Abstract

Many organisations change initiatives failed to deliver on set objectives. Sometimes such change might not be a total failure, but get misdirected or misled due to lack of adoption of a required change implementation framework that could help deliver on set objectives. While it was acknowledged that organisational leaders plays important role in achieving change implementation, organisational member's readiness for change which appeared to be a key parameter in ensuring effective change implementation is attracting less attention. More so, there is a significant gap of not inquiring into factors that can help increase people’s readiness for change in order to increase the level of organisational change implementation. For most part, the impact of the type of leadership behaviour and organisational culture types had not been fully understood, also the influence of managerial skills and organisational trust as an associate component for understanding organisational change implementation had been largely ignored. This study sought for a better link of leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust alongside with some contextual factors such as social norms and units/departments characteristics to influence the level of readiness for change in order to impact more on organisational change implementation.

The study reviewed relevant literature of all the variables underpinning the study. The review led to the development of a conceptual framework as a guide to understand the entire study. The framework integrated and combined the direct effect of leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust with organisational change implementation through the mediating role of individual readiness for change and the impact of the contextual factors in a single framework. In order to validate the conceptual framework, an empirical research was conducted on a realist perspective. Primary data was collected through questionnaires from change implementation officials in Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC).

The findings from the study revealed that the values of democratic and transformational leadership styles and the values of developmental and group culture types were contribute better to organisation change implementation with the mediating/moderating roles of individual readiness for change and the contextual factors. It concludes that managerial skills and institutional trust are critical for increasing the level of readiness for change and organisational change implementation. In line with the empirical link of the variables explored in this study, the study provides a more refined and clear understating of the factors capable of leading organisational change implementation. Consequently, this study has provided managers of the NNPC a better understating and strategy for change implementation. A major contribution to knowledge is an extension of the existing literature in linking the factors listed and the innovative contribution of the empirical evidence leading to the advancement of the understanding of the theoretical framework developed from this study which adds the value of originality.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction and Overview

1.1 Background of the Research

In today’s intense world involving self-motivated organisational change, the dynamic nature of business has continued to compel organisations to change in order to remain effective (Senior and Swailes, 2009). Many new change initiatives have been developed in order to improve organisations and adhere to change (Kim and Mauborgne, 2005; Wierdsma and Hemsbergen, 2009; Mueller et al., 2012; Rusly et al., 2012). Senior and Swailes (2009) used the term ‘wind of change’ as they view that business is becoming even more uncertain as the pace of change quickens and the future is increasingly unpredictable. Successful organisations including those in the oil and gas sector around the World have continued to thrive in their effort to remain competitive (Banerji, 2008; Dixon, 2008; Heywood and Kenley, 2008). Organisational change implementation strategies are influences of change initiatives put in place by leaders to help organisations meet up their challenging needs (By, 2007).

Also, there is a strong need for organisational leaders to inspire subordinates of the need to increase what is thought is possible for change implementation (Self and Schraeder, 2009). More so, organisational leaders are expected to activate the respective relational and collective identity of their subordinates to explicate the underlying influential processes leading to change implementation (Holt et al., 2007).

The literature of organisational change has identified various variables that can lead to a comprehensive understanding of organisational change implementation, some of these variables include: the style of leadership adopted in organisations, the type of organisational culture being practiced, skills of organisational members, and the need to increase individual readiness for change (Jones et al., 2005; Senior and Swailes, 2010).

Change initiatives for the purpose of improving people’s performance in order to achieve organisational change objectives have been stressed (Galpin and Robinson, 1997; Harari, 1997). Based on this background, individual readiness for change have
been viewed as a variable for improving unsuccessful change initiatives and difficulties in organisational change implementation processes (Jones et al., 2005; Holt et al., 2007). Furthermore, empirical investigation revealed that individual readiness for change can be used as a component for fostering organisational change due to its influence on organisational culture and leadership (Haffar et al., 2013).

Therefore, individual readiness for change is identified as a drive to effect organisational change implementation in this study. Studies have supported that readiness for change can be complimented with other acknowledged strategic variables to drive or support organisations in order to achieve a full and effective change (Ribiere and Sitar, 2003; Speculand and Chaudhary, 2008). Readiness for change is concerned with the implementation of new organisational structures, strategies, cultures, and practices (Self and Schraeder, 2009). It is worth mentioning that readiness for change prepares both individuals and the organisation with the requirement needed to drive change (Holt et al., 2007; Mueller et al. 2012; Goksoy, 2012).

Despite the benefits of individual readiness for change which supports organisational change implementation, relevant literature indicates a high rate of failures that were implicated in the process of implementing organisational change (Bolman and Deal, 2003; Smith, 2005; Erwin and German, 2010). Researchers such as Oreg (2006) focused on the relationship between organisational leaders/managers, employees and change agents, as well as the styles they employed when influencing change, and found that lack of trust in management was significantly associated with resistance to organisational change. Similarly, other researchers found lack of organisational leaders to increase employee’s skills and adhere to organisational change strategies (Mayer et al., 1999; Neves and Caetano, 2009; Ben-Gal and Tzafrir, 2011). More so, studies confirmed that lack of adherence to organisational culture types is a major hindrance to organisational change implementation (Shah and Shah, 2010; Shah, 2011; Prajogo and McDermott, 2011).

Oakland’s (2003) study identifies some factors that are inhibitors to change implementation which are: inefficient top management commitment to change, lack of creativity and innovation, lack of employees’ interaction, inability to identify the requisite culture for change and inadequate business measurement. These can cause a
rigid and routine bureaucratic organisational structure (Kim and Mauborgne, 2005) which hinders organisational change implementation. It is commonly understood that the efficacy to implement change in any organisation primarily depends on the structure, policies and members of staff (Mueller et al., 2012).

Recent studies in the field of organisational change shows an increasing recognition of the influence of readiness for change, leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust as leverage for enhancing change implementation (Hofstede, 2001; Martins and Terblanche, 2003; Avery, 2004; Oshagbemi and Ocholi, 2006; Yukl, 2006; Holt et al., 2007; Self and Schraeder, 2009; Northouse, 2010; Ringov and Zollo, 2010; Smollan, 2013). However, studies testing the impact of these variables are relatively scarce in developing nations such as Nigeria. Consequently, this study attempts to fill these identified gaps in the literature by examining the relationships between individual readiness for change, leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills, organisational trust and the contextual factors which are social norms, employees and units/departments characteristics as associate variables for increasing the understanding for change implementation in the NNPC. Studies have found that contextual factors such as employees’ job function, educational levels and years of people experience have contributed to organisational change in recent times (Shah and Shah, 2010; Orser and Leck, 2010). Jawahar et al.’s (1992) study relates employees’ age and gender to readiness for change and found that they are sources contributing to organisational change success. Also, O’Neil et al. (2008) believe that such contextual factors can either increase or reduce employee level of readiness for change. Therefore, investigating the extent these factors affect employees and organisational change implementation will increase the awareness of organisational leaders when engaged with change implementation.

The aim of this study is to find out factors that can help organisational change implementation. The relationship of the above identified variables which are leadership and organisational culture, managerial skills, organisational trust, individual readiness for change and the contextual factors will be integrated as a model for understanding organisational change implementation.
This chapter provides a brief outline of the study, with an overview of the research problem. It will define the aim and the objectives of this research. The chapter will conclude with a description of the structure of the thesis.

1.2 Problem of the Research

The problem of every study is to bring more closely the existing gaps in that area of study. The Nigerian oil and gas organisations are faced with problems of effective change implementation over time. Studies have shown that organisations in the Nigerian oil sector constantly lament their inability to implement change programmes, because they lack the capability to provide innovative solutions which offer strategic change implementation process (Makeri, 2009; Okoye, 2010). Scholars have confirmed that one of the reasons why organisations failed to implement change effectively is because they pay less attention to leadership and organisational culture which often help to leverage change implementation strategy (Bass and Avolio, 1994; Northouse, 2010; Holt et al., 2007; Mayer, 2008).

As noted earlier, there seems to be a lack of study in the Nigerian oil and gas sector especially in the aspect of the implication of leadership, organisational culture, skills when managing change implementation. More so, there appear to be less substantial study on the effect of change readiness that could influence effective change implementation in the Nigerian oil and gas sector. This study will attempt to make alignment between organisational culture, leadership styles, organisational trust and individual readiness for change as an understanding for organisational change implementation. It is expected that the outcome of this study will help to create a clear link between organisational leadership and organisational change implementation strategies. This does not mean that this study claims to provide all the answers to the problems confronting organisational change implementation, but the researcher’s effort is very robust to the extent that organisational leaders especially those in Nigeria and other cultures will benefit from the research.

A preliminary qualitative inquiry in the NNPC revealed lack of conformity to a predominant leadership style and organisational culture type as a major hindrance for change implementation. The preliminary study which engaged change implementation personnel in the NNPC revealed that organisational trust and relevant managerial
skills remain a huge challenge in the NNPC as members often remain inconsistent with the principles of trustworthiness which could have helped to enhance a formidable force to the glue of effective participation on change implementation. Also, there is lack of relevant skills associated with inconsistent managerial capabilities among organisational members, hence resulting to change failure. This is in line with relevant literature which evidenced that leadership remains a major factor for organisational success or failure (Powell et al., 2008; Larsson and Eid, 2012) also lack of alignment to organisational culture capable of leading effective change may lead to change implementation failure (Hooijberg and Petrock, 1993; Vilkinas and Cartan, 2006). The literature equally evidenced that managerial skills help organisational members especially change implementation personnel to develop the necessary skills required to face change implementation challenges (Erturk, 2008; Neves and Caetano, 2009). Also, the issue of organisational trust have been linked in the literature as a fundamental requirement for performance increase and change implementation success (Saunders and Thornhill, 2003; Ben-Gal and Tzafrir, 2011). Therefore, investigating the influence of these variables and their impact to organisational change implementation will be an immense support to the NNPC and other relevant organisations as well as change implementation practitioners.

So, the study will address the research problems as identified above in relation to the research aim and adjectives as stated in section 1.3 below. The research problem is related to the gaps identified in the organisational change literature which focus on the hindrances caused by the low level of individual readiness for change, inability to adhere to an appropriate leadership style and an appropriate organisational culture type, and lack of organisational trust, managerial skills and contextual factors identified in this study. Oakland and Tanner (2007) affirmed that the inability of organisational leaders to put together an organisational change framework as a strategy for leading organisational change implementation is a major setback and can cause change failure.

Eby et al. (2002) on the other hand argued that a major problem militating against organisation change implementation is that organisational leaders sometimes failed to prepare their subordinates on issues that will lead to change accomplishment. Therefore, it is important that organisational leaders make it clear to their subordinates what is expected from change implementation processes as well as the benefits if the
change is implemented. Armenakis et al. (1999) agreed that change implementation targets should be set out by organisational leaders and all members of the organisation must be carried along to ensure a comprehensive contribution towards effective change implementation. Hence, the need to identify the factors that are necessary to lead and increase the level of readiness for change and change implementation become extremely important. Also, where factors that militate against change implementation are not addressed head-on may reduce employee commitment to change.

Studies have explored the impact of leadership on organisational change implementation and conclude that leadership is a critical element for achieving organisational change success (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007; Neves and Caetano, 2009). This shows that the failure or success of organisational change deeply depend on organisational adoption of a predominant leadership style (Yukl, 2013). Therefore, this study will investigate the influence of leadership on organisational change implementation. This will view the extend leadership drives readiness for change and change implementation. In order to adequately explore the investigation, the following research question is put forward:

- What influence does leadership have on the level of individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation?

In addition, the impact of organisational culture on organisational change implementation has attracted much attention (Elwing, 2005; Naor et al., 2008). Saame et al. (2011) argued that organisational culture is a strong determinant for organisational change implementation. Moreover, the failure or success of organisational change implementation heavily relies on the perception and application of organisational culture (Prajogo and McDermott, 2005). Haffar et al.’s (2013) study confirms that there is a relationship between organisational culture and readiness for change. Therefore, for this current study to explore the impact of organisational culture on organisational change implementation, the following research is put forward:

- What role does the organisational culture play in increasing the level of individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation?
The literature confirmed that a lesser impact of individual readiness for change hinders greatly on organisational change implementation (By, 2007; Susanto, 2008; Shah, 2011). Other researchers agreed that the mediating role of individual readiness for change can be strengthened by adequate alignment of organisational culture, leadership practices and personnel skills development (Self and Schraeder, 2009). Recent studies have focused attention on the significance of individual readiness for change in organisational change implementation (Holt et al., 2007; Mueller et al. 2012; Goksoy, 2012), but a little of this has been applied in developing countries such as Nigeria (Oakland and Tanner, 2007; Okoye, 2010). With the need to investigate the influence of individual readiness for change on organisational change implementation, the following research question is put forward to aid the investigation:

- Does individual readiness for change play a mediating role to increase the level of organisational change implementation?

The argument also suggests that lack of managerial skills and organisational trust hinders organisational change implementation (Saunders and Thornhill, 2003; Erturk, 2008; Leong, 2008; Self, 2007; Yukl, 2013). Gentry et al. (2008) found that lack of managerial skills among organisational members reduces their ability to implement change successfully. Similarly, Yukl (2013) opined that where an organisation is considering a change implementation project and managerial skills are not emphasised adequately, the level of efficiency and effectiveness will continue to reduce. More so, Parente et al. (2012) conclude that understanding the dimensions of managerial skills helps to increase learning outcomes that are expected to increase the level of organisational change implementation. Therefore, it becomes necessary to examine the influence of managerial skills on organisational change implementation. Based on this, the following research question will help guide the investigation:

- What influence do managerial skills have on the level of individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation?

On the aspect of organisational trust, research has proven that where employees do not trust themselves and their organisation when engaged with change implementation practices, little or no effort is expected from them (Ben-Gal and Tzafrir, 2011; Smollan, 2013). Organisational trust has been viewed as a strong recipe for
organisational change implementation because it has elements of increasing people’s expectations (Neves and Caetano, 2009). Furthermore, the direct influence of organisational trust between employees and structures within the organisation has been viewed as a persuasive mechanism and as a model for organisational change implementation (Mayer et al., 1999; Ellonen et al., 2008). This argument implicitly presumes that organisation trust have a link with individual readiness for change and organisation change implementation. So, in order for the current study to examine the impact of organisational trust on change implementation the following research question is put forward:

- What impact does organisational trust play in increasing the level of individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation?

The contextual factors considered in this study are expected to moderate the relationship between leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills, organisational trust, and individual readiness for change in order to increase the level of organisational change implementation. The contextual factors include: social norms and department/units characteristics. These factors have been explored in different section of business and management research (Abraham et al., 1999; Temtime, 2003; Alas and Vadi 2006), and their impacts are very critical for moderating organisational change implementation. This study view that these factors will help to increase the impact of organisational change implementation, so the follow research question is necessary to help explore the influence of the contextual factors:

- Do the contextual factors play a moderating role in order to increase the level of organisational change implementation?

