced as autonomous.

However, while intrinsically motivated behaviour is prototypically autonomous, SDT also posits that extrinsic motivation can vary in the degree to which it is autonomous versus controlled (Gagne & Deci, 2005). Therefore, since the instruments used to assess different levels of autonomous motivation are designed to measure the motivation of more isolated situations, events or activities, and not the

motivation of the more multi-faceted nature of work, this study only investigated levels of intrinsic motivation. Furthermore, in order to "translate" SDT into a work setting, this research examine potential sources of need satisfaction by investigating employees' perceived job autonomy and job interdependence, and their perception of supervisor support for development, competence and autonomy.

2.4.2 Self Efficacy Theory

This study also presents self efficacy theory as an integrative theoretical framework to explain and to predict psychological changes achieved by different modes of treatment. According to Bandura (1977) this theory states that psychological procedures, whatever their form, alter the level and strength of self-efficacy. It is hypothesized that expectations of self efficacy determine whether resistance will be minimized, how much effort will be expended, and how long it will be sustained in the face of obstacles and aversive experiences. Persistence in activities that are subjectively threatening but in fact relatively safe are produced through experiences of mastery, further enhancement of self-efficacy and corresponding reductions in resistance. In the proposed model, expectations of personal efficacy are derived from four principal sources of information: performance accomplishments, vicarious experience, verbal persuasion, and physiological states. Thus, the more the self efficacy, the less the employees resistance to change.

2.4.3 Transformational Leadership Theory

Also, the study is based on transformational leadership theory which was proposed by Burns (1978) and further expanded upon by Bass and others (e.g., Bass & Riggio, 2006; Sosik & Jung, 2010). Transformational leadership contains four

components: charisma or idealized influence (attributed or behavioural), inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. Transformational leaders who display idealized influence set high standards for moral and ethical conduct, are confident about the future, and set high standards for emulation. Inspirational motivation involves transformational leaders providing followers with challenges and meaning for engaging in shared goals and undertakings. With intellectual stimulation, transformational leaders challenge their followers to be creative and innovative, to question long-term assumptions, to reframe questions, and to use new methods and mindsets to solve traditional problems and questions. Transformational leaders also display individualized consideration by paying special attention to specific followers' needs for personal growth and achievement, and trying to meet their needs and satisfy their expectations for future development, thus reducing employees resistance to change (Bass, 1985). It has been observed to add to the effectiveness of transformational leadership on followers' attitudes, committment and performance outcomes and minimizes employees resistance, thus demonstrating what is called the "augmentation effect" (Bass, 2008; Yukl, 2010).

Out of the three theories reviewed, transformational leadership theory was chosen to explain this study. This is because, transformational leadership encourages work autonomy. And, work autonomy promotes the nurturing of self-efficacy belief in employees. Benson and Lawler (2005) stressed that the positive effects of employees involvement on organizational performance come from the increased utilization of the knowledge and skills of employees, which then increases efficacy of workers, and

subsequently motivates them to exert extra effort, resulting in less resistance to change.

CHAPTER THREE

Research Methodology

3.1 Introduction

This chapter provides explanation on the research design, population of the study, details regarding the sample size, sampling technique, sources of data collection and instrumentation. The chapter also explains the model specification and the variables used to examine this study. The last part of this chapter explains the technique of data analysis used in this study.

3.2 Research Design

This study adopted cross-sectional research design, which is popularly used in most organizational change and other employee attitude studies. The choice of this design is determined by four factors, namely; the purpose of the study, the type of investigation, and the time period over which the data was collected and the type of analysis carried out. The major advantage of cross-sectional research design for this study is that the researcher was able to collect and compare several variables in the study at the same time. In addition, the collection of data is less expensive in terms of time and cost. Thus, in this study, data were collected from a sample of Federal College of Education, Zaria within a period of six months (31 August, 2012).

3.3 Population of the Study

The population of this study comprises six hundred and sixty (660) academic staff of Federal College of Education, Zaria listed on the Staff Nominal Roll as at 31 August, 2012 (FCE, Zaria, 2012).

3.4 Sample Size and Sampling Technique

The study used a sampling technique, in conjuction with Yamane sample selection formula as cited in Isreal (1992) which is stated as follow:

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(e)^2} \quad \text{----------3.1}$$

Where n = Sample size

N = Population of the study; and

E = Level of precision

After applying this formula, a representative sample size of three hundred and twenty three (323) were chosen from a population of six hundred and sixty(660) academic staff of Federal College of Education, Zaria with precision levels of +_ 5% and the level of confidence is 95%.

3.5 Sources of and Methods of Data

In this study, data was collected from both primary and secondary sources. The method that was used to collect primary data was questionnaire, which was administered to 323 respondents selected out of 660 academic staff of FCE, Zaria.

On the other hand, secondary data was generated by someone else. These sources were used to supplement the primary data generated. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, secondary data was collected from textbooks, journal publications, documentary reports, relevant theses, dissertations and seminar papers.

3. 6 Model Specification

The study employed the following econometric models, namely correlation model and regression model. The first model represents the relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change, self efficacy and employees resistance to change and transformational leadership and employees resistance to change. The general representation of the model is as follows:

3.6.1 Correlation Model

Mathematically, a correlation between 2 variables X and Y is given as:

$$Correl(X,Y) = \sum (x-\bar{x})\ (y-\bar{y}) / \sqrt{\sum (x-\bar{x})^2 \sum (y-\bar{y})^2}$$

.....(3.2)

Where:

Y = Employees Resistance to change

X = (Job autonomy, self efficacy and transformational leadership)

$\bar{x}, \bar{y}$ are the samples means (Iversen & Gergen, 1997).

3.6.2 Regression Model

$Y_t = C + \beta_{1t} X_{it} + \beta_{2t} X2t + \ldots\ldots. \beta_{nt} X_{nt} + \varepsilon_t$ ……..(3.3)

Where:

Y_t = dependent variable (employees resistance to change);

C = intercept;

βt = slope of the independent variables and control variables);

X_t = independent variables (job autonomy, self efficacy and transformational leadership)

ε_t = error term (Mills, 1999).

Decision Rule: The decision to accept or reject the null hypothesis (Ho) of the statistical test was based on the 95% confidence interval.

i. The null hypothesis is rejected if the P Value is at or less than 5% (0.05) level of significance from the regression output.

ii. The null hypothesis is accepted if the P Value is more than the 5% (0.05) level of significance from the regression output.

3.7 Measurement of Variables and Instrumentation

In this study, questionnaire was administered to the academic staff of Federal College of Education, Zaria (see appendix A). The questionnaire consists of five sections. PART A consists of 7 demographic variables, including gender, age, rank, work experience, educational qualification and geo-political zone, among others. PARTt B consists of 10-items that measure job autonomy. PART C consists of 10-items that measure self efficacy. PART D consists of 10-items that measure transformational leadership. While, PART E also consists of 10-items that measure resistance to change.

3.7.1 Employees Resistance Measure

In the present study, 10-items were adapted from Schiffer's (2011) resistance to change scale. They were used to measure employees resistance in the workplace. All the respondents rated themselves on the 10 items using 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to *5= strongly agree*. The use of Schiffer's (2011) resistance to change scale to assess workplace resistence is justified because it has

been found to be reliable in the previous studies, demonstrating internal reliability (cronbach alpha) above 0.70.

3.7.2 Job Autonomy Measurement Scale

To measure job autonomy, 10-items were adapted from Jackson, Martin, and Davids (1993) job autonomy scale. Furthermore, self-rating was applied to each item on the job autonomy scale using 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = strongly *agree*. Jackson, Martin, and Davids (1993) job autonomy scale was used in this study because previous studies have used it and found it to be reliable (e.g., Parker, Axtell & Turner, 2001; Holman, Axtell, Sprigg, Totterdell & Wall, 2010).

2.7.3 Self Efficacy Measurement scale

In the present study, 10-items were adapted from Schwarzer and Jerusalelm (1995). Self-efficacy was assessed using 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *stongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*.

3.7.4 Transformational Leadership Measure Scale

In the present study, 10-items of Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire developed by Krishna (1991) were adapted to measure transformational leadership. Respondents rated their perception of group norms using 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = strongly *agree*.

Generally, the study employed three independent variables which include, job autonomy, self efficacy and transformational leadership. Job autonomy was measured using ten constructs, self efficacy was measured using ten constructs and transformational leadership was also measured using ten constructs. The employees resistance to change which is the dependent variable was also measured using ten

constructs. Table 3.7.4.1 summarizes the measurement of the variables employed by the study.

Table 3.7.4.1 Measurement of Variables and Instrumentation

Code	Variable	Details of Measurment
TRC	Employees Resistance	Dependent variable. Measured qualitatively using ten constructs centering on: fair of change, irritating change, less motivation, frustration, bad outcome, refusal to support, avoiding work, high anxiety, sickness and less energy.
JA	Job Authonomy	Independent variable. Measured qualitatively using ten constructs centering on: starting time, finishing time, pace of work, decision on production, variation of work, work plan, control of quality, getting job done and method of carrying out work.
SE	Self Efficacy	Independent variable. Measured qualitatively using ten constructs centering on: solving difficult problems, getting what I want, sticking to aims, confidence, resourcefulness, effort investment, calmness, solution to problems, quick reasoning and coping with challenges.
TRL	Transformational Leadership	Independent variable. Measured qualitatively using ten constructs centering on: determination of appropriateness, values and beliefs, different perspectives, accepting responsibilities, morality, assignment completion, talking enthusiastically, consequences of decisions, heightens desire and meeting requirement.

Source: Researcher's Compilations, 2012

3.7.5 Validity of the Instrumentation

To ensure the validity of the items on the questionnaire, the study adapted some items on employees resistance to change (Schiffer, 2011), job autonomy (Jackson, Martin and Davids, 1993), self efficacy (Schwarzer and Jerusalem, 1995) and transformational leadership (Krishna, 1991). Adapting some of the items from these scales into the study's instrument was justified by the fact that these scales have been tested and proven to be valid over time in testing various dimensions of employees resistance to change, job autonomy, self efficacy and transformational leadership. Hence, the need for the study to further conduct validity tests for the instrument is not imperative since the items have been previously validated.

3.8 Method of Analysis

In order to determine whether a stastistically significant relationship exists between job autonomy, self efficacy, transformational leadership (independent variables) and employees resistance to change (dependent variable), this study employed two methods of data analysis. The first type of analysis is descriptive analysis, which provides some frequencies and percentages of relevant variables. The second method of analysis is Pearson-product moment correlation. A Pearson-product moment correlation and simple multiple regression were used to determine the relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change, self efficacy and employees resistance to change, as well as transformational leadership and employees resistance to change.

3.9 Justification for the methods of Data Analysis Used

Very often, in practice a relationship is found to exist between two (or more) variables (Spiegel, 2008). Gaiton cited in Ofo (1994) carried out various studies to determine the relationship between the heights of parents and their offsprings. The term regression came into use when the relationship between two variables was studied (Ofo, 1994). This work studied the relationship between two variables, that is, organizational change (independent variable) and employees resistance (dependent variable). This therefore justified the use of regression as an analytical tool to analyse the data. Also correlation is used to test hypothesis.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS.

4.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the results obtained based on the empirical analyses conducted to test the hypotheses. First, the chapter begins with analyses of demographic characteristics. This is followed by descriptive statistics calculated for the sample, the reliability of the instruments used, the reliability index of job autonomy, self efficacy, transformational leadership surveys and employees resistance scale. The next section of this chapter presents the result of the inferential statistics, which consists of the result of Pearson correlation co-efficient, result of the regression analysis and hypotheses testing, Summary of research findings were presented in the last section of this chapter.

4.2 Historical Background of Federal College of Education, Zaria

Federal College of Education, Zaria is a service delivery organization that requires organizational change at all levels of operation so that the college will survive and attain its set goals. Unfortunately, many cases of poor attitudes to work have been frequently reported by many surveys. The college has been in existence since 1959, but was officially renamed Federal College of Education, Zaria on 7th May, 1991 when Decree No.12 (Federal College of Education, Amendment) and Decree No. 13 (Ahmadu Bello University Amendment) were promulgated. Since then, the college has been operating well.

4.3 Presentation of Data

Data for this research were collected using questionnaire. The table below showed how the copies of questionnaire were administered to the various cadres of academic staff of FCE, Zaria out of the chosen sample size of 323. The table further showed the number of copies of questionnaire administered, retrieved and their percentages.

Table 4.3.1Administration of Questionnaire

Category of Staff	Number of Questionnaire Administered	Number Retrieved	Percentage (%)
Doctorate Degree	14	6	2.1%
Masters Degree	143	133	45.5%
First Degree	166	153	52.4%
Total	323	292	100%

Source: Field Survey, 2012

The table 4.3.1 above shows how copies of questionnaire were distribute, the categories of staff participated, the number of copies of questionnaire administered and the numbers filled and returned correctly. The analysis implies that all the cadres in academic participated in the exercise, 323 copies of questionnaire were administered and 292 copies of questionnaire were returned correctly filled.

4.4 Data Analysis

This section analysed the demographic data of the respondents and the frequency/percentage of the questionnaire questions using descriptive ststistics.

4.4.1 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

The respondents' demographic characteristics (gender, age, rank, experience, qualifications, status and ethnicity) are summerized in Table 4.3.1.1

Table 4. 4.1.1: Demographic Characteristics of Respondents (n=292)

Characteristics	Frequency	Percentage
Gender		
Male	200	68.5%
Female	92	31.5%
Age		
21-30 years	42	14.4%
31-40 years	138	47.3%
41-50 years	103	35.3%
51 years and above	8	2.7%
Rank		
Chief Lecturer	5	1.7%
Principal Lecturer	16	5.5%
Senior Lecturer	37	12.7%
Lecturer I	44	15.1%
Lecturer II	35	12.0%
Lecturer III	63	21.6%
Assitant Lecturer	91	31.2%
Experience		
Less than 1 year	33	11.3%
1-5 years	119	40.8%
6-10 years	63	21.6%
11 years and above	75	25.7%
Qualification		
Doctorate degree	6	2.1%
Masters degree	133	45.5%
First degree	153	52.4%
Status		
Married	173	59.2%
Single	99	33.9%
Widowed	17	5.8%
Divoced/Separated	3	1.0%
Ethinicity		
Yoruba	59	20.2%
Hausa/Fulani	87	29.8%
Igbo	43	14.7%
Others	102	34.9%

Source: Field Survey, 2012

From table 4. 4.1 above, it can be seen that 68.5% are male and 31.5% are female. This implies that majority of the respondents are male. In the same table, 47.3% of the respondents are aged between 31-40 years of age, and 35.3% are in the age between 41-50 years of age. This implies that majority of the respondents are aged

between 31-50. Table 4. 4. 1. 1 above also indicated that 1.7% of the respondents are Chief lecturers, 5.5% are Principal lecturers, 12.7% are Senior lecturers, 15.1% are Lecturer 1, 12.0% are Lecturer 11, 21.6% are Lecturer 111 and 31.2% are Assistant lecturers. This implies that all the cadres in academics participated in the exercise. The table also indicated that majority of the respondents which is 59.2% are married. Based on the table also, majority of the sampled lecturers (62.4%) have been in the teaching job between one year and ten years, while some are 11 years and above (25.7%). This implies that most of the teachers are young and vibrant in the job. Also looking at ethnicity on the Table 4.4.1.1 above, one can understand that appointment is based on federal character. However, the descriptive analysis of the dependent and independent variables were not shown because of the nature of the questionnaire which led to too many tables.

4.4.1.2 Analysis of Frequency and Percentage of Dependent and Independent Variables.

Tables 4.4.1.3, 4.4.1.4, 4.4.1.5 and 4.4.1.6 showed the frequences and percentages of responses based on the 5 likert scales of strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree and strongly agree for each case of job autonomy, self efficacy, transformational leadership and employees resistance to change.

Table 4.4.1.3: Responses of Academic Staff of FCE, Zaria on Job Autonomy

	SDFreq	SD%	DFreq	D%	N Freq	N%	A Freq	A%	SA Freq	SA%	TotaL Freq	Total %
Code												
JA01	**80**	**27.4**	**131**	**44.9**	**11**	**3.8**	**40**	**13.7**	**50**	**10.3**	**292**	**100**
JAO2	**112**	**38.4**	**101**	**34.6**	**8**	**2.7**	**51**	**17.5**	**20**	**6.8**	**292**	**100**
JA03	**95**	**32.5**	**120**	**41.1**	**10**	**3.4**	**39**	**13.4**	**28**	**9.6**	**292**	**100**
JA04	**103**	**35.3**	**115**	**39.4**	**10**	**3.4**	**22**	**7.5**	**42**	**14.4**	**292**	**100**
JA05	**118**	**40.4**	**135**	**46.2**	**6**	**2.1**	**20**	**6.8**	**13**	**4.5**	**292**	**100**
JA06	**99**	**33.9**	**139**	**47.6**	**13**	**4.5**	**11**	**3.8**	**30**	**10.3**	**292**	**100**
JA07	**126**	**43.3**	**119**	**40.7**	**9**	**3.1**	**21**	**7.2**	**17**	**5.8**	**292**	**100**
JA08	**13**	**4.5**	**40**	**1.6**	**5**	**1.7**	**113**	**38.7**	**121**	**41.8**	**292**	**100**
JA09	**104**	**35.6**	**148**	**50.7**	**2**	**0.7**	**25**	**8.6**	**13**	**4.5**	**292**	**100**
JA10	**132**	**45.2**	**11O**	**37.7**	**5**	**1.7**	**20**	**6.8**	**25**	**8.7**	**292**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2012

From table 4.4.1.3, JA represents Job Autonomy. JAOI is a statement on Job Autonomy that ‘my job allows me to decide on the order in which I do things’. 27.4% strongly disagree that their jobs allow them to decide on the order in which they do things. 44.9% disagree, 3.8% neutral, 13.7%agree and 10.3% strongly agree. This implies that majority of the academic staff of FCE, Zaria strongly disagree and disagree that their jobs allow them to decide on the order in which they do things.This implies that the academic staff of FCE, Zaria do not have total control on the order in which they do things. This contradicts the work of Jaramillo *et al* (2012).

JA02 is the statement that ‘my job allows me to decide when to start a piece of work’. 73% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that their jobs allow

them to decide when to start a piece of work. 2.7% were neutral. While 24% agree and strongly agree. This implies that the academic staff of FCE, Zaria are not given freedom to decide when to do work. This also contradicts the work of Hornnung & Roussean (2007).

JA03 is a statement on 'my job allows me to decide when to finish a piece of work'. 73.6% strongly disagree and disagree that their jobs allow them to decide when to finish a piece of work. 3.4% are neutral. While 23% agree and strongly angree. This implies that majority of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that their jobs allow them to decide when to finish a piece of work.

JA04 is a statement on'I do set my job own pace of work'. 74.7% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that they do set their jobs own pace of work. 3.4% are neutral, while 21.9% agree and strongly agree. This implies that the academic staff of FCE, Zaria have rules and regulations guiding their activities in the college.This is consistent with the work of Farh & scott (1983).

JA05 is a statement on 'I can control how much I produce'. 86.6% strongly disagree that they can control how much they produce. 2.1% neutral, while 11.3% agree and strongly agree that they can control how much they produce. This implies that the academic staff of FCE, Zaria strongly disagree and disagree that they can control the quantity of what they produce. This is in line with the work of Breaugh (1985).

JA06 is a statement on 'I can vary how I do my work'. 81.5% strongly disagree and disagree that they can vary how they do their work. 4.5% are neutral and 14.1% agree and strongly agree that they can vary how they do my work. This implies that

academic staff of FCE, Zaria can only vary how they do their works with permission from the authority concerned. This also contradicts the view of Siegel (2008).

JA07 is a statement on' I can plan my own work'. 83.9% strongly disagree and disagree that they can plan their own works. 3.1% are neutral, while 13% agree and strongly agree that they can plan their own works. This implies that the academic staff of FCE, Zaria have no total control to plan their own works. This also contradicts the work of Siegel (2008).