1.3 Aim and Objectives

The aim of this study is to find out factors that can help organisational change implementation. The study will develop an integrated theoretical framework that will explain the relationship between leadership, organisational culture types, managerial skills, organisational trust and the contextual factors with individual readiness for change in order to increase the effect of organisational change implementation. The proposed theoretical framework is expected to create an understanding that is necessary to lead change implementation in the NNPC and related culture.
Accordingly, the objectives of the study that will support this aim include the following:

1. To develop and validate an integrative theoretical framework regarding the relationship between objectives 2-7 on organisational change implementation.
2. To investigate the mediating role of individual readiness for change on organisational change implementation.
3. To investigate the impact of leadership styles on individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation.
4. To examine the influence of organisational culture types on change readiness and to investigate their impact on organisational change implementation.
5. To examine the influence of the dimensions of managerial skills on individual readiness for change and their impact on organisational change implementation.
6. To investigate the influence of the dimensions of organisational trust on individual readiness for change and their impact on organisational change implementation.
7. To examine the combined impacts of the contextual factors and how they increase the level of organisational change implementation.
8. To offer a recommendation of the proposed theoretical framework for adoption and guidelines for improving organisational change implementation in the NNPC, and other related organisations.

1.4 Justification and Rationale for the Study

Irrespective of the vast body of literature examining the need for a successful implementation of organisational change, very limited research has investigated the factors that can help implement organisational change in Nigeria. An extensive review of the literature revealed that a contribution to knowledge would be driven from an examination of the relationship between leadership styles, organisational culture, managerial skills, and organisational trust with individual readiness for change as potential machinery to mediate organisational change implementation in not only in the NNPC, but in other organisations. The literature equally revealed that contextual factors such as social norms and unit/departmental characteristics would form an
associate link in moderating the predictors with individual readiness for change in order to successfully implement organisational change.

Studies have explored the relationship between leadership and organisational culture in managing organisational change implementation (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007; Schein, 2010). Also, studies have paid some attention to the influence of managerial skills, and organisational trust on developing the internal structure and mechanism of organisations struggling to respond to change (Kelley, 2007; Neves and Caetano, 2009; Wagner and Hollenbeck, 2010; Yukl, 2013). More so, there is existing literature on the role of individual readiness for change in organisational change implementation (Jones et al., 2005; Lines, 2005; Helfrich et al., 2009). But, there appears to be a gap in the organisational change literature in not researching the direct role of various leadership styles, organisational culture types, the dimension of managerial skills, the dimensions organisational trust and the moderating role of the contextual factors can play on increasing the level of individual readiness for change as a theory for understanding organisational change implementation.

So, there is a need to explore these identified variables and develop an integrated theoretical framework that will explain their impact on readiness for change and organisational change implementation. The model will explain the combined direct effort of the above variables and their impacts on change implementation. It is expected that this study will contribute to the existing body of knowledge by giving a more refined understanding of the relationship between leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills, organisational trust, social norms and units/departments characteristics with individual readiness for change in increasing the impact of organisational change implementation.

Organisational change literature affirmed that individual readiness for change has a great impact in the implementation of organisational change (Holt et al., 2007; Self and Schraeder, 2009; Senior and Swailes, 2010; Shah, 2011; Mueller et al. 2012). Therefore, not recognising the significance of employees and their level of readiness for change can cause a huge hindrance to the change process hence making change a total failure (Jones et al., 2005; Weiner et al., 2008). So, creating employee readiness for change is a compelling instrument organisation must increase to ensure individual ample commitment to change (Mueller et al., 2012).
Managerial skills have been identified as an important factor that can contribute to employee readiness to change and change implementation (Carmeli and Tishler, 2006; Leong, 2008; Ellonen et al., 2008). So, there is a strong need for a better understanding of the dimensions of managerial skills and their impact on employees especially when organisations are embarking on change projects (Yukl, 2013). Studies have paid attention to the importance of employee skills development so they can better understand work and contribute to organisational success. For example, Parente et al. (2012) conceptualise the need for organisational members to acquire soft skills and strategic skills as a requirement for understanding good management practices, whereas, Yukl (2013) emphasises the need for a strong adherence to managerial skills in order to help equip organisational members with change implementation strategies. But, there seems to be a lack of empirical studies investigating the influence of the dimensions of managerial skills on individual readiness for change and change implementation. Therefore, this study empirically examines the influence of the dimensions of managerial skills identified by Yukl, which are: technical skills, interpersonal skills and conceptual skills on readiness for change in order to give a holistic view on how each type affects employee readiness for change and change implementation rather than focusing on one dimension of managerial skills.

Also, organisational trust has been viewed as a critical factor that can increase or decrease the reaction of organisational members especially in times of change implementation (Ben-Gal and Tzafrir, 2011; Smollan, 2013). Researchers have examined the need to strengthen the trust between among employees and organisations (Mayer et al., 1999; Ellonen et al., 2008). Mayer et al. (1999) identified two dimensions of organisational trust such as interpersonal and institutional trust which can fit into organisational strategy for increasing commitment to implement change. But, there seems to be some gaps in the literature for not properly aligning these dimensions with the enthusiasm of individual employee in line with change implementation. For example, Lester and Kickul (2001) believes that when the dimensions of trust are not adequate, organisation will experience a lack of leadership respect, absence of open and honest communication and unfair treatment between leaders and subordinates as well as weak interaction among organisation workers. Therefore, this study will examine the influence of interpersonal and institutional trust
and their relationship with readiness for change in order to enhance organisational change implementation.

On the aspect of leadership, the literature has reviewed a variety of leadership styles and their impact to either promote or reduce organisational members’ preparedness for change (Northouse, 2007; Sapru, 2008; Larsson and Eid, 2012). For example, Bass and Avolio (1993) affirmed that the autocratic leader is often centralised with authority, associated with dictating the method of work to subordinates all the time. This type of leadership practice often leads to less commitment and high staff turnover (Avery, 2004; Grint, 2005). Similarly, studies have proven that laissez-faire leadership style does not encourage feedback because tasks are often left for subordinates to accomplish with little or no support for their leaders (Northouse, 2010; Sapru, 2011). However, the literature identified democratic, transformational and transactional leadership styles as supportive leadership practice for organisational change implementation (Bass and Avolio, 1993; Howell and Shamir, 2005).

Many organisations are yet to understand the impact of these leadership styles on change implementation, hence failed to adhere to a predominant leadership style that could strengthen the relationship among organisational members and increase the understanding for change implementation. Pastor and Mayo (2008) believe that failure to adhere to predominant leadership styles such as transformational, democratic or transactional will limit the level of effectiveness and commitment, consequently reduce change implementation. Equally, Northouse (2010) opine that transformational and transactional leadership styles help organisation leaders build strong ethical values capable of supporting change implementation. More so, research confirms that transformational and democratic leadership styles tend to increase subordinates’ contributions and commitment to organisational change (Avolio and Bass, 1994). Therefore, this study empirically explored leadership styles in order to examine their influence on readiness for change and change implementation. It is believed that leadership styles have the tendency to either reduce or increase the value of workforce when responding to change (Pastor and Mayo, 2008). Also, it is expected that leadership styles will be the centre for perception increase and psychological support change implementation process are introduced (Northouse, 2010).
Finally, this study considers organisational culture types of the CVF as a strong determinant for ensuring change implementation (Quinn and Kimberly, 1984). Organisational culture is viewed as an important element for either enhancing or decreasing change readiness or change implementation (Cunninghan et al., 2002; Elwing, 2005; Shah, Elias, 2009; 2011; Saame et al., 2011). It is pertinent to explore which type of organisational culture is appropriate to encourage individual readiness for change in order to increase the level of change implementation. Researchers have studied the relationship between organisational culture types and readiness for change and support that CVF has helped to foster change in numerous organisations (Jones et al., 2005; Carlstrom and Inger, 2012; Haffar et al., 2013). However, there are still limited studies examining the influence of the various types of organisational culture on individual readiness for change to ascertain the best organisational culture type that can best lead change implementation. Therefore, this study views that an empirical examination of the impact of organisational culture types of the CVF model which are group, developmental, rational and hierarchical cultures will offer a holistic view of the extent to which each type impacts on readiness for change and change implementation.

Testing the relationship of the five variables mentioned above and their impact on individual readiness for change will help predict organisational change implementation in a developing economy such as Nigeria. This study will empirically bring the variables identified above in one location as a strategy for a better understanding of the factors capable of leading organisational change implementation. Also, it is anticipated that the outcome of this study will add to the general body of knowledge and especially the field of organisational change management.

1.5 An Overview of the oil and gas Industry

Unlike other industries, the oil and gas industry displays a high importance in the global economy (Seljom and Rosenberg, 2011). The international oil market shows that oil and gas form part of the largest commodity in the world international trade (Doukas et al., 2011) and is characterised with high economic value (Papadelis et al., 2011). Available data indicates that oil accounts for more than 50 percent of primary energy demand worldwide, larger than its nearest competitor coal, with a consumption demand of an average of 1.4 million barrels per day (Dale et al., 2014) making a huge
global economic impact in recent times. A study by Pongsiri (2004) confirmed that the important and economic value in the oil and gas sector is well known worldwide, given a strong relationship between energy development and the national economy, as energy demand, supply, and pricing has enormous impacts on economic growth. Also, with the rapid pace of economic expansion over the past decades, many developing countries experienced a sharp annual growth in petroleum demand (Collier, 2010). Dartey-Baah et al. (2014) described oil and gas as precious assets with high revenue potential which provide added impetus and opportunity for economic and social development. The oil and gas industry is also characterised by large capital investments with exploration and production operations including activities such as identifying hydrocarbon resources, and commercially exploiting them (Pongsiri, 2004; Holscher et al., 2008).

Despite the large or potentially large petroleum deposits and their unique impact on the international market, very few had sufficient resources for supply side investments, especially for the development of oil and gas exploration and production (Dartey-Baah et al., 2014). Also, ventures in the sector are associated with a high risk nature in the physical, commercial, and political sense as it is difficult to determine in advance the existence, extent and quality of production costs and the future price in the world market (Bindemann, 1999). This has resulted in the difficulties in gaining access to risk capital and lack of expertise needed for resource exploration and development. Based on this, most developing countries grant development rights such as concession licenses and contractual arrangements to foreign companies, which have adequate capital, technology and expertise, including capabilities to manage investment towards their diversified portfolios. This has instigated both practitioners and researchers of host nations in the sector to look inward and increase investigation on performance based service and upgrade their strategic focus with the need to modify performance measures as well as preferences of involving parties when managing activities in the sector (Kumar et al., 2006). Kumar et al. (2006) concludes that modifying performance strategy helps change implementers and project executors to recognise the importance of focusing more on strategic developments necessary to provide effective service in the oil and gas industry. A related study has equally emphasised the usefulness of increasing factors of performance and the importance of enhancing procedures for developing measures capable of managing and
implementing change in the oil and gas sector (Haji-Kazemi and Andersen, 2013). Therefore, in line with the problems illustrated in the current study, it is expected that the outcome of the study will benefit the sector as the proposed conceptual framework will be geared towards introducing measures that will help increase the understanding of organisational change implementation in oil and gas organisations.

1.6 The Structure of the Thesis

In order to successfully complete this study, this thesis is organised and presented in seven chapters (see Figure 1.1) for a clear illustration.

Chapter 1: Introduction and Overview

The objective of this chapter is to set out the prospect for the entire study. This chapter presents an overview of the research problem as well as the aim and objectives of the study. Also, the background of the study was established which helped to give an understanding of the purpose of the study.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter presents a comprehensive literature review of the debate in the relevant fields that made up this study they are: organisational change, individual readiness for change, leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills, organisational trust and contextual factors such as: social norms and units/departments characteristic. The chapter reviewed relevant theories of organisational change and presents the barriers that hinder organisational change implementation, as well as the research gaps. Finally, the chapter identifies the factors that can help organisations implement change effectively.

Chapter 3: Conceptual Framework and Research Hypotheses

This chapter presents a discussion of the relationship between leadership styles, organisational culture, managerial skills, organisational trust and the contextual factors to individual readiness for change and how they predict organisational change implementation. Also, the chapter presents research hypotheses which were used to explain the relationship that lead to the theoretical model for a better understanding of organisational change implementation.
Chapter 4: Research Methodology

This chapter identifies and justifying the research philosophy, approach and design that guided the entire study and presents the instruments for measuring the variables of the study. The chapter also justifies the sampling and the method used for data collection.

Chapter 5: Data Analysis and Results

This chapter presents the analysis and interpretation of the data collected from the questionnaire survey. It presents the descriptive statistics of all the variables, the reliability and factor loading and analysis of the variables as well as the regression of both mediating and moderating analysis of the variables using tools of statistical analysis compatible with the IBM Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) version 21.

Chapter 6: Discussion of Findings

In this chapter, the discussion of the research hypotheses and findings are discussed in full detail in relation with the existing literature.

Chapter 7: Contribution, Implications and Conclusion

This final chapter discusses the contribution and implications of the study for theory and practice. Conclusively, the chapter makes relevant recommendations and discusses the limitations of the study and future research directions.

1.7 Summary

This chapter has provided an overview of the current thesis, hence it presents a general introduction and plans for the current research. The chapter highlights the background of the study, research problems as well as the aim and objectives of the study. This is concluded by presenting an outline and structure of the study. The next chapter critically discusses the literature review of all areas considered in this study.
Figure 1.1: Outline and Structure of the Thesis
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The literature review provides critical analysis and demonstrates clearly the understanding of the research topic (Grieves, 2010). Also, it identifies the main studies underpinning a research area including different points of views on the research area and the existing gaps (Grieves, 2010).

The aim of this chapter is to explore and discuss critically the combined literature underpinning this research which is relevant to the topic, and relates to its aim and objectives. The area of this study consists of the integration of management research areas, namely, organisational change, leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills, organisational trust, and individual readiness for change. Individual readiness for change was introduced to mediate organisational change implementation. Also, the contextual factors which are social norms and units/departments characteristics were introduced to moderate the impact of organisational change implementation. Consequently, this chapter is divided into seven main sections, which are; organisational change, individual readiness for change, leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills, and organisational trust and the contextual factors.

The first section of this chapter provides a comprehensive literature review in the field of organisational change including models/theories of organisational change. It describes the concept and perspectives of organisational change based on the organisational change literature, empirical studies, and change models. It then proceeds to the description of leading studies of organisational change management. Lastly, the barriers that hinder the implementation of organisational change are identified and discussed. The second section presents a review of the literature of individual readiness for change and it impact on organisational change implementation. The third section reviews the literature about leadership and discusses the meanings, concepts, styles, and impact of leadership styles on readiness for change and organisational change implementation. The fourth section presents a review about
organisational culture, meaning and types as well as the impact of organisational culture types on readiness for change and organisational change implementation. The fifth section presents literature about managerial skills, dimensions of managerial skills and their impact on readiness for change and change implementation. Section six presents a review of organisational trust, as well as the dimensions of organisational trust and their impact on readiness for change and organisational change implementation. The last section of this chapter presents literature on contextual factors and their moderating impact on readiness for change in predicting more of organisational change implementation. The research gaps found in the combined literature are identified and discussed in the last part of this chapter (section 2.5).

Models of organisational change have been developed through era of classical and contingency approaches to change management, all of which has over time contributed to the accumulation of knowledge about more understanding of change implementation. The bequest of these contingency approaches shows that organisational change is an important issue in organisations and occurs as a reaction to the ever changing business environment. For example, the work of Lewin (1951) shows a scenario of an organisation before and after change intervention which assumes change to be a phenomenon required by every organisation to either increase competition or improve capacity and sustain output.