JA08 is a statement on 'I can control the quality of what I produce'. 18.1% strongly disagree and agree that they can control the quality of what they produce. 1.7% are neutral, while 80.1% agree and strongly agree that they can control the quality of what they produce. This implies that the academic staff of FCE, Zaria has right to produce quality students. This is consistent with those works of Adalgi et al (2013) which states that giving employees autonomy to contol the quality of what they produce will not only ensure commitment, but also ensure effectiveness and efficiency, thus, reduces resistance.

JA09 is a statement on 'I can decide how to go about getting my job done'. 86.3% strongly disagree and disagree that they can decide how to go about getting their jobs done. 0.7% are neutral, while 13.1% agree and strongly agree that they can decide how to go about getting their jobs done. This implies that academic staff of FCE, Zaria cannot decide how to go about getting their jobs done. They are guided by school standard. This contradicts the work of Jaramillo *et al* (2012).

JA10 is a statement on 'I can choose the methods to use in carrying out my work'. 82.9% strongly disagree and disagree that they can choose the methods to use

in carrying out their works. 1.7% of the respondents are neutral, while 15.5 agree and strongly agree that they can choose the methods to use in carrying out their works. This implies that academic staff of FCE, Zaria do not choose the methods to use in carrying out their works. They are guided by national policy on education.

Tabe 4.4.1.4: Responses of Academic Staff of FCE, Zaria on Self Efficacy

	SD Freq	SD%	D Freq	D%	N Freq	N%	A Freq	A%	SA Freq	SA%	Total Freq	Total%
Code												
SE01	**2**	**.7**	**6**	**2.1**	**-**	**-**	**148**	**50.7**	**136**	**46.6**	**292**	**100**
SEO2	**26**	**8.9**	**31**	**10.6**	**-**	**-**	**125**	**42.8**	**110**	**37.6**	**292**	**100**
SE03	**8**	**2.7**	**12**	**4.1**	**-**	**-**	**150**	**51.4**	**122**	**41.8**	**292**	**100**
SE04	**21**	**7.2**	**25**	**8.6**	**-**	**-**	**117**	**40.1**	**129**	**44.2**	**292**	**100**
SE05	**14**	**4.8**	**20**	**6.8**	**-**	**-**	**142**	**48.6**	**116**	**39.7**	**292**	**100**
SE06	**24**	**8.2**	**49**	**4.8**	**-**	**-**	**111**	**38.0**	**108**	**37.1**	**292**	**100**
SE07	**15**	**5.1**	**35**	**12.1**	**-**	**-**	**113**	**38.7**	**129**	**44.2**	**292**	**100**
SE08	**5**	**1.7**	**7**	**2.4**	**-**	**-**	**152**	**52.1**	**128**	**43.8**	**292**	**100**
SE09	**6**	**2.1**	**9**	**3.1**	**-**	**-**	**136**	**46,6**	**144**	**49.3**	**292**	**100**
SE10	**58**	**19.9**	**7O**	**23.8**	**2**	**0.7**	**82**	**28.1**	**80**	**27.4**	**292**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2012

Table 4.4.1.4 above shows the frequencies and the percentages of the questionnaire questions on how self efficacy builds confidence in ones ability to deal with change in the college. From the table SE represents Self Efficacy.

SE01 is a statement on 'I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough'. 2.8% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that they can always manage to solve difficult problems if they try hard enough. While 97.3% agree

and strongly agree that they can always manage to solve difficult problems if they try hard enough. This implies that the academic staff of FCE, Zaria can be able to control challenging situation. This is in consistent with those works of Wanberg &Banas (2000) which state that individuals with high self-efficacy for a specific challenge will be more likely to commit to make a success.

SE02 is a statement on 'If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want'. 19.5% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that if someone opposes them they can find the means and ways to get what they want. While, 80.4% agree and strongly agree that if someone opposes them they can find the means and ways to get what they want. This implies that the academic staff of FCE, Zaria involve themselves on research and development to increase knowledge. This is also consistent with the work of Bandura (1995; 1997).

SE03 is a statement on 'It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goal'. 6.8% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that it is easy for them to stick to their aims and accomplish their goals. Also, 93.2% agree and strongly agree that it is easy for them to stick to their aims and accomplish their goals. This implies that the majority of the respondents persevere in times of change. This is consistent with the work of Wanberg & Banas (2000).

SEO4 is a statement on 'I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events'. 15.8% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that they are confident that they could deal efficiently with unexpected events. 84.2% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that they are confident that they could deal efficiently with unexpected events. This is also consistent with the work of Bandura

(1997) and Gist & Mitchell (1992). This shows that academic staff of FCE, Zaria believe in their abilities and self confidence.

SE05 is a statement on 'Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations'. 11.6% of the respondents strongly disagree and agree that they know how to handle unforeseen situations. 88.3% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that they know how to handle unforeseen situations. This implies that majority of the academic staff of FCE, Zaria can handle any type of situation, like, change.

SE06 is a statement on 'I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort. 25% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that they can solve most problems if they invest the necessary efforts. While 75.1% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that they can solve most problems if they invest the necessary efforts. This implies that the academic staff of the college are hard working. This is also consistent with the work of Bandura (1997).

SE07 is a statement on 'I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities'. 17.2% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that they can remain calm when facing difficulties because they can rely on their coping abilities. 82.9% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that they can remain calm when facing difficulties because they can rely on their coping abilities. This shows that majority of the academic staff of FCE, Zaria can persist in time of difficulty like change.

SE08 is a statement on 'When I am confronted with a problem, I can find several solutions. 4.1% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that when they are

confronted with problems, they can find several solutions. 95.9% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that when they are confronted with problems, they can find several solutions. This implies that the academic staff of FCE, Zaria are high in their analytical thinking. This is also consistent with the work of Bandura & Wood (1989).

SE09 is a statement on 'If I am in trouble, I can think of a solution'. 5.2% strongly disagree and disagree that if they are in trouble, they can think of solutions. While 95.9% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that if they are in trouble, they can think of a solution. This implies that the academic staff of the college are innovative. This is consistent with the work of Kumar and Uzkurt (2011).

SE10 is statement on 'I usually handle whatever comes my way'. 43.7% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that they usually handle whatever come their ways. While 55.5% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that they usually handle whatever comes their way. This implies that the academic staff of FCE, Zaria perservere in times of change,

Table 4.4.1.5: Responses of Academic Staff of FCE, Zaria on Transformational Leadership

	SD Freq	SD%	D Freq	D%	N Freq	N%	A Freq	A%	SA Freq	SA%	Total Freq	Total%
Code												
TRL01	**12**	**4.1**	**10**	**3.4**	**-**	**-**	**150**	**51.4**	**120**	**41.1**	**292**	**100**
TRLO2	**30**	**10.3**	**50**	**17.1**	**-**	**-**	**114**	**39.0**	**98**	**33.6**	**292**	**100**
TRL03	**7**	**2.4**	**13**	**4.5**	**-**	**-**	**155**	**53.1**	**117**	**40.1**	**292**	**100**
TRL04	**14**	**4.8**	**8**	**2.7**	**-**	**-**	**129**	**44.2**	**141**	**48.3**	**292**	**100**
TRL05	**6**	**2.1**	**7**	**2.4**	**-**	**-**	**147**	**50.3**	**132**	**45.2**	**292**	**100**
TRL06	**4**	**1.4**	**10**	**3.4**	**-**	**-**	**153**	**52.4**	**125**	**42.8**	**292**	**100**
TRL07	**7**	**2.4**	**5**	**1.7**	**-**	**-**	**141**	**48.3**	**139**	**47.6**	**292**	**100**
TRL08	**4**	**1.4**	**8**	**2.7**	**-**	**-**	**150**	**51.4**	**130**	**44.1**	**292**	**100**
TRL09	**3**	**1.0**	**2**	**0.7**	**-**	**-**	**149**	**51.0**	**138**	**47.3**	**292**	**100**
TRL10	**4**	**1.4**	**6**	**2.1**	**-**	**-**	**132**	**45.2**	**150**	**51.4**	**292**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2012

TRL01 is a statement on 'My Head of Department re-examine critical assumptions to questions to determine whether they are appropriate'. 7.5% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that their Heads of Departments re-examine critical assumptions to questions to determine whether they are appropriate. 92.5% agree and strongly agree that their Heads of Departments re-examine critical assumptions to questions to determine whether they are appropriate. This implies that the heads of departments in FCE, Zaria are leaders with purpose.

TRL02 is a statement on 'My Head of Department talks about their most important values and beliefs'. 27.3% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that their Heads of Departments talk about their most important values and beliefs.

72.6% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that their Heads of Departmensts talk about their most important values and beliefs. This implies that the heads of departments in FCE, Zara want the vision of the college to be accomplished.

TRL03 is a statement on'My Head of Department seeks different perspectives when solving problems'. 6.5% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that their Heads of Departments seek different perspectives when solving problems. While 93.2% agree and strongly agree that their Heads of Departments seek different perspectives when solving problems. This implies that the heads of departments in FCE, Zaria believe in problem solving techniques and innovation. This is consistent with the view of Nahavandi (2012).

TRL04 is a statement on 'My Head of Department really feels as if this college's problems are hers'. 7.5% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that their Heads of Departments really feel as if this college's problems are theirs. 92.5% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that their Heads of Departments really feel as if this college's problems are theirs. This implies that the heads of departments in FCE, Zaria want the progress of the college. This is consistent with the views of Eisenbach *et al* (1999).

TRL05 is a statement on 'My Head of Department believes the organisation deserves her loalty'. 4.5% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that their Heads of Departments believe the organisation deserves their loyalty. While 95.5% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that their Heads of Departments believe the organisation deserve their loyalty. This implies that transformational leadership

believes in long term service to the organisation. This is consistent with the view of Nahavandi (2012)

TRL06 is a statement on ‘My Head of Department suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignment’. 4.8% of the correspondents strongly disagree and disagree that their Heads of Departments suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignment. 95.5% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that their Heads of Departments suggest new ways of looking at how to complete assignment. This implies that their heads of departments are innovative. This is consistent with the view of Gregory (2007).