Studies in the area of organisational change shows how models of organisational change develops overtime and help to increase the understanding of change management. This development recognises the limitations of contingency approaches and the need to see organisational change as a continuing phenomenon within an organisational circumstance (Tushman et al., 1986; Dunphy and Stace, 1990; Dawson, 1994). Importantly, a significant recognition of the classical studies indicates a consistent replacement or remodelling of the classical approaches to organisational change reflecting the discounting nature of static theories of change (Kotter, 1996; Barriere et al., 2002; Guidroz, 2010).

Organisational change management cannot continue to rely upon static models, rather the ever changing business environment have forced organisational to switch from the classical theories to a more strategic thinking for dealing with uncertainties
(Schraeder, 2005). Pettigew (1992) argues for the adoption of a procedural approach to the study of change management in order to avoid the static view to organisational change management and implementation. Hence, the study of organisational change management have attracted more strategic focus to change implementation which is more convergent in nature (Tusman et al., 1986), or fine tuning in process (Greenwood and Hingings, 1996).

The convergent approach increases the ongoing process to achieve fit between strategies or what Greenwood and Hingings (1996) refers to as bringing together the old and the new institutionalism for enhancing organisational structure, process and people towards achieving change implementation, which is yet needs improvement (Tushman et al., 1986). Therefore, a continuing process alignment to achieving improved organisational change remains a natural response to business environment and internal conditions to change implementation (Leifer, 1989). Leifer’s (1989) study shows that change is consistent with learning new ways of business environment and the adaptation from experience and conceptualising change dynamics. This view as been supported by Dunphy (1996) who opined that such conceptualisation could lead to a better understanding of organisational change management.

This indicates the critical aspect of organisational life lies on its capacity to respond to change. Daft (1995) argue that organisational change reflects the need to embrace flexibilities within a system. More so, Pettigrew (1990) further describes change conceptualisation as a holistic and multifaceted approach to better understand variables for change management and implementation. These have therefore raised the awareness of the need to conceptualised change concepts and increase the understanding for change management and implementation. However, there is a growing interest of managerial implication to change management which further activated the interest of researching about what managerial implications required in a change transition. This further led to the increase about factors that affects organisational change and how organisational change theories affect the conceptualisation of organisational change frameworks.

In order to understand the conceptualisation of organisational change, this study reviews various theories/models of organisational change and their implications to organisational change implementation. Below are a detailed discussion of relevant
organisational change theories/models and their impact on change implementation, however, it is imperative to present management attributes of the oil and gas industry following with a clear definition of organisational change so that it will help aid the understanding of various view points.

2.2 Attributes and Challenges of the oil and gas Industry

There is a global challenge confronting organisations in the oil and gas industry across cultures, especially when faced with challenges of change implementation or transforming its business processes (Hhmad and Elhuni, 2014). The inability to implement change has resulted in a loss of business confidence and collapse of systems including issues relating to the credit crunch (Hurn, 2012). However, the importance of the oil and gas business and its impact on national development cannot be over emphasised. Countries with national income predominantly dominated in the business of oil and gas would need to work extra hard to ensure sustainability and accelerated business processes. Nigeria is a key example in this category, as over 80 percent of its GDP comes from oil proceeds (NNPC Transformation News, 2010; Okoye, 2010). The change implementation challenges faced in the NNPC appear to be a potential threat if urgent steps are not taken to avert the trend. In line with the research problems identified in section 1.2 above which lament the inability of the NNPC to implement change and the lack of potential studies capable of resolving issues necessary for leading change implementation in the NNPC, this study resolved to find factors that can help organisational change implementation. However, lessons from related organisations are useful to help inform the activities in the NNPC as well as to develop the proposed theoretical framework for the current study.

Muralidhar’s (2010) study investigates the current status of enterprise risk management (ERM) in the Gulf Co-operation Council (GCC) oil and gas entities in order to come up with a practical, region-specific, and systematic action plan for the GCC oil and gas industry that can transform the existing ERM models to a mature and robust framework. The GCC nations are Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and United Arab Emirates. Oil and gas organisations in these countries are familiar with the ERM models which used to check effective management in the related business processes. Researches view that ERM is a new paradigm to check business processes and risk management (Walker et al., 2002; Ward, 2006). The ERM
Framework is now widely used in many organisations and it is also the most commonly used starting point for improving performance and change implementation strategies, but could not emphasise on appropriate organisational culture and leadership for adoption (Muralidhar, 2010). However, organisational frameworks must feature elements or variables such as appropriate leadership styles, the culture of doing things as well as issues relating to trust and skills (Northouse, 2010; Prajogo and McDermott, 2011; Vanhala and Ahteela, 2011; Yukl, 2013, Haffar et al, 2013), as a leverage for improving performance and enhancing change implementation. Although, the challenge of sustaining such business models as organisational strategy remains a major concern (Hhmad and Elhuni, 2014). For example, British Petroleum (BP) serious communication mistakes with its stakeholders during the huge oil spillage in the Gulf of Mexico in April 2010 which cost BP in terms of its reputation (Valvi and Fragkos, 2013), indicating weakness on BP’s business model to manage a communication crisis. Valvi and Fragkos (2013) findings indicates that the lessons to learn from this for both practitioners and researchers are the values of leadership, culture and public relations mistakes made by BP and to avoid them when managing performance and change. More so, they should select the strategies that foster their organisation’s strengths and correct its weaknesses in order to take advantage of external opportunities and counter external threats.

A study by Smith (1986) confirms that the strategic approach to management development applied in the US petroleum industry was based on core areas of business excellence such as strategic orientation management training geared towards delivering organisational goals and providing opportunities to learn in a compressed time frame rather than through years of on the job experience and allowing the opportunity to practice, learn, explore and make mistakes in a protected and safer business environment. In order develop a solid business competency background, most organisations established a business training process for leaders who are responsible for performance and change implementation focusing on core areas such as the fundamentals of management attributes that organisational managers, leaders and supervisors should know and the philosophy, heritage, beliefs, value systems, policies and practices that are unique to the organisation.
These were the core business strategies of Phillips Petroleum before the merger with Conoco Inc on August 30 2002 to form ConocoPhillips (Smith, 1986; ConocoPhillips Annual Report 2011), with the following managerial competence:

- Planning and organising - Planning and organising resources in such a way as to ensure maximum productivity and goal accomplishment.
- Initiative - self motivation to solve problems, seek information, find improved methods and procedures and get things done.
- Resource utilisation - use of appropriate available resources in the resolution of problems and in decision making.
- Future orientation - balancing immediate requirements with long-term needs. Taking actions today that will benefit the company in the long run.
- Setting goals for subordinates - Setting clear, specific performance goals for subordinates.
- Defining standards - clearly defining the performance standards required when assigning projects to subordinates.
- Evaluation of subordinates - accurate, objective assessment of employee performance and potential.
- Performance review - Providing frequent performance review with subordinates, focusing on direct and definitive performance feedback.
- Positive employee motivation - encouraging high performance by using recognition and positive feedback, when appropriate.
- Coaching - engaging in the day-to-day process of helping subordinates learn and apply principles and skills.
- Leadership - use of personal influence to build teams, alliances, and coalitions. Ability to provide guidance and direction.
- Teamwork - ability to work co-operatively with others to achieve common goals.
- Managing group process - managing group work effectively, ensuring smooth functioning of teams of subordinates
- Attitude about the company - demonstrated degree of positive feelings about the worth, value, "goodness" and direction of the company in regard to its role
in society, its position in the corporate world and its responsiveness to its employees.

- Application of company policies and programmes - effectiveness in using appropriate procedures, applying company policy and administering company programmes to achieve proper results.
- Discipline - proper application of disciplinary procedures.
- Example setting - through word and action, setting a proper example for peers and subordinates in respect to all areas of job performance.

Based on this, the organisation was able to demonstrate a visible and active organisational culture and leadership that engages employees and provides services necessary for improving performance and accountability; provide employees with the capabilities, knowledge and resource necessary for motivation and business excellence; manage projects for change implementation as well as maintaining work policies that establishes the responsibility and authority for all to work in a safe business environment. Achieving the above will possibly result from effective leadership being in place, because effective leaders are able to bring together factors necessary to create an understanding that will help their organisations implement change effectively (Northouse, 2010). Effective leadership plays functional roles that facilitates group outcomes and increase the ability to engage and coordinates effective teamwork as well as increasing the ability of organisational members to achieve collective goals (Bass and Avolio, 2004; Yukl, 2013). Organisations that adopt effective leadership such as transformational, democratic and transactional enable a collectives focus on how to develop the needed interaction necessary for providing a dyadic relationship between organisational leaders and subordinates (de Jong and Hartog, 2007; Raoprasert and Islam, 2010). Specifically, organisations benefit from such leadership behaviours because it enables them to develop or adopt efficient and effective business models, frameworks, or strategies and a predominant culture type as prerequisites for implementing change.

Hence, this study believes that organisations in the oil and gas sector such as Nigeria can learn from the above initiative in order to improve their business model, strategies and plans with adherence to effective and participative leadership style capable of increasing the opportunities for change implementation. Studies show that numerous
organisations in the oil and gas host nations adopt, develop and initiate business strategies capable of improving business performance, commitment and change implementation (Stone, 2006; Dixon, 2008; Davies, 2008; Svensson and Wagner, 2011), but find it difficult to implement due to a low regard to leadership. Wagner and Svensson’s (2014) study indicates that the transformative business sustainability model (TBS) helps organisations to emphasising commitment through corporate leadership and strategic priority to respond to current and future organisational needs. Wagner and Svensson (2014) conclude that the TBS model is useful for managers to plan, implement and assess practices as well as providing a holistic view of sustainable business activities that supports the development of an organisational network. Since such organisational models help organisations to increase interactions between elements within and external interest, adopting the right leadership behaviour becomes extremely important.

2.3 Defining Organisational Change

Organisational change is defined differently by different authors. While some authors defined it as a process where an organisation is going through a transformation or a change in culture, others think that it is a process where an organisation is restructuring itself to meet current demands (Judson, 1991). For example, Sengupta et al. (2006) defined organisational change as the adoption of a new idea or behaviour, or a way in which an organisation altered its existing structure to increase effectiveness and achieve set objectives. Jick (1993) defined organisational change as a planned or unplanned response to pressures from both inside an organisation and from the external environment. Lewis (2011) defines organisational change as a creation of an effective communication that will lead the organisation’s desired state. The critical issue about these definitions is that, each author keeps referring to the important of the need for organisations to overcome challenges in order to achieve desired objectives. However, in order to overcome such challenges, organisational members must resume process modification by adopting measure of re-engineering business processes and incorporate factors capable of driving the change process.

Researchers like Alas and Vadi (2006) believe that organisations needs modification from time to time in order to ensure stability and predictability, which often leads to restructuring and enhancing change implementation. However, lack of organisational
stability when modelling change may lead to confusion and uncertainty which often leads to a state of paralysis (Lewis, 2011). This is why Alas and Vadi (2006) agreed that change involves elements of organisational systems which must be sustain and align together in achieving the desired change. The literature on organisational change usually considers a step-by-step approach leading to a successful change, as evidenced in organisational change theories (Kotter, 1999; Grieves, 2010).

However, this step-by-step approach leading to organisational change has triggered researchers over time to ask questions about the process that could bring about effective change implementation; such as: how to establish the need for effective change, how to motivate employees to realise effective change and how to increase commitment toward sustaining effective change implementation (Judson, 1991; Bee et al., 1996; Kotter, 1999). An attempt to answering these questions has raised the concern about the need to consistently adopt appropriate change theoretical frameworks that could integrate factors capable of leading organisational change implementation (Holt et al., 2007). Consequently, this study identifies and adopts the following organisational change management theories as an understanding for developing a framework that will help guide the proposed conceptual framework necessary for increasing the understanding of organisational change implementation.

2.4 Organisational Change Theories

Organisational change implementation is not only a change philosophies or a structure of set of change assumptions (Graetz and Smith, 2010), but a practical way in which organisations adopts and practice change theories in order to make change happen effectively (Hayes, 2010). Change will only be effective and successful if organisational change processes are followed with due principles and a stated approach (Burnes, 2004). Hayes (2010) states that organisational change implementation entails thoughtful planning and sensitive implementation, consulting and effectively involving people in the change process.

Organisational change as a concept has been widely researched to achieve organisation’s change in direction, behaviour, control and attitude (Holt et al., 2007; Grieves, 2010). However, the concept of change has attracted new initiatives with critical consideration of the integration of management concepts such as leadership,
organisational culture and skills as values for developing and expanding people’s capacity for effective participation in change implementation (Ashley et al., 2010). Studies have equally shown that the integration of change models will improve the understanding and quality of people involvement in change implementation (Barriere et al., 2002; Sengupta et al., 2006; Hostetler, 2007; Lewis, 2011). More so, change models have shown the importance of paying attention to critical factors that influence effective change implementation in organisation, such factors are often considered as soft and hard skills which are capable of increasing the technicalities involves towards participating in change implementation.

Powell (1995) referred to such soft skills as intangible factors which are often associated with personal attribute and character of people but not easy to measure, yet could influence people’s participation when engage in change implementation. In another development, Rusly et al. (2012) and Michel et al. (2013) refer to these factors as teamwork, continuous improvement, consistent training, and active participation, emphasizing that they have a significant effect on effective change implementation. On the other hand, the hard skills with include the ability to communicate effectively and adequate use of database information to improve work situation can be combined as techniques necessarily for improve and implementing change (Greasley et al., 2009; Erwin and German, 2010; Okpara, 2011; Mueller et al., 2012). Bolman and Deal (2003) believe that such management techniques increase opportunities for change and as well reducing barriers such as ambiguities and incompetence. In addition, Brisson-Banks (2010) study concludes that in an organisation’s transition period, change models can be combined to form new models to best fit the current circumstance. More so, it will form a unique method and strategy capable of proving additional insights into possible ways of improvement. Brisson-Banks (2010) further stressed that the combination of management techniques increases skills which extremely become valuable to facilitate change in a transition period.

Evidence of empirical investigations had shown that organisation change implementation developed from existing change theories (Susanto, 2008; Self and Schraeder, 2009; Senior and Swailes, 2010), and such change theories help to develop frameworks to enhance practical directions for change implementation. Based on this development, a detailed account of organisational change models/theories and their
impact on change implementation and how they informed the current study is presented below.

2.4.1 Lewin’s Three Steps Change Theory

One of the most influential perspectives within what is popularly known as the planned approach to change is within the works of Lewin (1947, 1952) who argued that the process of managing change is in three stages which are; (1) unfreezing current behaviour, (2) moving to the process of new behaviour and (3) refreezing the new behaviour. Lewin is noted to be the first psychologist to work on change and his works are still applicable to both individuals and organisations in present times. Lewin related change with group dynamics and argued that it is important to emphasise group behaviour to change, rather than focusing on just one individual (Dent and Goldberg, 1999). This is because the individual is in isolation and is constrained by group pressures to conform (Lewin, 1947); however focusing change on group level should concentrate on factors such as group norms, role, interactions and socialisation to create disequilibrium and change (Schein, 1988).