TRL07 is a statement on’My Head of Department talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished. 4.1% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that their Heads of Departments talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished. 95.2% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that their Heads of Departments talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished. This implies that the heads of departments in FCE, Zaria want the future of the organisation to be favourable.

TRLO8 is a statement on ‘My Head of Department considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions’. 4.1% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that their Heads of Departments consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions. 95.1% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that their Heads of Departments consider the moral and ethical consequences of decisions. This implies that any perceived injustice in decision making process will likely lead to employees resistance.

TRLO9 is a statement on ‘My Head of Department heightens my desire to succeed’. 1.7% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that their Heads of Departments heighten theirs desire to succeed. 98.3% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that their Heads of Departments heighten theirs desire to succeed. This implies that their heads of departments in fce, zaria are inspirational leader. This is consistent with the work of Bass and Avolio (2003).

TRL10 is a statement on ‘My Head of Department is effective in meeting organisational requirement’. 3.5% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that their Heads of Departments are effective in meeting organisational requirement. While 96.6% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that their Heads of Departments are effective in meeting organisational requirement. This implies that the heads of departmens in FCE, Zaria are dedicated and hard working leader. This is consistent with the view of Benjamin and Flynn (2006).

Table 4.4.1.6: Responses of Academic Staff of FCE, Zaria on Employees Resistance to Change

	SD Freq	SD%	D Freq	D%	N Freq	N%	A Freq	A%	SA Freq	SA%	Total Freq	Total%
Code												
ERC01	**90**	**30.8**	**99**	**33.9**	**12**	**4.1**	**48**	**16.4**	**43**	**14.7**	**292**	**100**
ERCO2	**79**	**27.1**	**101**	**34.6**	**5**	**1,7**	**50**	**17.1**	**57**	**19.5**	**292**	**100**
ERC03	**106**	**36.3**	**122**	**41.8**	**1**	**0.3**	**40**	**13.7**	**23**	**7.9**	**292**	**100**
ERC04	**111**	**38**	**156**	**53.4**	**-**	**-**	**15**	**5.1**	**10**	**3.4**	**292**	**100**
ERC05	**149**	**51**	**97**	**33.2**	**10**	**3.4**	**25**	**8.6**	**11**	**3.8**	**292**	**100**
ERC06	**133**	**45.5**	**142**	**48.6**	**-**	**-**	**10**	**3.4**	**7**	**2.4**	**292**	**100**
ERC07	**140**	**47.9**	**129**	**44.2**	**3**	**1.0**	**13**	**4.5**	**7**	**2.4**	**292**	**100**
ERC08	**128**	**43.8**	**137**	**46.9**	**-**	**-**	**18**	**6.2**	**9**	**3.1**	**292**	**100**
ERC09	**151**	**51.7**	**119**	**40.6**	**-**	**-**	**8**	**2.7**	**14**	**4.8**	**292**	**100**
ERC10	**88**	**30.1**	**146**	**50**	**5**	**1.7**	**32**	**11.1**	**21**	**7.2**	**292**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2012

ERC01is a statement on 'I do not think this change is fair'. 64.7% strongly disagree and disagree that they do not think this change is fair. 4.1% are neutral,while 31.1% agree and strongly agree that the change is not fair change is fair. This implies that majority of the academic staff of FCE, Zaria strongly disagree and disagree that the change is not fair.

ERC02 is a statement on 'I am so irritated about this change'. 61.7% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that they are so irritated about this change. 4.1% are neutral, while 31.1% agree and strongly agree that they are so irritated about this change. This implies that majority of the respondents like the change. This is consistent with the work of Chonko (2004).

ERC03 is a statement on 'I am less motivated at work because of this change'. 78.1% strongly disagree and disagree that they are less motivated at work because of this change. 0.3% are neutral, while 21.6% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that they are less motivated at work because of this change. This implies that majority of the respondents are motivated with the change.

ERC04 is a statement on 'I feel frustrated with the new situation'. 91.4% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that they feel frustrated with the new situation. 8.5% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that they feel frustrated with the new situation. This implies that majority of the employees are interested in the change.

ERC05 is a statement on 'I am really worried that this change will have a bad outcome for me'. 84.2% strongly disagree and disagree that they are really worried that this change will have bad outcome for them. 3.4% are neutral, while 12.4% agree and strongly agree that they are really worried that this change will have bad outcome for them. This shows that majority of the respondents are comfortable with the change.

ERC06 is a statement on 'I refuse to support this change'. 94.1% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that they refuse to support this change. 5.8% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that they refuse to support this change. This implies that majority of the respondents support the change.

ERC07 is a statement on 'I try to avoid doing things at work the new way'. 92.1% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that they try to avoid doing things at work the new way. 1.0% are neutral, while 6.9% of the respondents agree

and strongly agree that they try to avoid doing things at work the new way. This applies that change is welcomed in FCE, Zaria..

ERC08 is a statement on 'I am experiencing high anxiety because of this change'. 90.7% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that they are experiencing high anxiety because of this change. 9.3% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that they are experiencing high anxiety because of this change.

ERC09 is a statement on 'I have had lots of headaches, backaches or other aches and pains since this change was introduced'. 92.3% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that they have had lots of headaches, backaches or other aches and pains since this change was introduced. While 7.5% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that they have had lots of headaches, backaches or other aches and pains since this change was introduced.

ERC10 is a statement on 'Since this change began, I seem to have less energy to do things I would normally do'. 80.1% of the respondents strongly disagree and disagree that since this change began, they seem to have less energy to do things they would normally do. 1.7% is neutral, while 18.3% of the respondents agree and strongly agree that since this change began, they seem to have less energy to do things they would normally do. This implies that majority of the respondents accept change.

4. 5 Reliability Analysis

In an attempt to determine the internal reliability of the instruments used, cronbach alpha co-efficient were used. Table 4.3.1 shows that the cronbach alpha co-efficient for job autonomy, self efficacy, transformational ledership scales and employees resistance to change scale were 0.957, 0.952, 0.911 to 0.933 respectively.

According to Sekaran (2003), a cronbach's alpha co-efficient greater than 0.5 is deemed to be acceptable. Thus, we conclude that the instruments adapted in this study were reliable since the cronbach alpha for each variable is greater than 0.5.

Table 4.5.1: Cronbach alpha co-efficient for job autonomy, self efficacy, transformational leadership and employees resistance to change scales.

Name of Instrument	No.of Items	Cronbach Alpha	Comment
Job Autonomy Scale	10	.957	Reliable
Self Efficacy Scale	10	.952	Reliable
Transformational Leadership Scale	10	.911	Reliable
Employees Resistance Questionaire	10	.933	Reliable

Source: Field Survey, 2012.

4.6 Test of Hypothesis

In the present study, Pearson correlation and simple regression were both utilized to test the relationship between job autonomy, self efficacy, transformational leadership and employees resistance to change. Correlation analysis was employed to test hypotheses 1, 2 and 3. Therefore, correlation is only used to indicate the relationship between variables. In the course of conducting correlation and regression analysis, we transformed all the items for each construct using SPSS version 16. Subsequently, we utilised the Pearson correlation and simple regression analysis separately. The interpretation of correlation coefficient was based on Cohen (1988) guideline as follows:

Table 4.6.1: Correlation Matrix

	JA	SE	TRL	ERC
JA Pearson Correlation	1			
SE Pearson Correlation	.736**	1		
TRL Pearson Correlation	.514**	.562**	1	
ERC Pearson Correlation	-.439**	-.559**	-.743**	1

Source: Field Survey, 2012

The results of the Pearson correlation analysis are shown in table 4.6.1 stated that there were three (3) significant correlations as follow:

1. Job autonomy and employees resistance to change.
2. Self efficacy and employees resistance to change.
3. Transformational leadership and employees resistance to change.

There was a negative correlation between job autonomy and employees resistance to change at the level of -.439. Hence, the result supported null hypothesis one (H_{01}) which states that there is no significant relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change. In other words, employees who have freedom or control over their jobs, who decide on the order in which they work have more tendency of resisting change in the organisation and verse versa.

More so, the correlation between self efficacy and employees resistance to change was a moderate positive correlation at the level of 0.736. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected while the alternate accepted. This predicts that employees who have self confidence over their jobs tend to resist change less and verse versa. Similarly, the correlation between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change was moderate at the level of 0.514. Hence the result supported the alternate hypothesis which predicted that there is a positive relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change. This means that transformational leadership style inspires followers to share a vision and empower them to attain the vision by providing the necessary resources to develop their full personal potentials thereby reducing resistance to change by employees.

4.6.2 Regression Analysis

Regression analysis was used in this study to determine the strength of the relationship, between job autonomy and employees resistance to change, self efficacy and employees resistance to change, and transformational leadership and employees resistance to change.

Table 4.6.2.1

Simple Regression Result among Predictor Variables and Employee Resistence to Change

	Unstandardized Beta	*Std. Error*	*Standardized Beta*	*T*	*Sig.*
(Constant)	7.246	0.235		30.846	0.000
Job Autonomy	0.078	0.056	0.079	1.382	0.168
Self-Efficacy	-0.256	0.059	-0.258	-4.355	0.000
Transformational Leadership	-0.65	0.048	-0.638	13.658	0.000
R	0.764				
R-square	0.584				
Adjusted R^2	0.579				
F	134.558				

Note. Significance a < 0.05

$H0_1$: There is no significant relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change.

Simple regression was used to examine the relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change. As can be seen from Table 4.6.1, there is no positive significant relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change. (B= 0.078, t=1.382, p<0.168. This means that the null hypothesis is accepted while the alternate is rejected. However, this is not suprising because if employees are given control (autonomy) over their jobs, they will abuse the opportunity: thus, increasing the level of resistance any time change is introduced in the organisation. Therefore, this study established that there is no significant relationship between job

autonomy and employees resistance to change. This study is in contrast to the work of Jaramillo *et al* (2012), Hornnung & Roussean (2007), Adalgi et al (2013) and Siegel (2008).

H02: There is no significant relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance to change.