Lewin who adopted action research to develop his theoretical position about change stressed that change can only be achieved by helping individuals to reflect on new insights into the existing situation (Smith, 2005). Schein’s (1996 p. 64) work reflected on Lewin’s theoretical thought that ‘one cannot understand an organisation without trying to change it’ (p 64). This means it is more important in understanding the processes and procedures that could result in change from the individuals and groups perspectives. Furthermore, it was stressed that for change to be effective, it must involve the participation and collaboration of all those concerned about the change (Lewin, 1947; French and Bell, 1990; Day et al., 2002). Lewin believes that for change to be effective the following are necessary:

Step 1, unfreezing: That human behaviour was based on a quasi-stationary equilibrium supported by a complex field of forces. Meaning, before an old behaviour can be discarded (either unlearnt) and new behaviour successfully adopted, the equilibrium needs to be destabilized (unfrozen). Although, Lewin did not believe that this would be easy or that the same techniques could be applied in all situations. Hence it was
further noted that ‘unfreezing’ the present level may involve different problems in different cases (Lewin, 1947a: 229).

Step 2, moving: Unfreezing is not an end in itself, it does create a motivation to learn but does not necessarily control or predict the direction’ (Schein, 1996: 6). (Lewin, 1947a) viewed that it is necessary to take into account all the forces at work to identify and evaluate the available options to enable people move to a more acceptable set of behaviours.

Step 3, refreezing: This seeks to stabilize the situation at a new quasi-stationary equilibrium in order to ensure that new behaviours are relatively safe from regression (Lewin, 1947). The new behaviour must be to some degree matched with the rest of the behaviour (Schein, 1996). This is why effective change must require organisational culture, norms, policies and practices (Cummings and Worley, 2001). However, Lewin’s theory has been criticised over time; for example, Burnes (2004) argued that Lewin’s theory is only suitable for small change projects, and it ignores organisational powers and politics identified in Morgan’s (1986) study which viewed organisational politics as a metaphor or critical factors that influence organisational change process. Morgan (1986) believes that organisations are rational systems and can find ways to overcome limitations however, over reliance of this metaphor could increase organisational politicisation. The critique of Lewin’s model led to Lippitt et al. (1958) study which adds that after the unfreezing phase, there is a need to establish a change relationship, and after the refreezing phase, there is the terminal relationship. This model which is widely used by numerous organisations with eight stages of change has been re-classified into three stages of organisational change which are (1) clarification or diagnosing the problem, (2) examination of alternative routes and goals and establishment of goals and intentions for action and (3) the transformation of intentions into actual change efforts. Mitchell, (2013) also argued that change can only be effective when those managing the change (leaders or managers) establish goals and intentions as a guide to help lead the change process.

In furtherance to this, Schein (1980) reviewed Lewin’s three steps change model and came up with a new way to describe the situation surrounding unfreezing and freezing organisation. The way to unfreeze an organisation is either, to move the organisation from the current status quo to a future state and freeze the changes. Schein (1980)
indicated that for unfreezing to work well, organisational members would need to embrace change and see the need for change. The need to be dissatisfied with the current status quo must be observed, and once such perception is introduced people will then see the gap between what has been and what should be. This is then conceptualized to motivate people in order to reduce organisational implementation gaps and achieve desired change.

Schein (1992) also believes that such conceptualisation of change should not cost the organisations humiliation, punishment, or loss of self esteem. However, Schein (1992) model did not offer a clear process of conceptualising organisational change management. This criticism led to a step by step conceptualisation of organisational change which was appreciated in the works of Kotter (1996). Kotter’s (1996) model shows a step by step chronological order of organisational change implementation process. See section 2.3.2 for a detailed discussion of Kotter’s (1996) change model.

2.4.2 Kotter’s Model

Some authors such as Appelbaum et al., (2012) argue that Kotter’s (1996) change model lacks rigorous fundamentals. However, it was an instantaneous success at the time it was advocated and it still remains a key reference in the field of change management (Appelbaum et al., 2012). Kotter’s book titled Leading Change has been used to support different conceptual framework to assist organisational change management and implementation (Buchanan et al., 2005). Kotter’s organisational change model has been cited in recent academic textbooks such as Langton et al. (2010) and has contributed to several articles on organisational change and management (Jansen, 2004; Todnem, 2005; Lines; 2007; Sidorko 2008; Zakariasen et al., 2008; Brisson-Banks, 2010; Farkas, 2013; Parker et al., 2013). For example, Parker et al. (2013) adopted Kotter’s (1996) change management principles to construct what they called Alignment of PRINCE2 and change management activities, to identify key stakeholders that could influence the success of a project change. Accordingly, Alignment of PRINCE2 and change management activities are used to enhance change activities such as creating a sense of urgency, form a powerful coalition, create and communicate a vision, assessing the readiness for change and capacity for change, building the understanding for change, and developing the potential necessary for implementing change.
Brisson-Banks (2010) confirmed that most successful business change models of recent times are based on Kotter’s (1996) change model, and it has been the key mechanism for leading organisational change (Kouzes and Posner, 2007). Also, Alas et al.’s (2012) study shows that the steps in the process of change in Chinese and Estonian organisations were analysed on the basis of the steps contained in Kotter’s change model. Another study by Farkas (2013) found that Kotter’s (1996) change model provides a pragmatic structure for change culture through behavioural change and change leadership regardless of positional authority in an organisation.

In as much as Kotter’s (1996) change model has helped numerous organisations to manage organisational change, it has also been faced with some challenges. For example, Parker et al. (2013) viewed that a key hindrance of Kotter’s (1996) change model is that it projected a long-term period for change to be sustained, therefore making change implementation process difficult to cope with. But, this position is been cross examined by Choi (2011) who argued that most failures to implement change are not caused by long-term implementation process but failure to adhere to stated change implementation ideas and principles. Lyons et al. (2008) cited the Kotter model when developing the Acquisition Solution View Knowledge Framework, which is used for knowledge integration and quality management practice in change implementation. Ronnenberg et al. (2011) equally found that the model helps managers to increase their role and techniques when dealing with organisational change management and implementation. The above illustration affirms the importance of conceptualising change management implementation in line with existing models in order to ensure consistency and effectiveness.

The important phenomenon of Kotter’s (1996) model is to increase organisational change implementation with a stage by stage, or sequential, approach of managing effective change (Smith, 2011). For example, Sidorko (2008) breaks down Kotter’s (1996) eight steps model into three categories, namely, preparation (steps 1-4), action (steps 5-7) and grounding (step 8):

1. Establish a sense of urgency: change means uncertainty about what the future looks like (Alas et al., 2011); uncertainty makes people uncomfortable hence people would prefer the status quo (Pryor et al., 2008). Furthermore, people tend to mistrust things about which they are uncertain (Smith, 2011). Therefore
people need to be encouraged about the need to make change happen (Kotter, 1996).

2. Form a powerful high level coalition to guide and lead the change: a group needed with enough power and influence to be responsible to effect change in an organisation. Kotter (2002) posited that such group would is surrounded people with vision and a sense of what is happening outside of organisation, credibility within the organisation, knowledge, and good communication skills. Some people may exemplify more than one of those qualities, but each of those qualities is essential for developing a strong vision and communicating clearly to the rest of the organisational members. The members also need to work together and commit fully to the perceived change.

3. Create a vision of the organisation’s future: to help focus and direct the change (Kotter, 1996). It is important to develop a vision that reflects in line with an understanding of organisational culture and what its members value (Kotter, 1996), as well as creating the strategies for achieving the vision that will help expedite the change (Kotter, 1996, 1998).

4. Communicate that vision widely, repeatedly and consistently: from the leadership level down through all organisational levels, in language and in actions and behaviours (Kotter, 1996).

5. Empower people in the organisation to act on the vision: either removing obstacles to change, improve processes and systems, encourage and enable people to take risks, engage in non traditional thinking and activities (Kotter, 1996).

6. Plan for visible short-term performance improvements: enable these to occur and recognise people’s achievement and the work of those who have enabled that achievement (Kotter, 1996).

7. Consolidate improvements and produce more change: as change takes effect, build on the credibility and confidence that results, extending the reform or structures, systems and processes and encouraging and growing change agents in the organisation (Kotter, 1996).
8. Institutionalise new approaches: clearly articulate the connections between the new ways of working towards organisational successes and encourage change leadership and anchor the changes into the organisational culture (Kotter, 1996).

Kotter’s eight-step model, which has features of the change model (Kanter et al., 1992), has been fully elaborated to address the fundamental changes on how organisations conduct their business to cope with a new and more challenging business environment (Kotter, 1995). This statement implicitly states a framework in which the model is applicable; therefore it is not expected to be applicable to all types of changes (Appelbaum et al., 2012); however, the lessons from this change model can be adopted for conceptualising subsequent change models (as in the current study) or can be adopted with or without modification.

2.4.3 Galpin’s Nine Wedge Change Model

While, Kotter’s (1996) change model ascertained an increased people’s role and techniques in change intervention (Ronnenberg et al., 2011), Galpin’s (1996) change model on the other hand emphasises adherence to organisational culture as reflected in the organisation’s rules and policies, behaviour and norms. Galpin’s (1996) model comprises the following: (1) establishing the need to change; (2) developing and disseminating a vision of a planned change; (3) diagnosing and analysing the current situation; (4) generating recommendations; (5) detailing the recommendations; (6) pilot testing the recommendations; (7) preparing the recommendations for rollout; (8) rolling out the recommendations; and (9) measuring, reinforcing, and refining the change.

Galpin (1996) who noted that lack of confidence in one’s ability to adapt to a particular change initiative can lead to resistance, equally viewed that successful organisational change must by targeted on two levels such as a strategic level which refers to the initial efforts involving executives, senior managers or a small cadre of employees, and a grassroots level which refers to the efforts that drive the change deeply into the organisation. Galpin’s (1996) model also emphasises training and education of employees in line with change implementation initiatives (Self and Schraeder, 2009). This means organisational members need to acquire the training and
education required to drive change implementation process. However, failure to provide such training and education may lead to employees lacking confidence in the process of implementing change (Galpin, 1996).

Galpin’s (1999) criticism suggests that the model focuses only on organisational norms and policies but fails to take care of other behaviours such as change resistance. Consequently, Judson’s (1991) model looked at issues concerning resistance to change by using alternatives measures such as; reward, bargaining and persuasion drive the organisational change process. Judson (1991), change model which sometimes referred to as change implementation phases consists of the following five phases such as; (1) analysing and planning the change; (2) communicating the change; (3) gaining acceptance of new behaviours; (4) changing from current status quo to a desired state; and (5) consolidating and institutionalising the new state. Within each phase, Judson (1991) discusses predictable reactions to change and methods for minimising resistance to change agent’s efforts. In the same vein, Luecke’s model (2003) viewed the need for organisational members to increase participation in change programmes in line with organisation policies, system and structure, and importantly identify an appropriate techniques necessary for leading organisational change (Self and Schraeder, 2009; Cervone, 2013). The McKinsey change framework plays an important role on the expansion of organisational systems, structure and technique as observed in Luecke’s study.

2.4.4 McKinsey 7S Framework

The McKinsey 7S framework is a technique developed by McKinsey Company in the early 1980s, has helped management consultancy firms in the United States for the purposes of leading organisational change implementation (Grieves, 2010). The technique rests on the complex relationship between strategy, structure, system, style, skills, and staff and shared values when considering change implementation (Sekhar, 2009). The framework, which was developed by Peters and Waterman in search of excellence in the 1980s, is used to improve performance and can be used to effect organisational change. The framework is equally used for the aligning of departments, and deciding the best way to go when implementing strategies leading to organisational change. The framework is made up of hard elements and soft elements. The hard elements are elements in the organisation that cannot be easily changed. The
soft elements consist of shared values, skills, style, and staff. These are elements that can be changed easily. The 7S framework shows a strategy for change organisational by bringing all seven-S in one location as discussed below:

**Strategy:** This is the process through which organisations achieve their purposes. It is defined as the systematic approach to positioning the business in relation to its environment to ensure continued success. It can be also used to maintain recognised quality in the process of implementing organisational change. An organisation that wants an accelerated process of change implementation is expected to continuously acquaint itself with quality processes to ensure a good and sustainable supply of available resources needed for the change project. While no one approach can guarantee continuous success and total organisational change implementation, an integrated approach to strategy formulation involving all levels of management can go a long way in achieving results (Grieves, 2010).

**Shared Values:** They refer to the objectives, goals and values perceived as norms which organisations adhere to. They are equally a set of values and aspirations that go beyond the conventional formal statement of the organisation’s corporate objectives and are the fundamental ideas which the organisational strategy is built on (Sekhar, 2009).

**Structure:** This implies the basic framework that could lead to employee’s responsibilities and functions. It is defined as the design of organisation through which the organisation is administered, both in authority and communication and data that flows through the line of communication and authority (Grieves, 2010).

**Systems:** It includes the rules and regulations of the organisation, the procedures and ways in which things are administered. It is the collection of management tools for planning, decision-making, communication and control. It also includes production planning, the control system and cost of production, budgeting systems, performance evaluation systems and coordination. The power to implement organisational change has a direct effect on the system that holds the organisation. For example, Sekhar (2009) posits that change in strategy may be implemented with a change in ‘systems’ rather than in the organisation’s structure.
**Staff:** It refers to the organisation’s human resources strategy which is part of the process of acquiring the human effort for the organisation, and assuring that they have the potential to contribute in achieving objectives leading to change (Grieves, 2010).

**Skills:** Refers to individual capabilities in the organisation, and how such capabilities would lead to organisational change. The level of employee skill is expected to increase the level of employee’s readiness for change and change implementation (Grieves, 2010).

**Styles:** This refers to how an organisational leader leads and motivates their subordinates. Thus the way in which managers make decisions and delegate responsibilities and interact with employees can affect the entire organisational style to bring about effective change. Organisational members that feel motivated and have confidence in the company’s vision are expected to be more productive and adapt to change. Successful organisational change is also evident in the style organisational leaders adopts when leading change (Mohapatra, 2012).

Grieves (2010) believe that the 7S framework is adopted by organisations in order to develop a strong corporate culture capable of promoting excellent management system and performance that will lead to successful change implementation. According to Peters and Waterman (1982) the 7S framework is necessary for large organisations who wish to increase performance by linking their structural component parts and increase efficiency. The 7S change framework is an effective way to diagnose and understand the workings of an organisation as a method for viewing the possibilities of change implementation and as a guide for increasing the capacity for renewing quality and responsibilities (Hatum, 2013).

However, this framework has been criticised for not incorporated employee’s task and work process as a component alignment for increasing organisational change implementation. Such inadequate integration of employee task to the values of organisation most time leads to ignoring or take for granted some core processes that underlie key functions; such as: core values, positive attitudes, and good working relationships that underpin the process of organisation change implementation (Grieves, 2010). A view of Tichy’s change framework is used to improve on the McKinsey 7S framework due to its emphasis on people involvement in change implementation and process alignment.
2.4.5 Tichy’s Change Framework

Tichy’s theory becomes important due to the significance emphasis on organisational culture change (Sharma, 2008). The change framework shows how organisations strengthen its internal structure when confronted with challenges of change implementation (Lane and Casile, 2011). The theory is an integration of three dimensions which are; technical, political and cultural, generally referred as the TPC framework. The technical dimension entails that the organisation would need to rearrange the way things are done in order for change to occur. The political dimension is based on conflict and politics where people or groups of people have more power than others to ensure a balanced situation. Finally, the cultural dimension assumes that values, beliefs and viewpoints are strongly held for the survival of organisations. Tichy (1983) believes that the management of organisational change is pervasive throughout the framework and dealing with only one or two of the dimensions at a time will adversely affect effectiveness and process change (Sharma, 2008).

Tichy (1983) confirmed that the framework suggests nine change levers in which organisation effectiveness depends on. They are the organisation’s external environment (input), mission and strategy, engaging relevant interest groups, tasks (new tasks as a result of change), prescribed networks (organisational structure), organisational processes (communication, problem solving and decision making), and people and emergent networks of the informal structure of the organisation. Thus, organisational effectiveness that depends on the characteristics of these levers and their interrelationships will also need to align with the components of the functioning systems of the organisation (Sharma, 2008).

The framework which is equally described as the 6 x 3 TPC matrix provides a comprehensive framework for diagnosing organisational change where the systems contrast with the change levers. In this case data is collected for diagnostic purposes for each cell of the matrix as shown in Figure 2.3; hence the data collected is expected to be informative about the degree of change needed for adequate alignment. Tichy (1983) viewed that the alignment must be aligned within the system and down the matrix. However, it was observed that Tichy’s framework failed to align people’s activities in relation to organisation analysis.
Organisational Components

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Strategy</th>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Prescribed network</th>
<th>People</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Emergent network</th>
<th>Amount of within alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1: Tichy's TPC Change Framework

Source: Sharma (2008)

Lane and Casile (2011) agreed that the dimensions provide the fundamentals for organisational change because they create set of measurements that can increase the requirements for change. Accordingly, Tichy believes that the dimensions are braided like a rope, to make it stronger; thus, effective change requires changing organisational old values and adopts new values as identified in Tichy TPC framework capable of enhancing organisational change process (Sharma, 2008). Sommer (2012) study suggest that Tichy’s framework can be aligned with Kanter et al.’s (1992) three kinds’ movement in order to benefit from holistic performance increase and activate a stronger process for organisational change implementation as evidenced in the complexity theory of change.

2.4.6 Complexity Theory

This theory is defined as the measure of heterogeneity or diversity in internal and external environmental factors that affect organisational change, such are; units of organisations, employees, customers, suppliers, socio-politics and technology (Mason, 2007). Complexity theory is concerned with the study of emergent order in what otherwise may be considered as very disorderly systems (Sherif, 2006), and focuses on how parts at a micro-level in a complex system affect emergent behaviour and the overall outcome at the macro-level (McElroy, 2000; McKenzie and James, 2004).
Mason (2007) believe that as a system becomes more complex, making sense of it equally becomes more difficult and adaptation to change becomes even more problematic. Also, the characteristic structural and behavioural patterns in a complex system are due to the interactions among the system’s parts (Rhee, 2000). Therefore, complex systems help to determine nature and process of the organisation by establishing new relationships between its internal and external environments and itself (McElroy, 2000; Sullivan, 2004).

An important aspect of complexity theory is that it allows a system to absorb information from its environment and create stores of knowledge that can aid “complex adaptive systems” (Mason, 2007; Fioretti and Visser, 2004). It explains how systems can have adaptive learning and innovation (Morel and Ramanujam, 1999). Complexity theory enhances an increased amount of interaction within an organisation (Sherif, 2006). The levels of interaction between each unit are typically associated with the presence of feedback mechanisms which are associated with the theory. Price (2004) posits that such interactions produce what is known as non-linearities within the organisation system (Sherif, 2006). Styhre (2002) equally views that complex organisations are dissipative in nature structures, that is, a semi-stable configuration that does not correspond to external pressures and manipulations in a linear manner. Moreover, a dissipative structure absorbs significant external pressure in certain positions, yet can be significantly altered with minor influences in other positions (Fioretti and Visser, 2004; Meek et al., 2007). This makes the organisation become stronger when embarking on change implementation.

The theory increases an organisation’s opportunity to adapt to change, either in time when responding to change or deriving change implementation processes (Byeon, 2005). On the other hand, it strengthens the ability of an organisation to modify or remodel itself in response to environmental disturbances that threaten the adherence to change. However, due its complexity in nature, in time of emergence it may easily head toward a state of chaos and trigger disorderliness within the organisation (Pascale et al., 2000). At this stage, the organisation may break down, leading to total failure. This is why a careful consideration of appropriate management concepts for change implementation is very necessary, as it enables organisational leaders discover the type of integration needed to fast track change implementation.
2.4.7 Importance of Change Models

Understanding the importance of organisational change theories and models is very essential (Anderson and Anderson, 2010), because they help organisational leaders and practitioner to successfully facilitate change framework that will guide change implementation. Change theories help change agents to operate effectively by creating alignments that will help to resolve issues surrounding change implementation (Senior and Swailes, 2010). A clear organisational change model enables a clearer understanding of the perspectives and requirements for organisational change implementation (Sengupta et al., 2006). It enhances the level of people’s involvement and participation in the change process and also shows where emphases are needed. Researchers have argued that a clear organisational model is driven by factors that impact positively on change process and implementation (Hameri and Hintsa, 2009; Shah, 2011).

As noted earlier, the chronological development of organisational change models has played a significant role in helping many organisations to develop and improve their change programmes (Buchanan et al., 2005; Nelissen and van Selm 2008; Appelbaum et al., 2012). Consequently, the lessons from the change models/theories cited earlier will be use to inform the construct of the proposed conceptual framework for the current study. For example, the Eight-Stage process of Kotter’s (1996) model for organisational change creates some guidelines in which organisational change can follow when embarking on a transformational change.

Scholars believe that organisational change implementation must be guided with a comprehensive change implementation framework because it will help change implementation personnel with appropriate direction and criticalities necessary for driving change (Grundy, 1993; Johnson, 2004 Senior and Swailes 2010; Anderson and Ackerman 2010). Tushman et al. (1988) has on the basis of previous studies proposed a model of organisational change that consists of periods of incremental change, discontinuous change and came up with convergent change such as fine-tuning and incremental adaptation. Tushman et al. (1988) intention is to maintain the fit between organisational strategy, structure and process. While fine-tuning aimed at doing better than what is perceived is being done already, incremental adaptation involves small changes in responding to minor shifts in the environment. Both fine-tuning and
incremental adaptation allow organisations to perform more effectively and optimize the consistencies between strategies, structure, people and process. Richard (2000) added that developing a model for organisation change is a strategic approach needed for effective change implementation, and it helps organisation’s corporate culture with systematic direction in line with the right values needed for adoption (Earnest and Shawnta, 2003). Nevertheless, achieving change implementation could mean that organisational leaders will improve on their thinking of integrating managerial concepts in order to create an understanding for sustaining accelerating change implementation.

2.4.8 Integrating Effective Organisational Change Implementation

Ashley et al. (2010) found the need to integrate concepts of change and create synergy between leaders and organisational change implementation processes, emphasising that such interaction programme would enhance a combination of measures that would help guide and sustain a system capable of leading change effectively. Ashley et al., (2010) further states that integrating various organisational measures for improving change will put in place a clear understanding between individuals and organisation and build a broader accountability and ideas for the success of organisational change implementation.

Barriere et al. (2002) believe that it is important for leaders and managers to create ideas of strong relationship with their subordinates when adapting strategies for change implementation in order enhance their change readiness. Therefore, a careful integration of variables such as leadership style, organisational culture type, managerial skills and organisational trust are capable of increasing the level of readiness for change and the impact of organisational change implementation (Holt et al., 2007). For example, Hostetler (2007) viewed that organisation leaders should be encouraged to carry out change projects that are capable of initiating a culture of effectiveness and efficiency. Initiating change within an organisation requires accuracy and careful thought that must be supported with the right personnel and resources (Kotter, 1996). Such change is often successful when there is support by all stakeholders (Schraeder et al., 2005).
Studies have shown that factors responsible for change implementation failures are: style of leadership adopted by organisational leaders (Avolio, 2004; Powell et al., 2008; Northhouse, 2010; Yukl, 2013); types of culture practice in organisations (Quinn and Cameron, 1999; Quinn and Spreitzer, 1991); issues of skills and training (Self, 2007; Sail and Alavi, 2010) and trust (Ben-Gal and Tzafrir, 2011). Other researchers argued that factors that impact on organisational change must be associated with the norms of the organisation in order to increase change implementation efficacy (Hardina et al., 2006; Hardina et al., 2006; Holt et al., 2009; Aspinwall and Elgharib, 2013).

Hameri and Hintsa (2009) and (Shah, 2011) view that organisational leaders most times failed to adhere the critical processes capable of reinforcing organisational change process, such as:

1. Establishing the readiness for change.
2. Establishing the objective for change.
3. Establishing the benefits the change will deliver.
4. Establishing the capability to manage and deliver the change.
5. Recognising the factors that could affect, constrain, block or influence change outcome.
6. Understanding the interdependencies between the change and other change initiatives.
7. Recognising that achieving the outcome will involve a substantial effort.
8. Accepting that everyone involved in or effected by the change must understand the implications of the desired outcomes if the change implemented.

The current study views and adopts factors such as leadership styles, organisational culture types of CVF model, managerial skills, trust and readiness for change as substantial factors that impede or improve organisational change implementation. This is because the organisation under study strongly associates with the perceived factors. More so, there is a strong assertion that social norms and departments/units characteristics are critical factors that could help sustain change implementation in organisations (Harrison and Carroll, 1991; Elbanna, 2007; Reissner, 2011; Gillespie et al., 2011; Lunenburg, 2012).
Bass and Avolio (2004) viewed that transformational, transactional, democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire appears to be the dominant leadership styles in recent times and have been adopted by various organisations as a measure to achieve change, improve performance or sustain competitive advantages. More so, researchers have expressed the relevance and importance of organisational culture of the CVF framework (Denison and Spreitzer, 1991), arguing that it connects the strategic aspects of organisational life by offering different patterns of share values, assumptions and interpretations which defines the organisation’s culture. On the other hand, managerial skills and organisational trust are viewed to have the ability to establish powerful and articulate connection between active participation and commitment (Neves and Caetano, 2009; Neves and Caetano, 2009). In this sense, individual readiness for change, leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills and organisational trust as well as the contextual factors which include: social norms and department/unit characteristics are view as integrated factors for understanding organisational change in this study. Below is a detailed review of these factors and their impact on organisational change implementation.

2.5. Individual Readiness for Organisational Change

Individual readiness for change is defined as the extent to which organisational members are psychologically and behaviourally prepared to implement a proposed organisational change (Rusly et al., 2012). This views organisational readiness for change as a perception based construct, comprised of both leaders and subordinates and their perceived behavioural efficacy to actualise organisational change implementation (Weiner et al., 2008). Holt et al. (2007) believes that organisational readiness for change can be represented by aggregating individual attitudes and cognitive behaviour regarding direction of the organisation.

Self and Schraeder (2009) posit that organisational change is concerned with implementation of new organisational structures, strategies, cultures, and practices throughout the organisation, but must be aligned with organisational members who are the drivers of change. The nature of organisational competitiveness in organisations has continued to force businesses to adopt to change initiatives that will increase their readiness and effectiveness in order to survive the trend and even remain competitive (Susanto, 2008; By, 2007; Shah, 2011).
A study by Lawson and Price (2003) affirms that successful organisations are those who adopt various change initiatives and prepare members to effectively and efficiently drive the change. To this end, such organisations make huge attempts to implement change strategies because the possibility of increasing performance is often high (Lawson and Price, 2003). However, Senior and Swailes (2010) add that readiness for change must involve the right attitude and belief as well as an effective organisational system capable of engaging those responsible for driving the change process.

In recent times, attention has been focussed on individual readiness for change as this is seen as the best preparation for organisational change implementation. Also, the literature has consistently stressed the need for an increasing level of individual readiness for change because of its criticality towards organisational success (Mueller et al. 2012; Goksoy, 2012; Haffar et al., 2013). In line with strategies of implementing change, authors have emphasised the importance of human factor as a consideration for change implementation (Jones et al., 2005; Holt et al., 2007). Hence, ignoring the role of the individuals within the organisation or the change implementation framework may be an impediment to the entire change implementation process (Jones et al., 2005). Rather, individuals should be equipped with the change strategy to increase their ability in order to understand the change process as well as to implement the change effectively.

Jones et al. (2005) view that employees’ negative attitude towards change initiative is a major obstacle that might leads to the change failure. Importantly, researchers in the field of organisational change management have continued to concentrate on a number of factors that might encourage the spirit of readiness to change among organisational leaders as well as assessing the level to which readiness for change causes change implementation success (Jones et al., 2005).

In their study Jones et al. (2005) came up with a concept of change and described readiness for change as “the extent to which organisational members hold a positive views about the need for change (acceptance of change), as well as the extent to which employees believe that such changes are likely to have positive implications for themselves and the wider organisation” (p. 362). Rusly et al. (2012) conceptualised a model for understanding the influence of change readiness. The model posits the
potential implications of change readiness from both psychological and structural dimensions. Knowledge acquisition, creation and sharing processes are put forward as possible areas for continuous research into management effectiveness from a change perspective. Similarly, Mueller et al. (2012) posit that the key prerequisite for successful change in organisations is to understand and develop readiness for change among organisational members. In their work, Mueller et al. (2012) affirmed that the readiness for change is a valid instrument for assessing current behaviour and change commitment both for the individual employee and the organisation. Similarly, Weiner at al.’s (2008) research into readiness for change shows the deliberate efforts leaders and subordinates must do in order to increase the effectiveness that could lead to change implementation.

In an extensive review on organisational readiness for change identify 43 instruments for measuring the construct for change readiness (Weiner et al., 2008). Altogether, they found a small consistency in terminology or conceptualisation and limited evidence of reliability or validity for most currently obtainable instruments. Based on this, Weiner et al. (2008) make the following recommendations. One of which is: the content of an organisational readiness for change instrument should be general enough to enable researchers to use the instrument for a wide range of organisational changes and focus the respondents’ attention to a specific, future organisational change, providing a specific change referent (Weiner, 2009). Furthermore, Weiner (2009) recommended that commitment and change efficacy are very vital dimensions for assessing readiness for change. Mueller et al. (2012) viewed that readiness for change cover the following conceptual basis:

- The individual and the organisation are distinct agents of change. This differentiation is relevant for planning subsequent interventions as it allows analysing which agent’s readiness for change needs to be developed for the change project.
- Both the individual and the organisation also constitute key targets of change.
- Introducing aspects of specific targets of the change initiative and the benefit for both the individual and the organisation.
- Readiness for change is the assumption that attitude and behaviour of both leaders and subordinates must be the underlying efficacy for change.
Based on this conceptual basis, Mueller et al. (2012) further view individual readiness for change as the extent to which an individual is ready to implement change, targeting his own individual health behaviour and promoting a good work environment. Shah (2011) concluded that employees’ development and positive attitudes and behaviours for organisational change are the foundation of that change. Accordingly, the most affected element in an organisational situation process is the employees who develop different thoughts, feelings and behaviours towards the unknown situation. Ilgen and Pulakos (1999) support the need for employees to be motivated, given the right knowledge, attitudes and behavioural patterns for achieving a proposed change.