As can be seen from the table above, there is a significant positive relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance to change (B=-0.256, t= -4.355, p<0.000). However, this finding is in line with the findings of Kura *et al* (2013), Moran and Hoy (2013), Kumar and Uzkurt (2011) and Rodda (2010), who discovered that there is a significant positive relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance to change.

H03: There is no significant relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change.

The next hypothesis postulates a positive relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change (B=-0.65, t=13.658, p<0.000. However, this finding is not surprising because it is in line with the previous studies such as Faghihi & Sayyed (2012), Carter *et al* (2012), Dubs *et al* (2012), Oreg & Berson (2011) and Tseng & Kang (2008). Therefore, this study established a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change.

Finally, Table 4.6.1 shows that R^2 was 0.584, which indicates that 58.4% of the variance in employees resistance to change can be explained by employees perception

of job autonomy, self efficacy and tramsformational leadership. On the other, the remaining 41.6% of the variance is unexplained.

4.7 Discussion of Findings

On the basis of the simple regression analysis, this study found significant negative relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change (table 4.6.1). The implication of this finding is that if the employees are given freedom or control over their jobs, there will be high degree of resistance to change since they are allowed to take decisions over their jobs and vice versa. This finding contradicts the work of Jaramillo *et al* (2012), Hornnung & Roussean (2007), Adalgi et al (2013) and Siegel (2008) which demonstrates that employees are less likely to resist change when they think that they can freely determine the way they perform their jobs. They assert that job autonomy enhances the workers confidence in accepting broader job role and their willingness to behave in novel and innovative ways, thus reducing resistance to change.

Table 4.6.1 also shows a positive significant relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance to change. This implies that the higher the self efficacy the lower the employees resistance to change and vice versa. This finding confirms the work of Kura *et al* (2013), Moran and Hoy (2013), Kumar and Uzkurt (2011) and Rodda (2010), which established that self efficacy is highly related to employees resistance to change due to its ability to motivate action and increase confidence in performance. Also, Judge *et al* (1998), Judge and Bono (2001), Wanberg and Banas (2000) and Scholz *et al* (2002) advocated that self efficacy or one's estimate of one's fundamental ability to cope, perform, and be successful will contribute to positive-

evaluations. Consequently, efficacious people are likely to deal effectively with difficulties and persist in the face of challenges and subsequently reduce resistance to change from employees.

More so, Table 4.6.1 shows a positive significant relationship between transformational leadership and employees resistance to change. This implies that transformational leadership is one of the most significant predictors of employees resistance to change. This finding confirms the works of Dubs *et al* (2012), Carter *et al* (2012), Faghihi and Sayyed (2012), Oreg and Berson (2011), Tseng and Kang (2008), Bass *et al* (2003), Benjamin and Flynn (2006), Nahavandi (2012) and Eisenbach (1999) which state that transformational leaders inspire followers to share a vision and empower them to attain the vision by providing the necessary resources to develop their full personal potentials thereby reducing resistance to change by employee and vice versa. They also established that transformational leaders have stronger focus on intellectual stimulation. Transformational leaders are concerned about enhancing employees innovation and creativity. They are willing to take risks to attain organisational success and eliminate ineffectiveness in processes and systems.

It would be recalled that this study reported 58.4% R^2 indicating that the remaining 41.6% of the variance is unexplained. This implies that there are some other variables that were not captured in this study.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary

Studies have shown that most of the researches on job autonomy, self efficacy , transformational leadership and employees resistance to change have been carried out in developed countries like United States of America (Rodda, 2010), Spain (Jaramillo *et al*, 2012), the Netherlands (Oreg & Berson, 2011), Thailand (Schwaniger, 2008) and Turkey (Kumar & Uzkurt, 2011). However, very few studies have been carried out on job autonomy, self efficacy, transformational leadership and employees resistance to change in developing countries like Nigeria, particularly among the academic staff of colleges of education. Therefore, the researcher was motivated to investigate the relationship between job autonomy, self efficacy, transformational leadership and employees resistance to change among the academic staff in Nigerian colleges of education particularly among the academic staff of Federal College of Education, Zaria.

Three major theoretical perspectives of job autonomy, self efficacy and transformational leadership were reviewed viz, self determination theory, self efficacy theory and transformational leadership theory. Of these three theories, transformational leadership was adopted. Furthermore, in order to explore the relationship between job autonomy, self efficacy, transformational leadership and employees resistance to change respectively among the academic staff of Federal College of Education, Zaria, a cross sectional survey study was undertaken, where data were collected from a sample of 323 academic staff of FCE, Zaria by adopting

Yamane (1967) in Isreal (1992). The study also adapted measurement scales on job autonomy, self efficacy and transformational leadership for surveys and Schiffer (2011) Employees Resistance to Change Scale. The job autonomy, self efficacy and transformational leadership surveys consists of 10 items each and 5 scale to assess employees attitude about their jobs. And the employees resistance to change scale consists of 10 items and 5 scales to measure employees resistance to organisational change.

The overall result of the present study yielded some significant findings. The study established that there is a negative significant relationship between job autonomy and employees resistance to change. Also, there are positive significant relationship between self efficacy and employees resistance to change, and transformational leadership and employees resistance to change; Job autonomy ($B= 0.078$, $t=1.382$, $p<0.168$), Self efficacy ($B=-0.256$, $t= -4.355$, $p<0.000$) and Transformational leadership ($B=-0.65$, $t=13.658$, $p<0.000$). Increased job autonomy in FCE, Zaria will increase resistance to change by employees. Also, increase self efficacy and transformational leadership style among the academic staff of FCE, Zaria will also increase employees commitment thereby reducing resistance to change. This implies that the higher the job autonomy the higher the resistance. While, the higher the self efficacy and transformational leadership style, the less the employees resistance to change.

5.2 Conclusion

This study attempted to assess the relationship between job autonomy, self efficacy, transformational leadership and employees resistance to change respectively

among the academic staff of FCE, Zaria, (B= 0.078, t=1.382, p<0.168), (B=-0.256, t= -4.355, p<0.000) and (B=-0.65, t=13.658, p<0.000). This implies that high job autonomy will grant employees more opportunities in taking personal decisions on their jobs, thus, resulting to high level of resistance to change. On the other hand, employees with high self efficacy have more confidence in their capabilities, thus remaining committed to their organisations even when change is introduced and versa. Also, transformational leaders are willing to exert considerable efforts on behalf of the organisation and have a desire to maintain membership of the organisation. The implication of these findings is that it is imperative for government and all stakeholders in education to ensure a high level of self efficacy and transformational leadership to reduce resistance to change since environment, individuals and organisations are dynamic.

5.3 Recommendations

On the basis of the above findings, the following recommendations are made:

i. Academic staff of FCE, Zaria should not be given total freedom or control over their jobs. This is because, if autonomy is given to the academic staff, there will be high degree of resistance to change since they are allowed to take decisions over their jobs. They will put individual interest before the college's interest. If autonomy should be given at all, it should be with close supervision to avoid negligency of duty.

ii. The potential contribution of self-efficacy in minimizing the tendency of employee's resistance will have practical implications for selection and recruitment. For example, the management in FCE, Zaria could reduce the

likelihood of workplace resistance among employees by recruiting employees with high self-efficacy. As demonstrated by the previous research, an individual who is high in self-efficacy is less likely to engage in resistance to change.

iii. The study also recommends that the management (leaders) of FCE, Zaria should realize that instead of motivating their employees by punishment or rewards, they should create a vision and inspires subordinates to strive beyond required expectations. They should focus on getting the employees to take interest in achievement, growth and development by using charisma and inspiration, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration.

Generally, in order to ensure a high level of self efficacy and transformational leadership of employees in the organisations, there is a need to enhance employees salaries. This is needed to satisfy the material needs of the employees and also improve their public image and self esteem. Furthermore, the organisations rules, policies and procedures should be based on the foundation of distributive and procedural justice. Any perceived inequity in the distribution of rewards or any perceived injustice in the decision making process is likely to lead to employees resistance to change. Lastly, the management of organisations should build trust on employees to reduce resistance to change. Furthermore, to gain trust of employees, the management of organisations must be honest with them. Therefore, dishonesty on the part of the management or any unmet promises is likely to diminish employees level of trust which could consequently result to employees resistance to change.

5.4 Contribution to Knowledge

Theoretically, the findings of this study offer empirical evidence on the influence of job autonomy, self efficacy and transformational leadership on employees resistance to change, thus enriching the existing literatures. The study reveals that total freedom or autonomy should not be giving to academic staff of FCE, Zaria to avoid negligence of duty, thus reduces employees resistance.The study also reveals that the potential contribution of self efficacy in minimising the tendency of employees resistance to change has practical implications for selection and recruitment of employees in FCE, Zaria. The study equally adds that management (leaders) of FCE, Zaria should realize that instead of motivating their employees by punishment or rewards, they should create a vision and inspires subordinates to strive beyond required expectations. They should focus on getting the employees to take interest in achievement, growth and development by using charisma and inspiration, intellectual stimulation and individual consideration.

5.5 Suggestions for Further Research

It could be recalled that this study reported 58.4% R^2 indicating that the remaining 41.6% of the variance is unexplained. This implies that there are some other variables that were not captured in this study. Therefore, future studies should incorporate other personality traits.

Further studies should also include non-academic staff in their sample as well as replicating the study in different colleges of education in order to generalize findings. Future studies should also be conducted in order to confirm the findings of this study using longitudinal study.

REFERENCES

Adalgi, S. A, Battistel I. A., Francesco M.A & Odoardi C.O. (2013). The Impact of Feedback from Job and Task Autonomy in the Relationship Between Dispositional Resistance to Change and Innovative Work Behaviour: *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 22, 26-41.

Agboola, A. A & Salawu R. O. (2011). Managing Deviant Behaviour and Resistance to Change. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6, No. 1

Armstrong, M. (2009). *Armstrong's Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice*, (11th ed.) Kogan Page, London.

Aronsson, G. (1989a). Dimensions of Control as Related to Work Organization, Stress and Health, *International Journal of Health Services*, 79, 3,459-468.