Social theories have been used to support the process of individual readiness for change in recent times (Hayes, 2010). Such social change theories have helped organisational members with the right attitudes that do lead to change implementation (Hayes, 2010). Weiner et al. (2009) agreed that theories of change have enabled change implementers with new practice and effort in supporting individual readiness for change and on the other hand reducing hindrances in the process of change implementation. Armenakis et al. (1999) identified five message domains which are discrepancy, efficacy, appropriateness, principal support and personal valence. Armenakis and Harris (2002) posit that these five message domains have significant implications in the organisational change process. Armenakis and Harris (2002) argued that the content of these message domains combine to shape individual motivation and support a positive individual readiness to change. The following explains the various message domains:

1. **Discrepancy** – this addresses sentiment as regards to whether change is needed or not and clarifies how the organisation’s current performance differs from some desired state. It enables the organisation to believe in the change they are embarking on and the strategies that help them achieve the change.

2. **Efficacy** – this brings about confidence in the individual ability to succeed in the change. This is consistent with Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory of motivation, affirming that individuals will only be motivated to attempt a change to the extent that they have confidence that they can succeed in the change project.
3. Appropriateness – this helps to check disagreement and hindrances among organisational leaders and subordinates. It is expected that a change message should be convened appropriately to avoid uncertainty and ambiguities. Armenakis et al. (1999) noted that sometimes organisational leaders make mistakes within organisational diagnosis that could lead to inappropriate design of the change structure. The solution: Bringing in appropriate help to check such issues to bring individual readiness to change in an effective manner.

4. Principal Support – the individuals within the change structure need the required change support in terms of the resources and other tools of enhancing commitment to see the change process through. Many change efforts fail due to lack of support and unclear demonstration of the need of perceived change. Nutt’s (1986) study found that the most successful change tactics were those that received great support and encouragement throughout the change process.

5. Personal Valence – most individuals within the change structure (change target) would be interested in ‘what is in it for me’? An individual may be prepared for the change project, but where an individual’s self-interest in threatened then the change might be negatively impacted.

In order to ensure a persuasive effectiveness, Armenakis et al. (1999) developed a strategy named ‘the readiness model’ for conveying the above message (see figure 2.2).
As indicated in the model, it involves direct communication efforts where organisational leaders are expected to lead the way for change. The model emphasises active participation where people would be involved in some kind of design of the process and have basic skills on how to implement change. While the various message seems to impact on change implementation, researchers viewed the need to pay attention to the attitude of employees in order to reduce resistance to change.

2.5.1 Employee Attitude in Organisational Change

Employees are usually a key parameter for a successful implementation of organisational change. Alas and Vadi (2006) agree that the success of organisational change should positively correlate with the skills of the individuals who are responsible for driving the change process. Klewes and Langen’s (2008) study
examined the attitudinal patterns of employees and came up with the following mix of reactions:

1. Those in favour of change can be seen spearheading the change implementation process. They hardly wait for necessary support before they act.
2. Those that are neutral do not really have a well founded opinion on the change project. They have to be positively influenced either by motivation or training.
3. The employees that reject the change are those that will strongly resist the change. They are those who have been in the organisation for a long time and want to cling with the current status quo, therefore it is important to restrict their negative effect.

This is in line with Kim and Mauborgne (2005) four hurdles organisational leader faces when trying to institute organisation change: (1) cognitive; which requires that people must have some understanding of why the change strategy is necessary; (2) Inevitably; changing an organisation will require shifting resources away from some area to the most needed area; (3) motivation: ultimately, employees would want to make the change, mobilization can be a challenge; and (4) the need for institutional politics where policies are the main driver for the change.

2.5.2 Resistance to Change

Organisational members may feel uncomfortable responding to change and express pains when confronted with change motives (Erwin and German, 2010). Studies have stressed that the reason for failures of many change initiatives are found in the resistance from employees (Strebel, 1996; Maurer, 1996) who feel uncertain, not knowing where to go, what to expect, what the future will look like, how they can reach the future, what kind of people and characters they would meet after the change process has been completed.

Organisational members are often afraid of change because they fear losing control of the known status quo and enter into unknown working conditions and an unpredictable future (Carnell, 1986; Erwin and German, 2010). Thus, a change process is immensely personal and involves employees’ emotions and their response
to change (Nair, 2008). This is why employees are sceptical about contributing to change processes (Erwin and German, 2010).

Considering Armenakis and Bedain’s (1999) study when they reviewed works published during the 1990s identified several areas in which greater methodological attention for organisational change is needed: for example, content (“what”), context (salient environmental factors affecting the organisation), and process (“how,” including the phases of change occurring over time).

During the process, Armenakis and Bedain (1999) reviewed stage models of organisational change such as Judson’s (1991) five phases of organisational change, and Kotter’s (1995) proposed eight steps for effective change. In response to this, Armenakis and Bedain (1999) drew attention to individual reactions to organisational change, or how organisational change is interpreted and responded to by members of the organisation. In reviewing the work of Isabella’s (1990) which proposes a four-stage model which are: anticipation (information about how the change is assembled), conformation (the implications of change beginning were understood), culmination (pre-change and post-change results are compared and assimilated), and aftermath (consequences of the change are evaluated). Jaffe et al.’s (1994) model suggested four reactions organisational members experience as they move through the change process: denial (refusal to believe the change will be implemented); resistance (not participating or attempting to avoid implementation); exploration (experimentation with new behaviours); and commitment (accepting or embracing the change). A recent study has linked resistance to changes to barriers which emanate from the attitude of people (Hurn, 2012), where those involved in the change project do not have the right attitude and will therefore definitely hinder the change process.

Bolman and Deal (2003) view the barriers to organisational change in four different frames; firstly, the human resource frame; which includes change, include anxiety, uncertainty, and feelings of incompetence and neediness; secondly, the structural frame: barriers include loss of clarity and stability, confusion, and chaos; thirdly, the political frame: barriers of change include disempowerment, and conflict between winners and losers; and lastly, the symbolic frame: barriers include loss of meaning and purpose, and clinging to the past.
Bolman and Deal (2003) believe that restructuring, recruiting, and retraining can be powerful levers for organisational change. They suggest the following strategies to overcome barriers of change: for the human resource frame, training to develop new skills, participation and involvement, as well as psychological support; for the structural frame, communicating, realigning and renegotiating formal patterns and policies; for the political frame, creating arenas where issues can be renegotiated and new coalitions formed; and for the symbolic frame, creating transition rituals by mourning the past and celebrating the future. This clearly shows that organisational change touches different aspects that affect members of the organisations in order to support change implementation.

Equally, Strebel (1996) noticed that organisational change failed to be effective because most times managers and their subordinates see change differently. For example, for many leaders, change means opportunities for the business and for themselves, and for many employees, change is seen as disruptive and intrusive (Strebel, 1996). Therefore, it is important leaders create a balance that is acceptable to them and their subordinates and how that will benefit them and sustain organisation success (Hurn, 2012).

Researchers view that it is better all members of the organisation work hard to strengthen the intra-organisational apparatus in order to reduce change resistance (Mabin et al., 2001; Stanley et al., 2005 Erwin and German, 2010). Erwin and German (2010) confirmed that researchers have challenged the perspective of resistance to change because it precludes some of the more positive aspects and intentions of resistance. For example, Mabin et al. (2001) proposed that resistance may be useful, and that it can be productively harnessed to help challenge and refine strategic and action plans and improve the quality of decision making. More so, resistance may be a productive response to perceived wrong (change) actions that may not be in the best interest of the organisation (Oreg, 2006).

In support of organisational change practice, Erwin and German’s (2010) study attempted to answer the question: what practice guidance do the findings of recent research provide to organisational change agents and managers in addressing individual resistance to organisational change? In an attempt to answer this question a full range of discussions will provide insights into the cognitive, affective, and
behavioural dimensions of resistance, and discover how various personality differences and individual concerns influence resistance, and what change agents and managers might be able to do in order to appropriately influence resistance (Erwin and German, 2010). One of such discussion is of goal achievement and the compatibility of change with organisational culture, and the goals of the persons affected. Also, one discussion is of organisational commitment to influence change which also includes the dimensions of attachment, effort, and loyalty to change.

Resistance involves the level of enthusiasm for the change initiative (Erwin and German, 2010). This is linked to the concepts of trust, scepticism and cynicism (Stanley et al., 2005; Oreg’s 2006). Oreg (2006) examined the relationships between employees and leaders/managers and change agents, as well as the styles they employed when influencing change, and found that lack of trust in management was significantly associated with resistance to organisational change.

Stanley et al. (2005) explored the concepts of scepticism and cynicism and their relationships to resistance to change and ascertained that trust in management involved individuals’ perceived confidence levels in the ability of management to lead effective change and what is best for the organisation and its members. Oreg (2006) believes that a lack of faith in management had a significant association with all types of resistance (cognitive, affective, and behavioural), and particularly with employee’s cognitive analysis of the change initiative. Oreg (2006) equally ascertained that lack of trust in management was strongly related to reports of anger, frustration, and anxiety, increased action against the change initiative and, negative evaluations of the need for such change.

In relation to scepticism and cynicism, Oreg’s (2006) study confirmed that employee scepticism doubted the capability of management to achieve the anticipated change and was related to employee perceptions of management’s abilities to achieve change. It was also found that employees tended to be cynical (which they defined as a disbelief in management motives) about organisational change when they were cynical about management in general.

In another development, Stanley et al. (2005) indicated that cynicism seemed to be a reaction to experiences within the organisation rather than a pre-disposition of the
individual. Also, without change organisational members cannot develop and move further, hence making risks obsolete (Pritchard, 2010). However, for change to be successful organisations must undergo restructuring and reformation which has to do with culture transformation (Wierdsma and Hemsbergen, 2009). Also, leadership activities should be engaged by all leaders during the change process in order to simultaneously influence various dimensions of the organisation.

However, Kim and Mauborgne (2005) suggest what they called a ‘tipping point’ approach in dealing with change resistance and problems of organisational change initiatives. This involves:

1. Acknowledge that you cannot convert everyone at once. Starts with the employees who you know have disproportionate influence in the organisation. Get such employees committed to the change, or, failing that, get them out. Once they are committed to change, shine a spotlight on their accomplishment in order for others to get the message.
2. Do not just lecture employees on the need for change but rather find ways of getting them to experience the harsh realities for making change effective.
3. Look for a way to redistribute resources that results in large change, and away from ‘cold spots’ or areas with large resource demands, but relatively low impact.
4. Appoint a consigliere: a highly respected insider who knows who is fighting the change process, and who is supporting the change process, and who knows what is needed to build coalitions and devise strategies to sustain the change. It is believed that managers or organisational leaders run the risk of losing touch with what is really happening underneath them, hence a good consigliere can go long way toward addressing the problem.

2.5.3 The Influence of Individual Readiness for Change on Organisational Change

Individual readiness for change has been the fundamental and mediating factor that has been used to support organisational effectiveness and success (Jones et al., 2005; Weiner, 2009; Haffar et al., 2013). Various writers have argued that the level of readiness for change has a significant impact on the success of implementing organisational change objectives (Lines, 2005; Helfrich et al., 2009), thus affirming
that where the level of readiness for change is low it will in turn affect the rate of change implementation, which will be likely to cause resistance.

Cameron and Green (2012) believe that individual readiness for change is the heart of everything in organisation responding to change, and once individuals have the motivation and are ready to participate in the change process their level of self-awareness in line with achieving the change objectives will be increased. More so, individual readiness for change will enhance a collective share of organisational values and beliefs by increasing organisational member’s capability to execute the action involved in change implementation. Change efficacy is high when members of the organisation share a sense of collective underling behaviour capable of implementing change. But, where individual readiness for change is least considered might lead to a potential change resistance and change failure (Newton, 2007).

Resistance to change is believed to be the biggest barrier to the implementation of any change programme (Mueller et al., 2012). Also, the impact of the level of individual readiness for change on the success of organisational change is stressed in past studies (Smith, 2005; Mueller et al., 2012). They found that individual readiness for change is a valid instrument for assessing subcomponents of current behaviour and commitment for organisational change, both for the individual and the organisation as an agent of change, as well as achieving and sustaining effective change implementation.

Organisational change is implemented from one transition of state to another (Newton, 2007) and this may not be achieved without the support for individual readiness for change, because individual readiness for change is a fundamental factor which involved members of the organisation initial support for change initiatives (Cameron and Green, 2012). Authors have concluded that an increasing level of change readiness will have a significant impact on effective change implementation (Shah, 2011; Haffar et al., 2013). These studies viewed that a low level of change readiness will result to change implementation failure. In another development, Holt et al. (2007) and Rusly et al. (2012) shows that a high level of individual readiness for change will have a positive influence on organisational change implementation. This means the organisational members who have a positive feeling about change implementation will demonstrate higher level of involvement toward implementing change effectively.
It is expected that where the attention of individual readiness for change is high in the NNPC, the value for, and perception of, implementation of the ongoing change will be high as well. More details of this section are better evidenced in the data analysis and discussion sections of this research. However, a lot of concern has been raised about the role organisational leaders play in actualising the impact of implementing organisational change hence the next section reviews various leadership styles and their impact on organisational change implementation. Leadership has been largely researched as a major factor affecting organisational change implementation, however the type of leadership style organisational leaders adopt when leading change implementation remains a major concern for both organisational leaders and practitioner (Ivey and Kine, 2010). The next section discussed leadership and its impact on organisational change implementation.

2.6 Leadership

This section review leadership and its impact on organisational change implementation. Various leadership styles are introduced in this study and the study is expected to measure their impact on readiness for change and organisational change implementation. They are: transformational, transactional, democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles which appear to be the dominant leadership strategies currently adopted by various organisations in recent time (Bass and Avolio, 1994).

Scholars in the academic literature of leadership argue that leadership holds two mutually exclusive interpretative schools of thought. One holds that leaders are born (Grint, 2000), and that the qualities they embody are subliminal (Lowen, 1975), while the other posits that humans beings would need to work hard in order to develop qualities before they can emerge as good leaders (Kakabadse and Myers, 1996; Kakabadse and Kakabadse, 1999; Henrikson, 2006).

The “great man” theory of leadership (Carlyle, 2007) exemplifies the former view and is interested in the personality traits which leaders intrinsically possess (Kakabadse and Kakabadse, 1999). This approach assumes that a “great man” naturally holds essential skills which allow him to function as a leader. By identifying these essential traits, others can emulate them through simulated versions of leadership (Lawler, 2005). When applying this approach, scholars analyse specific tasks or problems and
provide leadership typologies for addressing them (Hersey and Blanchard, 1993; Bass and Avolio, 1994). Scholars have equally explored the behaviour of leaders, the impact of context or “situation” on leadership (Yukl, 2013), the function of leadership (Shamir, 1995), as well as “contingency” and dynamic processes (Fiedler, 1967).

Both the behavioural perspective as well as the economic model examines leadership as a role whose purpose is to assist organisations to adapt to specific change with the participation of competent individuals to help in adaptive change (Kotter, 1990; Nanus, 1995; Heifetz, 1998). Over the past decades, researchers studying leadership have found it difficult to ascertain a single way to leadership. However, basic knowledge of leadership is available, but the details are hard to specify (Bass and Stogdill, 1990). These details include the complexity of the construct of leadership (Bass and Stogdill, 1990), the difficulty of forming a single definition or theoretical perspective from many possible options (Edmunds and Yewchuk, 1996), and the lack of valid and reliable measures of leadership ability (Edmunds, 1998). In 1999 alone, more than 2,000 books on leadership were published (Goffee and Jones, 2000). Between the year 2000 and 2014, more than 5,000 published articles contained the keywords ‘leadership’ and ‘leadership development and styles. This shows how vast the area of the study and theories of leadership is.

2.6.1 Meaning of Leadership

Experts in the study of leadership have given numerous meanings to leadership, for example, some scholars view leadership as a process of influencing people to achieve an organisational objective in such a way that makes it more coherent and cohesive (Bennis and Namus, 1985). Studies view leadership as a process of leading people in the right direction in order to achieve set objectives, another group of scholars view leadership as a process that ensures successfully accomplishing desired goals through motivating people to excel in specific areas (Crawford et al, 1997; Jogulu and Wood, 2006; Northouse, 2010).

Winston and Patterson (2006) defined leadership as an attempt to equip, train, and influence subordinates who have diverse gifts, abilities, and skills, to focus on organisational mission and objectives. Winston and Patterson (2006) further noted that
leaders are enthusiastic people who ensure that subordinates are emotional and physically coordinated to achieve the organisational mission and objectives.

Related research on leadership shows that leadership also exists in the minds of both the leaders and those led (Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio, 2004). Hofstede et al. (2010) confirm that statements from those who are led are a better reflection of the actual meaning of leadership. Carlyle (2007) also argued that the understanding of leadership can best be summarised in terms of an interdependent relationship between structure, process and outcome. Similarly, Gill (2006) posits that leadership entails having the skills and capabilities of creating a vision for inspiring trust, including team building and emotional intelligence.

The literature on leadership evidences that leaders accomplish their tasks through innovative flexible means of education, training, support, and protection that provide subordinates with what they need within the reason and scope of the organisation’s resources to accomplish objectives (Bass, 1985). Leadership has over the years evolved as a crucial aspect of management for stimulating subordinates to change their motives, beliefs, values and capabilities so that their own interests and personal goals become congruent with organisational change processes, which make leadership very interesting, important and effective (Bass, 1985; Gill, 2006; Hofstede et al., 2010).

2.6.2 Importance of Leadership in Organisational Change

The importance of leadership in maintaining organisational success has been given increasing prominence in research, policy and practice (Crawford et al, 1997). Whilst there are differences in the interpretation of what is meant by ‘leadership’ there is also a consensus of research and opinion that points to the interdependence of improving workers’ achievement. In their study, James and Connolly (2000) confirm that effective change and organisational improvement resulted from good quality of leadership.

Leadership has helped numerous organisations to focus on moving business forward and sustaining business strategies and change. It is important also to note that leaders and leadership theories are crucial to all components of organisation and have
contributed to the development of organisation change and implementation (Oshagbemi and Ocholi, 2006; Northouse, 2010). For example, leadership theories such as transformational and democratic have been adopted by various organisations for the purposes of increasing productivity and effectiveness (Avery, 2004; Pastor and Mayo, 2008; Powell et al., 2008).

2.6.3 The Relationship between Leadership and Organisational Change

Scholars who introduced the four basic leadership styles or what other referred to as the behavioural leadership theories tend to answer questions about what behaviours make a leader more effective and efficient (Bratton et al., 2005). This area of study began in the 1960’s after the arguments on traits theories failed to adequately establish what could make a good leader and the ability to distinguish between one leader and another (Zastrow and Kirst-Ashman, 2009). Afterwards researchers began to pay attention to the behaviour exhibited by some leaders at specific points (Sapru, 2013), which began to attract the attention of behavioural theories to provide more vital information on the nature of leadership. More precisely, theorists of leadership behaviour were concerned with critical aspects of behaviours that could determine a good leader (Maurik, 2001). Also the study at Iowa University conducted by Lewin and his associates explores three leadership behaviour types namely; autocratic leadership, democratic or participative and laissez-faire leadership styles (Avery, 2004). The study attaches the following explanations to the three leadership types:

**Autocratic leadership style:** is where leaders have absolute power over subordinates or a team. Here the employees have little or no contributions in decision making even where such decisions would create an opportunity for them (Sapru, 2013). The leader centralised authority, dictated methods of work and limited employees’ suggestions (Avery, 2004), this leadership style usually leads to high staff turnover or absenteeism.

**Democratic leadership style:** unlike autocratic, the democratic leader tends to involve subordinates and hence, considers their suggestions in decision making. Delegating authority is encouraged as well as a fair level of participation in deciding on work methods and goals. Sapru (2013) agrees that democratic behaviour encourages feedback and gives opportunity for training or coaching. Avery, (2004) equally affirms that it increases job satisfaction and enables skills development. Self-
confidence is enhanced among employees. More so, employees are ensured of feeling in control of their own destiny and able to promote what they want. With this type, workers are motivated to effectively and efficiently engage with their job well by more than just a financial reward (Avery, 2004). In another development, Spance’s (2009) study shows that democratic leadership style enables organisational leaders to actively engaged subordinates by encouraging them to increase their inputs and participation as well as providing support and facilitating interaction. Spence (2009) study shows further shows that democratic leadership behaviour was better enhancing feedback and creasing work alignment among employees.

**Laissez-faire leadership style:** in English this means “leave it be” or “let things ride” and is described as a leadership behaviour that allows or gives complete freedom for employees to get on with their work (Sapru, 2013). This approach hardly encourages feedback and the leader makes little effort to help his/her subordinate satisfy or accomplish tasks (Northouse, 2010). An example of laissez-faire leadership behaviour is where a manager of a small manufacturing firm, who hardly calls meetings with his/her plant supervisors, has no long-range plan for the firm and barely makes contact with employees (Northouse, 2010). The Lewin’s study at *Iowa University* found that, the group with an autocratic leader was more dissatisfied and behaviour was either more aggressive or apathetic. While the group with laissez-faire behaviour showed no particular dissatisfaction, and had ineffective input, low productivity as well as low performance (Sapru, 2013). However, the group with a democratic leader showed more co-operation and enjoyment, evidence of a high performance level and there was evidence of good contributions to both good quality and good quality of work (Northouse, 2010).

Lewin aimed to show that the democratic style achieves better results (Arnold and Randall, 2010). Though, social and cultural influences undermined their finding to some extent, the study nevertheless suggests numerous benefits of democratic behaviour (Sapru, 2013). Other discussions of democratic leadership behaviour pointed out that it do not only allow the subordinates to be involved in the work but it allows three main elements, namely: Distributing responsibility, Empowerment, and Aiding deliberation (Gastil, 1994). These three elements ensure employees’ maximum involvement and participation, giving responsibilities to employees, setting instructions by avoiding unproductive roles, as well as encouraging individual
participation in problem solving. Keller and Dansereau (1995) agreed that the use of empowerment by leaders can both help achieve the performance they want from subordinates and increase subordinates’ satisfaction with their leadership.

The work of Tannenbaum and Schmidt in (1958) entitled “How to choose a Leadership Pattern” expressed a continuum ranging from behaviour between leaders and subordinates that focused on manager-centred leadership and subordinate-centred leadership (Maurik, 2001). The main emphasis in the continuum is the use of some management measures by managers to focus on their subordinates in order to take possible actions and make good decisions. The continuum which has seven different approaches was described as follows:

1. The leader/manager permits subordinates (followers) to function with the scope of design, with confidence in the subordinate and only wishes to conduct an occasional check on activities.
2. The leader/manager makes provisions within which the group (followers) operate and then allows subordinates to make their decisions as to how they would undertake the tasks.
3. The problem is presented to subordinates by the leader or manager, who asks them to make suggestions about solutions in solving the problem and make a head way.
4. Leader/manager makes thoughtful decisions that are subject to change before presenting such to the team (followers).
5. Leader/manager invites team and seeks their opinion about organisational issues but make their own input where necessary.
6. Leader/manager imposes decisions without considering adequate deliberations from the team.
7. When the leader/manager makes a decision, it is announced to the group and everybody is expected to work accordingly.

The criticism here is that the relationship between leaders and followers cannot be cordial as most of the decisions were imposed on the followers by their leaders (Maurik, 2001). More so, in view of three leadership styles, the democratic style has been adopted in various studies but faced forms of criticism (Maurik, 2001). However, it was viewed that with the democratic leadership style it is better to encourage a
greater leader and follower relationship which is equally geared to move organisations forward.

Scholars equally argued that leaders and employees relationship should be democratically based because it gives a better recognition to the choice they make when engaged in organisational success (Mostovicz et al., 2009). Such a relationship is also capable of creating an organisational learning process, as described by Senge et al. (1999), in order to shape a common and evolving future. Loermans (2002) added that it enhances knowledge management and better emotional understanding among employees.

In another development, Avery (2004) argued that in order to increase the interaction between leaders, followers and colleagues in a change implementation process, organisational leaders should base their interaction on situations that the organisation intends to use to achieve its objectives. A study of leadership carried out in the University of Michigan in 1947 with an extensive investigation of leadership development shows a strong relationship between leadership behaviour and organisational success (Warrick, 1981). The study at the University of Michigan group identified two styles of leader which are Employee Centred (supervisor) and Production Centred leaders.

The study found that Employee Centred leaders or supervisors spent more time in actual supervisory activities in organisations and less time performing tasks similar to those performed by subordinates (Warrick, 1981). They used general supervision rather than close supervision, and often takes a personal interest in employees and were less punished when made mistakes (Warrick, 1981). On the other hand, Product Centred supervisor spent less time in actual supervisory practices such as planning, more time performing tasks similar to those subordinates performed, used close supervision and ensure that punishment were made for mistakes.

The Ohio State University and University of Michigan leadership studies have stimulated a considerable interest in leadership theory and has lead the way numerous study of leadership such as Hersey and Blanchard (1969) leadership theory, Keith (1981) human behaviour at work and Blake and Mouton (1964) managerial grid. These studies identified two basic dimensions of leadership which resulted in four basic leadership styles such as Autocratic Leader (with high emphasis on performance
but very emphasis on worker warfare), Laissez Faire Leader (with low emphasis on performance and employees or subordinates), Human Relation Leader (with low emphasis on performance but high emphasis on people), Democratic Leader (with high emphasis on performance and people, see Table 2.3

**Table 2.1: The Four Basic Leadership Styles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Human Relations Leader</th>
<th>Democracy Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasized on performance and high emphasis on people. They assumes that people are honest, trustworthy, self-motivated and want to be involved and participate in supportive work environment that can lead to happy working system. This leadership style which is closely related to transformational leadership style relies on teamwork, human relations, participative decision-making and harmony and fellowship towards task completion.</td>
<td>High emphasis on performance and people. These set of leaders assumes that most people are honest, trustworthy and are willing to work hard to accomplish meaningful achievement. They strive for a well organised and challenging workplace environment with a clear objectives and responsibilities. They motivate and manage individuals and groups in using their full potential in reaching achieving the objectives of the organisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laissez-faire leaders</th>
<th>Autocratic Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Characterized on low emphasis on performance and people. They assume that people are unpredictable and uncontrollable and the leader’s job is to keep a low profile and stay out of trouble or leave people alone as much as possible. But relies on abdicating to whoever will rise to the occasion to get the work done.</td>
<td>Low emphasis on people, but high on performance. They assume that people are lazy, irresponsible and can never be trusted therefore planning, organising, controlling and decision making should be accomplished by the leader with minimal employee involvement. They often rely on authority, control, power, manipulation and hard work to accomplished tasks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Blake and Mouton (1964) study which developed the Managerial Grid is viewed as a transition theory between leadership theories and the contingency theories by Blake and Mouton (1978). In their study, Blake and Mouton (1978) described the two basic dimensions of leadership as Concern for organisational effectiveness and production which is at the horizontal axis of the grid and Concern for people at the vertical axis that represents the concern for maturity and healthy relations among those engaged in
production. The term concern for as used in the grid is a theoretical variable which reflects the basic attitudes and styles of control (Awan and Mahmood, 2010). However, it does not reflect actual production as well as effectiveness. This theory results in five basic styles of leadership such as: A production Pusher, Do Nothing Manger, Organisational Man, Country Club Manager and the Team Builder (Awan and Mahmood, 2010).

This leadership theory is considered transitional for the following reason: First, the two dimensions of the theory are interdependent rather than independent. Secondly, the dimensions are associated with the basic attitudes rather than specific behaviours. This makes it possible for a leader to exhibit a variety of behaviours while using the same style to manage organisation, either it encourages flexibility and the thirdly importance points out to the inconsistency in conceptualizing the different leadership styles. Blake and Mouton (1978) maintained that when the Managerial Grid model is used, behavioural science research consistently supports the ability of managers to consider art of flexibility when applying their leadership styles. This approach or contingency approach to leadership let to the current study of the two most popular transformational and transactional leadership theories which affirmed that the behaviour of leaders can be described and evaluated (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985; Bass and Avolio, 1993; Yukl, 1994), and can increase people’s readiness to implement organisational change.

2.6.4 Transformational and Transactional Leadership Styles

According to Stone et al. (2004) transformational leadership was first initiated by Burns (1978) to improve the process where leaders and followers engage in a mutual process of raising one another to a high level of morality and motivation. It has also been described as a process through which leaders effect a radical change in the behaviour of subordinates (Jabnoun and Rasasi, 2005). Transformation and transaction leadership theories have become popular concepts in recent times (Northouse, 2010; Sheaffer et al., 2011). Also, Stone et al. (2004) state that researchers and practitioners around the World have adopted both theories in a variety of organisations; either changing the management focus or used to correct a particular situation.

Cardona (2000) defines transactional leadership as an economically based exchange relationship which promotes uniformity by providing extrinsic (positive or negative)
rewards to co-workers, whilst transformational leadership theory enhances a work-based exchange relationship that promotes teamwork and team building by providing fairer extrinsic rewards which appeal to the intrinsic motivation of the collaborators. Transactional leadership theory, on the other hand, focuses on the basic management process of controlling, organising, and short team planning; also it encourages exchange of awareness, motivation and self-interest rather than self and organisational interest (Northouse, 2010). Transactional leaders are often influential because it is in the interest of subordinates to do what the leader wants (Avery, 2004) by interaction and negotiable agreement. Avery (2004) further states that transactional leadership is dependant to a great extent on the leader’s skill, confidence in choosing direction and obtains the followers cooperation to be effective. More so, leaders with transactional theory motivate, direct, control, develop and teach followers with relevant skills (Bratton et al., 2005). Avery (2004) again pointed out that transactional leaders tend to:

1. Possess some expertise or knowledge that the team accept as relevant.
2. Be skilful at negotiation, persuasion and motivating others.
3. Be accepted as the most appropriate person to lead the group at the time.

Crawford (2005) used the phrase ‘the ability to cultivate the need of the followers in a follower centred manner’ and this aligns with Fein et al. (2010) suggesting that transactional leadership theory is engaged with the structuring of organisational performance to assist employees in achieving goals, objectives and receiving rewards where necessary.

Transformational leadership style focuses on creating changes in followers’ values, self-perceptions, and psychological needs for organisational development (Pastor and Mayo, 2008). This suggests that transformational and transactional theories may add value to workers’ relationships at the workplace. But, while transactional leader looks into promoting economic and social justice of employees, transformational leaders promote an articulate and compelling vision for the future and establish the difference between success and failure (Avery, 2004).