Aronsson, G. (1989b). *Swedish Research on Job Control, Stress and Health*. In: S.L. Sauter, J.J. Hurrell.

Aquino, K., Galperin, B. L. & Bennett, R. J. (2004). Social Status and Aggressiveness as Moderators of the Relationship Between Interactional Justice and Workplace Deviance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34*(5), 1001-1029 .

Bailyn, L. (1985). Autonomy in the Industrial R&D Lab. *Human Resource Management*, 24, 129-146.

Bandura A. (1977). Self-Efficacy: Toward a Unifying Theory of Behavioural Change. *Psychological Review*, 84, No. 2, 191-215.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social Foundations of Though and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

Bandura, A. (1995). Exercise of Personal and Collective Efficacy in Changing Societies. In A. Bandura (Ed.), *Self-Efficacy in Changing Societies* (1-45). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control.* New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.

Bandura, A., & Wood, R. (1989). Effect of Perceived Controllability and Performance Standards on Self-Regulation of Complex Decision Making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology , 56* (5), 805-814.

Bass, B.M. (1985) *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectation.* Free Press, NY.

Bass, B.M. (1990) Form Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-36.

Bass, B. M. (1997). Does the Transactional-Transformational Leadership Paradigm Transcend Organizational and National Boundaries? *American Psychologist*, 52(2), 130-139.

Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass Handbook of Leadership: Theory, Research and Managerial Applications* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1997). *Full Range of Leadership: Manual for the Multi-Factor Leadership Questionnaire*. Palto Alto, CA: Mind Garden.

Bass, B. M. Aviolo, B. J., Jung, D. I. & Berson, Y. (2003). Predicating Unit Performance by Assessing Transformational and Transactional Leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 88 (2), 207-218.

Bass, B. M. & Riggio, R. (2006). *Transformational Leadership (2nd ed.),* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Bazerman, M. H. (1982). Impact of Personal Control on Performance: Is Added Control Always Beneficial? *Journal of Applied Psychology,* 67, 4, 472-479.

Benjamin, L. & Flynn, F. J. (2006). Leadership Style and Rgulatory Mode: Value from Fit? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Process,* 100 (2), 216-230.

Benson, G. S. & Lawler, E. E. (2005). Employee Involvement: Utilization, Impacts, and Future Prospects. In D. Holman, T. D. Wall, C. W. Clegg, P. Sparrow, & A. Howard (Eds.), *The Essentials of the New Workplace* (153-172). West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.

Bernerth, J. (2004). Expanding Our Understanding of the Change Message, *Human Resource Development Review,* 3, no. 1, 36-52.

Breaugh, J. A. (1985). The Measurement of Work Autonomy. *Human Relations,* 38, 551-570.

Brown, F.W. & Moshavi, D. (2002). Herding Academic Cats: Faculty Reactions To Transformational and Contingent Reward Leadership by Department Chairs. *The Journal of Leadership Studies,* 8(3), 79-93.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Burnes, B. (2004). *Managing Change*, 4th ed. Prentice-Hall, Financial Time, London.

Burnes, B. (2004). *Managing Change*, (4th ed.). Essex: Pearson Education Limited.

Caldwell, S. D., Herold, D. M. & Fedor, D. B. (2008). Toward an Understanding of the Relationships among Organizational Change, Individual Differences, and Changes in Person-Environment fit: A Cross-Level Study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 868-882.

Carnall, C. A. (1995). *Managing Change in Organizations*. (2nd ed.). Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall International.

Carr, D. K, Hard, H. J. & Trahant, W. J. (2006). *Managing the Change Process: A Field Book for Change Agents, Consultants, Team Leaders, and Reengineering Managers.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Carter M. Z., Achilles A. Armenakis, H., Hubert S. F. & Mossholder K. W. (2012). *Transformational Leadership, Relationship Quality, and Employee Performance during Continuous Incremental Organizational Change.* Department of Management and Marketing, Troy University, Troy, Alabama, U.S.A. and Department of Management, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, U.S.A.

Child, J. (1984). *Organization: A Guide for Problems and Practice*. 2nd ed. London: Harper and Row.

Cho, S. D. & Chang, D. R. (2008). "Salesperson's Innovation Resistance and Job Satisfaction in Intra-Organizational Diffusion of Sales Force Automation Technologies: The Case of South Korea", *Industrial Marketing Management*, 37 No. 7, 841-7.

Chonko, L. B. (2004). Organizational Readiness for Change, Individual Fear of Change, and Sales Manager Performance: An Empirical Investigation, *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 24, No.1, 7-17.

Coch, L. & French, J. R. P. (1948). "Overcoming Resistance to Change", Human Relations, 1 No. 4, 512-532.

Coghlan, D. (1993). 'A Person-Centred Approach to Dealing with Resistance to Change',*Leadership and Organisation Development Journal*, 14(4), 10-14.

Compeau, D. R. & Higgins, C. A. (1995). Computer Self-Efficacy: Development of a Measure and Initial Test. *MIS Quarterly , 19* (2), 189-211.

Cummings, T. G. & Worley, C. G. (2009). *Organizational Deveopment & Change* (9th ed.). Mason: South-Western Cengage Learning.

DeCotiis, T. A. & Koys, D. J. (1980). The Identification and Measurement of the Dimensions of Organizational Climate. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 171-175.

Dent, E. B. (1999). Challenging "Resistance to Change." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 35*(1), 25–41.

Desler, G. (2007). *Management Principle and Practices for Tomorrow's Leaders*. (3rd ed). United States of America: Haughton Mifflin.

Dool, R. R. (2006). *The Impact of Persistent Change Initiatives on Job Satisfaction D*octoral Dissertation, University of Maryland University College,2006).Retrievedfromhttp://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=1140191901&Fmt=7&clientId=79356&RQT=309&VName=PQD

Dube L. (2009). *Managing Deviant and Resistance to Change in Selected Organizations,* Unpublished Assignment Submitted to the Department of Management, Faculty of Business, University of Botswana, as Part of Assessment for MGT 674

Dubs J., Eriksson M., Felldin S. & Hanson F. (2012). Leadership and Organizational Change: Leading Organizational Change at SAAB Support and Services -*With a focus on communication and resistance. A Thesis,* Linköping University,

Eisenbach, R., Watson, K. & Pillai, R. (1999). Transformational Leadership in the Context of Organizational Change. *Journal of Organizational Change, 12*(2), 80-88.

Faghihi A. & Sayyed M. A. (2012). Investigating the Influence of Employee Attitude toward Change and Leadership Style on Change Readiness by SEM (Case Study: Isfahan Municipality) . *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences. 2, No. 11 ISSN: 2222-6990.*

Farh, J. L. & Scott, W. E. Jr. (1983). The Experimental Effects of "Autonomy" on Performance and Self-Reports of Satisfaction. *Organisational Saviour and Human Performance,* 37, 203-222.

Federal College of Education (FCE), Zaria Chronicle. *A New Magazine of Federal College of Education, Zaria.* 3. April, 2010-February, 2011.

Federal College of Education, Zaria Staff Nominal Roll as at 31 August, 2012.

Fedor, D. B., Caldwell, S. & Herold, D. M. (2006). The Effect of Organisational Changes on Employees Commitment: A Multilevel Investigation. Personnel Psychology, 59-29.

Gagne, M. & Deci, E. L. (2005). "Self-Determination Theory and Work Motivation", *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 26, 331-62.

Ganster, D.C. (1989). *Worker Control and Well-Being:* A Review of Research in the Workplace. In: S.L.

Ganster, D.C. & Fusilier, M. R. (1989). Control in the Workplace. In: C.L. Cooper & IT. Robertson (Eds), *International Review of Industrial and Organisational Psychology* (235-280).

Gardell, B. (1982). Worker Participation and Autonomy: A Multilevel Approach to Democracy at the Workplace, *International Journal of Health Services*, 72, 4, 527-558.

Gist, M. E. & Mitchell, T. R. (1992). Self-efficacy: A Theoretical Analysis of its Determinants and Malleability. *Academy of Management Review, 7*(2), 183–211.

Goetsch, D. & Davis, S. B. (2006). *Quality Management: Introduction to Total Quality Management for Production, Processing and Services*. New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Graetz, F., Rimmer, M., Lawrence, A. & Smith, A. (2006). *Managing Organizational Change.* (2nd ed.). Australa: Wiley and Sons, Sidney and Melbourne.

Grau, R., Salanova, M. & Peiró, J. M. (2001). Moderator Effects of Self-Efficacy on Occupational Stress. *Psychology in Spain, 5* (1), 63-74.

Greenberg, J. & Baron, R.A. (2002) *Behaviour in Organizations*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey.

Grouzet, F. M., Vallerand, R. J., Thill, E. E. & Provencher, P. J. (2004). "From Environmental Factors to Outcomes: A Test of Integrated Motivational Sequence", *Motivation and Emotion,* 28 No. 4, 331-46.

Hackman, J. R. & Oldham, G. R. (1980), *Work Redesign,* Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA.

Hackman, J. R. & Lawler, E. E. (1971). Employee Reactions to Job Characteristics, *Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph,* 55, 3, 259-286.

Harvey, D. & Brown D. R. (200l). *An Experiential Approach to Organization Development*. (6th ed). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Herold, D. M., Fedor D. B. & Caldwell S. D. (2007). Beyond ChangeManagement: A Multilevel Investigation of Contextual and Personal Influences on Employees' Commitment to Change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*, 942–951.

Holman D. J, Axtell C. M., Sprigg C. A., Totterdell, P., Toby D. & Wall T.D. (2010). The Mediating Role of Job Characteristics in Job Redesign Interventions: A Serendipitous Quasi-Experiment. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour* 31, 84–105.

Hornung, S. & Rousseau, D. M. (2007). "Active on the Job-Proactive in Change: How Autonomy at Work Contributes to Employee Support for Organizational Change", *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 43 No. 4, 401-26.

Isreal G. B. (1992). *Determining Sample Size.* University of Florida: IFAS Extension.

Jackson, P..R., Martin, R. & Keith D. K. (1993). New Measures of Job Control, Cognitive Demand, and Production Responsibility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 5, 753-762

Jaramillo, F., Mulki J. P., Onyemah V. & Rivera M. P. (2012). Salesperson Resistance to Change: An Empirical Investigation of Antecedents and Outcomes. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 30, 7, 548 – 566.

Jegar, P. (2001). Resistance to Change: A New View of an Old Problem Futurist;35(3),24.Fromhttp://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=bth&AN=12251892&site ehost-live&scope=site; accessed 10th may, 2011

Jonge, J. D. (1996). Job Autonomy, Well-Being, and Health: A Study Among Dutch Health Care Workers. *Thesis Rijksuniversiteit Limburg, Maastricht. -With ref. - With summary* in Dutch and German.

Judge, T. A., Locke, E. A., Durham, C. C. & Kluger, A. N. (1998). Dispositional Effects on Job and Life Satisfaction: The Role of Core Evaluations. *Journal of Applied Psychology* , *83* (1), 17-34.

Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Pucik, V. & Welbourne, T. M. (1999). "Managerial Coping with Organizational Change: A Dispositional Perspective", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84, 1, 107-222.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of Core Self-Evaluations Traits - Self-Esteem, Generalized Self-Efficacy, Locus of Control, and Emotional Stability - with Job Satisfaction and Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology* , *86* (1), 80-92.

Kotter, J. P (2006). *Leading Change*, Harvard Business School Press, Botson.

Krishna, Y. R. (1991). Effects of Transformational Leadership on Team Performance and Commitment: *Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment.*

Kumar, R. & Uzkurt, C. (2011). Investigating the Effects of Self Efficacy on Innovativeness and the Moderating Impact of Cultural Dimensions. *Journal of International Business and Cultural Studies.* 2, 1-15.

Kura, K. M., Shamsudin, F. M. & Ajay, C. (2013). Modeling the Influence of Group Norms and Self-regulatory Efficacy on Workplace Deviant Behaviour. *Asian Social Science*; 9, 4; 2013.

Kuvaas, B. (2009). A Test of Hypotheses Derived from Self-Determination Theory among Public Sector Employees. *Employee Relations* 31 No. 1, 39-56

Lawrence, T. B. & Robinson, S. L. (2007). Ain't Misbehaving Workplace Deviance as Organizations Resistance. *Journal of Management*, 33, 378-394.

Lewis, L.K.(2006). Employee Perception on Implementation Communication as Predictors of Perceptions of Success and Resistance. *Western Journal of Communication,*70(1), 23-46. From http://oak.cats.ohiou.edu/-yq279103; accessed 15th may, 2011.

Lewis, L. K. (2011). *Organizational Change: Creating Change through Strategic Communication*. Chichester: Blackwell Publishing.

McDonald, T. & Siegall, M. (1996). Enhancing Worker Self-Efficacy: An Approach For Reducing Negative Reactions to Technological Change. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 11* (2), 41-44.

Metselaar, E. E. (1997). *Assessing the willingness to change: construction and validation of the Dinamo,* Free University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.

Mooketsi, D. S. (2009). *Managing Deviant Behavior and Resistance to Change,* Unpublished Assignment Submitted to the Department of Management, Faculty of Business, University of Botswana, as Part of Assessment for MGT 674.

Moran, M. T. & Hoy A. W. (2013).The Differential Antecedents of Self Efficacy Beliefs of Novice and Experienced Teachers. *Asian Social Science*; 9, 4; ISSN 1911-2017 E-ISSN 1911-2025

Mulki, J. P., Lassk, F. G. & Jaramillo, F. (2008). "The Effect of Self-Efficacy on Salesperson Work Overload and Pay Satisfaction", *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management*, 28, 3, 283-95.

Nahavandi, A. (2012). *The Art and Science of Leadership*. Person Education, Inc., Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Naimatullah, S. (2009). Determinant of Employee Readiness for Organizational Change, *A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy*, Brunel Business School, Brunel University.

Neves, P. (2009). Readiness for Change: Contributions for Employee's Level of Individual Change and Turnover Intentions. *Journal of Change Management, 9*(2), 215-231.

Ofo J. N. (1994). *Research Methods and Statistics in Education and Administration*. Lagos: Jaja Press Limited.

Oreg, S. (2003). Resistance to change: Developing an Individual Differences Measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 680–693.

Oreg, S. (2006). Personality Context and Resistance to Organizational Change:*European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology,* 15, 1,73-101.

Oreg, S. & Berson, Y. (2009). *Leaders' Characteristics Behaviours and Employees' Resistance to Organizational Change*. University of Haifa, Department of Sociology and Anthropology Mt. Carmel, Haifa, 31905, Israel University of Haifa.

Oreg, S. & Berson, Y. (2011). Leadership and Employees' Reactions to Change: The Role of Leaders' Personal Attributes and Transformational Leadership Style. *Personnel Psychology***.** 64, 627–659

Parker, S. & Wall, T. (1998). *Job and Work Design: Organizing Work to Promote Well-Being and Effectiveness.* United States of America: Sage Publications.

Parker, S. K., & Wall, T. D. (2001). Work Design: Learning from the Past and Mapping a New Terrain. In N. Anderson, D. S. Ones, H. K. Sinangil, & C. Viswesvaran (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology* (90-109). London, United Kingdom: Sage Publications.

Piderit, S. K. (2000). Rethinking Resistance and Recognizing Ambivalence: A Multidimensional View of Attitudes Toward an Organizational Change. *The Academy of Management Review, 25*(4), 783-794.

Rodda, J. (2010). A Multi-Level Examination of Employee Reactions to Organizational Change. *Theses and Dissertations.* Paper 59. DePaul University,http://via.library.depaul.edu/etd/59.

Rush, M. C., Schoel, W. A. & Bernard, S. M. (1995). Psychological Resilience in the Public Sector: "Hardiness" and Pressure for Change. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 46,* 17-39.

Schiffer, E. F. (2011). Resistance to Change: Implications of Individual Differences in Expression of Resistance to Change. *A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy,* Department of PsychologyCollege of Arts and Sciences University of South Florida.

Scholz, U., Gutiérrez-Doña, B., Sud, S. & Schwarzer, R. (2002). Is General Self-Efficacy a Universal Construct?: Psychometric Findings from 25 Countries. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment , 18* (3), 242-251.

Schwaninger, M. (2008). Job Motivation and Self-Confidence for Learning and Development as Predictors of Support for Change. *Journal of Organisational Transformation and Social Change.* 5, 2.

Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). General Self-Efficacy Scale http://userpage.fuberlin. de/~health/selfscal.htm.

Sekaran, U. (2003). *Research Methods for Business*: A skill Building Approach (4th. Ed). New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Sheldon, K. M., Elliot, A. J., Kim, Y. & Kasser, T. (2001). "What is Satisfying by Satisfying Events? Testing 10 Candidate Psychological Needs", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 80, 325-39.

Siege, l. D. (2008). An Overcoming Resistance to Change Using the Motivation and Acceptance Model. *A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Educational Research, Technology, and Leadership in the College of Education at the University of Central Florida Orlando, Florida*

Siegel R. M. & Stephens I. J. (2008). *Schaum's Outlines Statistics (4th ed.).* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Sinha, C. and Sinha, R. (2012). The Differential Antecedents of Self-Efficacy Beliefs of Novice and Experienced Teachers: Employee Perception of Cognitive After-effects of Change: *Amity Business School, Amity University, Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India And Galgotias Business School, Greater Noida, Uttar Pradesh, India.* IJMBS 2, Issue 3.

Sosik J. J. (2005). The Role of Personal Values in the Charismatic Leadership of Corporate Managers: A Model and Preliminary Field Study. *The Leadership Quarterly, 16,* 221–244.

Sosik, J. J., & Jung, D. I. (2010). *Full Range Leadership Development: Pathways for People, Profit and Planet.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Spreitzer, G. M. (2007). Taking Stock: A Review of More than Twenty-Years of Research on Empowerment at Work. In C. L. Cooper, & J. Barling (Eds.), *The Handbook of Organizational Behavior.* Sage Publications.

Strebel, P. (1996). "Why Do Employees Resist Change?" *Harvard Business Review*, 74, 3, 86-92.

Tseng, H. C. & Kang L. M. (2008). Regulatory Focus, Transformational Leadership, Uncertainty towards Organizational Change, and Job Satisfaction: In a Taiwan's Cultural Setting: *Asia Pacific Management Review* 14 (2) 215-235.

Van Mierlo, H., Rutte, C. G., Vermunt, J. K., Kompier, M. A. & Dooreward, J. A. (2006). Individual Autonomy in Work Teams: The Role of Team Autonomy, Self-Efficacy, and Social Support. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology , 15* (3), 281-299.

Veld, J. (1981). *Organ/saf/e-sfrucfuur en arbeidsp/aats [Organizational Structure and Workplace*]. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Wanberg, C. R. & Banas, J. T. (2000). Predictors and Outcomes of Openness to Changes in a Reorganizing Workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*(1), 132-142.

Warr, P. (1987). *VVort, l/nemp/oymenf, and Menfa/Hea/fh*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Yamane, (1967). *Statistics, An Introductory to Analysis,* 2nd edn. New York: Harper and Row.

Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in Organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Zhu, W., Riggio, R., Avolio, B. J. & Sosik, J. J. (2011). The Effect of Leadership on Follower Moral Identity: Does Transformational/Transactional Style Make a Difference? *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 18*(2), 150 – 163.

APPENDIX I

Department of Business Administration,

Ahmadu Bello University,

Zaria.

Dear Respondent,

Academic Research Questionnaire

The researcher is a post graduate student in the above named Institution and currently carrying out a research study entitled Organizational change and Employees Resistance. A study of Academic Staff of Federal College of Education, Zaria.

This questionnaire is an integral part of the study and it is designed to seek your own opinion or perception of the subject under investigation. The researcher assures you that the information you will give will only be used for academic purpose and treated as confidential. To ensure your anonymity, your name is not required on this questionnaire.

Your honest response in this direction is highly solicited.

Thank you for anticipated cooperation.

Yours faithfully,

Patience Enyiamaka Nwidi-Enobun

APPENDIX II

PART A

INSTRUCTION:
Please read and tick as appropriate in the provided boxes your exact assessment of the following demographic information:

1. What is your gender?

Male	
Female	

2. What is your age?

21-30	
31-40	
41-50	
51 and above	

3. What is your present rank?

Chief Lecturer	
Principal Lecturer	
Senior Lecturer	
Lecturer I	
Lecturer II	
Lecturer III	
Assistant Lecturer	

4. How long have you been in the present job?

Less than 1 year	
1-5 years	
6 -10 years	
11 years and above	

5. Highest Educational Qualification

Doctorate Degree	
Master's Degree	
First Degree	

6. What is your marital status?

Married	
Single	
Widowed	
Divorced or Separated	

7. What is your ethnic group?

Yoruba	
Hausa/Fulani	
Igbo	
Others (please specify)_____	

PART B

INSTRUCTION:

The following questions are designed to ask you about the amount of control you have over your job (JA=Job Autonomy) in your workplace. Use the scales provided below to indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement.

Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly agree**
SD	**D**	**N**	**A**	**SA**

		SD	D	N	A	SA
JA01	My job allows me to decide on the order in which I do things.					
JA02	My job allows me to decide when to start a piece of work.					
JA03	My job allows me decide when to finish a piece of work.					
JA04	I do set my job own pace of work					
JA05	I can control how much I produce.					
JA06	I can vary how I do my work.					
JA07	I can plan my own work					
JA08	I can control the quality of what I produce.					
JA09	I can decide how to go about getting my job done.					
JA10	I can choose the methods to use in carrying out my work.					

PART C

INSTRUCTION:

The following questions are designed to ask you about how self efficacy (SE=Self Efficacy) builds confidence in your abilities to deal with change in the college. Please indicate as honestly and as objectively as you can about yourself. Use the scales provided to indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement.

Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
SD	**D**	**N**	**A**	**SA**

		SD	D	N	A	SA
SE01	I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough					
SE 02	If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want					
SE03	It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals					
SE04	I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.					
SE05	Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.					
SE06	I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.					
SE07	I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.					
SE08	When I am confronted with a problem, I can find several solutions.					
SE09	If I am in trouble, I can think of a solution.					
SE10	I usually handle whatever comes my way.					

PART D

INSTRUCTION: Transformational Leadership Scale

The following questions ask you about your immediate Supervisor, Head of Department or Management of your college (TL=Transformational Leadership). Please use the scales provided to indicate as honestly and as objectively your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement.

Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
SD	**D**	**N**	**A**	**SA**

		SD	D	N	A	SA
TRL01	My Head of Department re-examine critical assumptions to questions to determine whether they are appropriate					
TRL02	My Head of Department talks about their most important values and beliefs					
TRL 03	My Head of Department seeks differing perspectives when solving problems.					
TRL04	My Head of Department really feels as if this organization's problems are hers					
TRL05	My Head of Department believes the organization deserves her loyalty					
TRL06	My Head of Department suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments					
TRL07	My Head of Department talks enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished					
TRL08	My Head of Department considers the moral and ethical consequences of decisions					
TRL09	My Head of Department heightens my desire to succeed					
TRL10	My Head of Department is effective in meeting organizational requirements					

PART E

INSTRUCTION:

The following questions requires your perception of changes in the college (ERC=Employees Resistance to Change). Please use the scales provided to indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with each statement.

Strongly Disagree	**Disagree**	**Neutral**	**Agree**	**Strongly Agree**
SD	**D**	**N**	**A**	**SA**

		SD	D	N	A	SA
ERC01	I do not think this change is fair					
ERC02	I am so irritated about this change.					
ERC03	I am less motivated at work because of this change.					
ERC04	I feel frustrated with the new situation.					
ERC05	I am really worried that this change will have a bad outcome for me.					
ERC06	I refuse to support this change.					
ERC 07	I try to avoid doing things at work the new way.					
ERC08	I am experiencing high anxiety because of this change.					
ERC09	I‟ ve had lots of headaches, backaches, or other aches and pains since this change was introduced.					
ERC10	Since this change began, I seem to have less energy to do things I would normally do.					

Thank you once again.

APPENDIX III

Frequencies

Statistics

		Gender	Age	Rank	Experience	Qualification
N	Valid	292	292	291	290	292
	Missing	0	0	1	2	0
Mean		1.32	2.28	5.20	2.62	2.51
Std. Deviation		.465	.784	1.693	.992	.540

Statistics

		Status	Ethnicity
N	Valid	292	291
	Missing	0	1
Mean		1.49	2.65
Std. Deviation		.655	1.157

Frequency Table

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	200	68.5	68.5	68.5
	Female	92	31.5	31.5	100.0
	Total	292	100.0	100.0	

Age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	21-30 years	42	14.4	14.4	14.4
	31-40 years	138	47.3	47.3	61.6
	41-50 years	103	35.3	35.3	96.9
	51 years and above	8	2.7	2.7	99.7
	7	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	292	100.0	100.0	

Rank

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Chief Lecturer	5	1.7	1.7	1.7
	Principal Lecturer	16	5.5	5.5	7.2
	Senior Lecturer	37	12.7	12.7	19.9
	Lecturer I	44	15.1	15.1	35.1
	Lecturer II	35	12.0	12.0	47.1
	Lecturer III	63	21.6	21.6	68.7
	Assitant Lecturer	91	31.2	31.3	100.0
	Total	291	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.3		
Total		292	100.0		

Experience

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 1 year	33	11.3	11.4	11.4
	1-5 years	119	40.8	41.0	52.4
	6-10 years	63	21.6	21.7	74.1
	11 years and above	75	25.7	25.9	100.0
	Total	290	99.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2	.7		
Total		292	100.0		

Qualification

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Doctorate degree	5	1.7	1.7	1.7
	Masters degree	133	45.5	45.5	47.3
	First degree	153	52.4	52.4	99.7
	4	1	.3	.3	100.0
	Total	292	100.0	100.0	

Status

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Married	173	59.2	59.2	59.2
	Single	99	33.9	33.9	93.2
	Widowed	17	5.8	5.8	99.0
	Divoced/Separated	3	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	292	100.0	100.0	

Ethnicity

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yoruba	59	20.2	20.3	20.3
	Hausa/Fulani	87	29.8	29.9	50.2
	Igbo	43	14.7	14.8	64.9
	Others	102	34.9	35.1	100.0
	Total	291	99.7	100.0	
Missing	System	1	.3		
Total		292	100.0		

Reliability

Scale: JA

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	290	99.3
	Excluded[a]	2	.7
	Total	292	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.957	10

Reliability

Scale: SE

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	292	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	292	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.952	10

Reliability

Scale: TRL

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	292	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	292	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.911	10

Reliability

Scale: ERC

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	290	99.3
	Excluded[a]	2	.7
	Total	292	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.933	10

```
RECODE ERC01 ERC02 ERC03 ERC04 ERC05 ERC06 ERC07 ERC08 ERC09 ERC10 (1=7)
(2=6) (3=5) (4=4) (5=3) (6=2) (7=1).
EXECUTE.
SAVE OUTFILE='C:\Users\enyiamaka\Documents\PATINECE MSC DATA.sav'
 /COMPRESSED.
SAVE OUTFILE='C:\Users\enyiamaka\Documents\PATINECE MSC DATA.sav'
 /COMPRESSED.
COMPUTE
ERC=MEAN(ERC01,ERC02,ERC03,ERC04,ERC05,ERC06,ERC07,ERC08,ERC09,ERC10).
EXECUTE.
SAVE OUTFILE='C:\Users\enyiamaka\Documents\PATINECE MSC DATA.sav'
 /COMPRESSED.
REGRESSION
  /MISSING LISTWISE
  /STATISTICS COEFF OUTS R ANOVA
  /CRITERIA=PIN(.05) POUT(.10)
  /NOORIGIN
  /DEPENDENT ERC
  /METHOD=ENTER JA SE TRL.
```

Regression

Variables Entered/Removed[b]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	TRL, JA, SE[a]	.	Enter

a. All requested variables entered.

b. Dependent Variable: ERC

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.764[a]	.584	.579	.56637

a. Predictors: (Constant), TRL, JA, SE

ANOVA[b]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	129.489	3	43.163	134.558	.000[a]
	Residual	92.384	288	.321		
	Total	221.873	291			

a. Predictors: (Constant), TRL, JA, SE

b. Dependent Variable: ERC

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	7.246	.235		30.846	.000
	JA	.078	.056	.079	1.382	.168
	SE	-.256	.059	-.258	-4.355	.000
	TRL	-.650	.048	-.638	-13.658	.000

a. Dependent Variable: ERC

```
SAVE OUTFILE='C:\Users\enyiamaka\Documents\PATINECE MSC DATA.sav'
 /COMPRESSED.
DATASET ACTIVATE DataSet1.
DATASET CLOSE DataSet3.
GET
  FILE='C:\Users\enyiamaka\Documents\PATINECE MSC DATA.sav'.
DATASET NAME DataSet4 WINDOW=FRONT.
SAVE OUTFILE='C:\Users\enyiamaka\Documents\PATINECE MSC DATA.sav'
 /COMPRESSED.
CORRELATIONS
  /VARIABLES=JA SE TRL ERC
  /PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
  /MISSING=PAIRWISE.
```

Correlations

Correlations

	JA	SE	TRL	ERC

JA	Pearson Correlation	1	.736**	.514**	-.439**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	292	292	292	292
SE	Pearson Correlation	.736**	1	.562**	-.559**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	292	292	292	292
TRL	Pearson Correlation	.514**	.562**	1	-.743**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	292	292	292	292
ERC	Pearson Correlation	-.439**	-.559**	-.743**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	292	292	292	292

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

Correlations

	JA	SE	TRL	ERC
JA Pearson Correlation	1	.736**	.514**	-.439**
Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
N	292	292	292	292
SE Pearson Correlation	.736**	1	.562**	-.559**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
N	292	292	292	292
TRL Pearson Correlation	.514**	.562**	1	-.743**
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
N	292	292	292	292
ERC Pearson Correlation	-.439**	-.559**	-.743**	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
N	292	292	292	292

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