Transformational and transactional leadership theories have attracted more attention than other leadership theories in recent times as they both enhance emotional intelligence through contingent reward, which is also referred to as constructive
transaction (Barling et al., 2000) and ensures successful quality implementation of organisational objectives (Waldman et al., 1990; Jabnoun and Rasasi, 2005). Despite the arguments concerning the differences of transformational and transactional leadership, Cardona (2000) confirmed that a transformational leader is an enriched transactional leader. Similarly, Bass and Avolio (1994) agreed that transformational leadership theory is an expansion of transactional leadership. Also, Mykytyn et al. (1994) described this as knowledge acquisition which consequently leads to better organisational performance (Politis, 2005).

Powell et al. (2008) are of the view that transformational leadership is gender oriented (feminine trait), positively associated with nurturance in organisations and supports gender balance in management. Raoprasert and Islam (2010) equally state the importance of ‘harmony’ as working behaviour which indicates smooth, kind, conflict-free, non-assertive, humility and politeness amongst people in the workplace. Such behaviour enables a pleasant working environment which helps people to be happy, stay motivated and encourages long-term relationships and commitment from top-to-bottom and vice versa.

Consequently, it will reduce Hofstede and Hofstede’s (2005) power distance and individualism in organisations. Barling et al. (2000) also noted that transformational leadership consists of idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration. A transformational leader engages in moral uplifting of their followers, sharing mutually rewarding visions of success and this empowers the followers to transform organisational vision into realities and makes them sustainable (Cardona, 2000). Hater and Bass (1988) and Barling et al. (2000) further suggest that transformational leadership enhances subordinate satisfaction and trust in organisations.

In addition, Politis (2002) also suggests that transformational leadership enhances employee attitudes and performance. It is equally proven that the theory helps to enhance objective performance measures such as sales volume, profit margin, and stock product performance (Geyer and Steyer, 1998; Howell and Avolio, 1993; Politis, 2002) in addition to employees’ satisfaction and commitment to organisations (Barling et al., 2000).
A study by Ivey and Kine (2010) confirmed that transformational leadership theory is rated as one of the most popular theoretical frameworks in the leadership area and has been lauded for its superior, positive relationship to subordinate satisfaction, performance motivation, effectiveness and commitment (Kane and Tremble, 2000; Judge and Piccolo, 2004). Xirasagar (2008) refers to it as a scale of management improvement technique that favours the male and female gender. Furthermore, there is substantial evidence which shows that transformational and transactional leadership theories stimulate stronger organisational strength since they encourage followers to maximise their full potential by going beyond their believed capabilities in pursuit of a common goal (Powell et al., 2008; Eid et al., 2008; Pastor and Mayo, 2008). Barnett et al. (2001) and Limsila and Ogunlana (2008) conclude that transactional leaders encourage management by active exception and hence monitor followers to ensure that mistakes are corrected as quickly as needed.

**2.6.5 Challenges of Leadership Styles**

According to Pounder (2003) transformational leaders are associated with challenges of subordinates who are not creative or critically thinking towards goal achievement and ways of finding solutions to solving problems. Eid et al. (2008) also argued that, at some point, leaders and managers who consider transformational theory fail to master all components of the theory and as a result they underperform and the organisational goals are not met as expected. Barling et al.’s (1996) study affirmed that the absence of initiating programmes to support improvement reduces the progress of implementation and hence causes failure in the end.

For example, a study conducted within a Canadian institution found that training is the key catalyst for the success of adopting a predominant leadership style (Barling et al., 1996). Equally, Walumba et al. (2007) argue that one of the challenges leaders faced when adopting leadership styles was due to the complexity of employees’ behaviour and attitudes, especially from an individualist culture.

This suggests that managers or leaders that are familiar with leadership styles need to take adequate consideration and put in place measures to overcome such behaviour. Crawford (2005) also noted that leaders under such jurisdictions are sometimes faced with problems of cost innovation, and the inability to manage modern technology, information and knowledge. Investigation by Crawford and Strohkirch (2002) on the
relationship between leadership styles and organisation change implementation suggests that leadership requires further investigation based on ‘problems perfection’. Other major limitations of these leadership styles include communicating clear expectations about effectiveness, effort and commitment to the task at hand (Pastor and Mayo, 2008).

In addition, another challenge associated with behaviour of both leaders and followers, is where leaders’ failed to show concern for their followers’ welfare. Such leaders should have engaged their followers in frequent dialogue on improving strategies and moving the organisation forward. Doing so may help followers reframe problems and approach old situations in innovative ways, enhancing teamwork rather than criticizing individual members’ for their mistakes (Pastor and Mayo, 2008). Davis (2006) noted that other challenges associated with leaders in organisations also include ethics and values which are the platform for developing the transformational process and trust.

Despite the challenges faced by organisational leaders, studies have proven that the relevant theories are characterized with leader-follower connections (Walumba et al., 2007). Thus the leaders’ interaction and relationship with followers are guided by mutual goals of improved performance, development and achievement. This can be achieved through commitment from followers when leaders attend to emotions, values, ethics, and long-term goals.

Eid et al. (2008) agreed that transactional leadership enhances the use of contingent reward, and enables leaders to provide positive reinforcement that is contingent upon performance. Studies of leadership have identified numerous achievements of shared goals in organisations which are often referred to as a ‘final objective’ (Burns, 1978; Love, 2005). This final objective is however achieved through learning and training for better performance, teamwork and productivity. Foster et al. (2008) outlines some principles that designers may want to incorporate more deliberately into their leadership training and development programmes (Table 2.2).
Table 2.2: Principles of Leadership Training and Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Learning principle</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | Set up opportunities for social interaction and thereby for the co-construction of new knowledge and understanding | Small group problem solving  
Large and small group discussions |
| 2   | Activate prior knowledge                                                          | Brainstorming and concept maps                                             |
| 3   | Determine the zone of proximal development of participants                         | Provide activities for both group and individual to tap into current or prior knowledge and understanding |
| 4   | Create situations of cognitive conflict                                            | Present new situations or problems for consideration that are just beyond their level of competence |
| 5   | Provide facilitator scaffolding                                                   | Be ready with hints, cues, facts, stories to present in just the right amount and at just the right time to facilitate the construction of new connections |
| 6   | Provide opportunities for peer scaffolding                                        | Organize groups with respect to the extent of prior knowledge. Provide problem solving activities just above their current level of competence |
| 7   | Provide opportunities for developing conceptual frameworks                         | Offer activities that necessitate combining learning from various sessions/time periods |

Source: Foster et al., (2008)

Hallinger (2011) agreed that the table above helps organisations to ask managerial questions such as; what, why and how. For example, “what” refers to the constructs analysed, or the target of theorising, “how” explains the methods we use to create interrelationships between constructs of the theory and “why” represents the conceptual assumptions behind the relationships.

In contemporary leadership theories the “what” represents the goal that the leader helped to attain, the “how” explains the ways in which the leader reaches such goals, and the “why” explains the reasons behind selecting the particular method for attaining such goals (Northouse, 2004). An understanding of the components as outlined in Table 2.2 above would be achieved with the application of behavioural theories (Bratton et al., 2005) which could equally encourage a learning culture among practitioners.
2.6.6 The Impact of Leadership on Readiness for Change and Change Implementation

Leadership is considered a major factor that may influence organisational change (Yukl, 2013). Early theories have tried to define various leadership styles and relate them to organisational performance and change. More so, researchers in the field of organisational performance focus mainly on the subordinates’ perspective and also came up with leadership theories such as transformational and transactional (Bass, 1985; Burns, 1978). The theories strongly support the argument about employees’ job performance, workplace environment and relationships.

From a different approach, different studies also draw the attention of the impact of leadership on change readiness and change implementation, stating that effective and people oriented leadership styles are better engaged organisational members to efficiently and effective participate in organisational change implementation (Northouse, 2010; Kacmar and Baron, 1999; Valle and Perrewe, 2000). For example, many organisations have benefited from the characteristics of transformational and democratic leadership styles because they were better engaging subordinates by increasing their level of participation in order to increase the level of change implementation (O’Connor and Morrison, 2001; Adams et al., 2002). Most of the management and leadership styles have relied on the definition of organisational governance as behaviour strategically designed to influence organisational performance, especially in African countries (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007). Vigoda-Gadot, (2007) viewed that such leadership styles often have pressures on organisational politics which most times result to a negative image in the workplace especially where the policies that could emanate from the fact that such organisations’ corporate strategy did not adhere to the aims and objectives of the organisation.

While, critiques have related most organisational failures to wrong organisational politics, others feel that organisational policy should be related to leadership styles that promote fairness, equity, and justice in the workplace environment (Kacmar and Ferris, 1991; Ferris and Kacmar, 1992; Vigoda-Gadot, 2003). Putting this simply, Burns (1978) uses transformational and transactional leadership theories to differentiate what likely would be care in a contemporary organisation. Thus, the influence of organisational policies should function in accordance with the
transformational leader objectives because they believe that if properly aligned, its outcome would benefit the entire organisation (Vigoda-Gadot, 2003).

This approach could equally be based on the relationship between the leader and his employees that inspires and breaks the cycle of subordinates’ basic expectations. This kind of leadership approach urges employees to engage onto new and challenging objectives with the urge to improve organisational standards. Transformational leadership, in line with policies that would move the organisation forward, is a very good tool that would lift the employees’ awareness of their need to grow, validates self expression, and motivates people to perform effectively (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007).

Vigoda-Gadot (2007) developed a research model (Figure 2.3) that suggests a relationship between leadership style, organisational politics, and employees’ performance. The model was based on building a political theory of leadership in organisations. The model examines perceptions of organisational politics as a mediator in the relationship between leadership and performance and change. The rationale for the model is based on other theories such as the leader-member exchange theory (Graen, 1976; Wang et al., 2005), expectation theory (Vroom, 1964) and the social-exchange theory (Blau, 1964). These theories affirm the leaders’ responsibility to create an organisational atmosphere with the spirit of mutuality, fairness, and accomplishment of the expectations and needs of the individuals and the managerial cadre, as well as the organisation as a whole to build on the required capacity to increase the level of change implementation.
Enhancing fair social exchange relations may reduce the level of intervention that would negatively influence organisational change implementation. Ferris and Rowland (1981) argued that the leaders’ behaviour affects employee job perceptions, which in turn affects employee attitude on the job. Figure 2.3 is a modified model of Vigoda-Gadot (2007), and the researcher adds a link within organisational commitment and performance, aligning with individual behaviour and satisfaction. The researcher believes that a more acceptable leadership style will benefit organisational members and increase the impact on total performance of the organisation to respond to change as it will attempt to reduce stringent condition capable of reducing change implementation.

2.7 Organisational Culture

This section provides an outline of the literature on the impact of organisational culture and types of organisational culture and their implication to organisational change implementation. The four dimensions of organisational culture types of the competing values framework (CVF) model were introduced in this study in order to help ascertain which type better increase the level of individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. The CVF suggests four value dimensions which are group, developmental, rational and hierarchical culture, identified by Quinn.
and Rohrbaugh (1983) to increase understanding of how organisational culture types impact on organisational effectiveness.

Hofstede (1980) and Hofstede and Bond (1988) examined the concept of culture from a wider perspective by studying the cultural differences, whereas researchers such as Schein (1992) otherwise considered culture from organisational perspectives. Hofstede (2001) further suggests that while cultural differences reside in values at the country level, they reside in practices at the organisational level. Hofstede et al. (2010) affirm organisational culture includes a cognitive framework consisting of attitudes, values, behavioural norms and expectations. It also involves patterns of arrangement, material or behaviour which a corporation, organisation, group, team, or society adopts in solving evolving organisational problems (Armstrong, 2006), which enable organisational members to adapt to a particular behaviour capable of increasing the levels of change implementation. Scholars have linked organisational culture to the character of organisations, which dictates the working relationship amongst its employees in their day-to-day activities and guides their behaviour and communication within the organisation, as well as determining the hierarchical processes and procedures of getting things done within and outside the organisation (Ribiere and Sitar, 2003). However, organisational culture means different things to different organisation hence a clear meaning and examination of organisational culture would benefit organisational practitioners and policy makers.

2.7.1 Meaning of Organisational Culture

According to Prabhu et al., (2002) “organisational culture includes the way an organisation communicates with, develops, empowers and involves its employees”. However, the most widely used definition of organisational culture is that given by Schein (2004) as:

“A pattern of shared basic assumptions that the group learned as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration that has worked well enough to be considered valid and should therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to those problems”. (p 17)

This means, organisational culture entails the behavioural patterns that support the activities of organisation members to participate towards increasing organisational
performance and change implementation (Schein, 2004). Clemente and Greenspan (1999) also add that organisational culture are the collective thoughts, habits, attitudes, feelings and patterns of behaviours within an organisation policy framework expected to be practiced collectively by organisational members.

Porter (1990) argues that any organisation that has a history must equally have a culture, suggesting that organisation culture involves the commonly held and relatively stable beliefs, attitudes and values that exist within the organisation (Williams et al., 1993; House et al., 1997). One unique thing is the fact that there seems to be agreement in the definitions and descriptions of organisational culture between several past researchers and authors as they all see organisational culture as sets of behavioural patterns which are embodied in collective habits, symbols, slogans, attitudes, rituals, etc., which are reflected in organisational norms, rules, communication, dress codes and role models. Qubein (1999) argues that organisational culture is enhanced by its corporate values, which are consistent with its purpose and aligned with the personal values of members. He further stated that organisational culture is not only enhanced by an organisation’s corporate mission statement, but also by its clear corporate vision which represents the mental picture of the organisation’s desired future.

Researchers have suggested that the concept of organisational culture has been used in many recent studies in order to understand the term ‘culture’ in the context of organisations (Dahlgaard et al., 1998). After an extensive review of the literature, it was found that there are many definitions and meanings of organisational culture. Some examples include:

- A core set of assumptions, understandings, and implicit rules that govern day-to-day behaviour in the workplace (Deal and Kennedy, 1982).
- A set of commonly held values, and beliefs that guide the behaviour of an organisation’s members (Martins and Terblanche, 2003).

While Campeanu-Sonea et al. (2010) argued that organisational culture can be better defined as organisational values, Suppiah and Sandhu (2011) viewed that “organisational culture can better be defined by organisational practices instead of values hence organisational practices are central to their definitions of organisational
culture.” They studied Hofstede’s work and found that values are obtained early in one’s life, for example, within the family. In addition, they assumed that organisational values are expressed in organisational practices, and that values are typically not directly visible to the employee.

The concept of organisational culture has been identified by many authors using different meanings and inferred meanings. This is based on different perceptions of organisational culture by different authors (Poor, 2000; Hofstede, 2001). In addition, Campeanu-Sonea et al. (2010) added another reason: different authors use different methods to study organisational culture, as well as coming from varied disciplines, such as psychology and sociology. Despite the fact that there are various different definitions of the term ‘organisational culture’, the majority of these definitions include the idea of a mixture of beliefs, values and practices that are shared and perceived by organisational members as a guide for organisation’s activities. Schein (2004) has argued that the shared meanings in any organisation are a means to distinguish its culture from other organisations’ cultures.

The available ways of measuring organisational culture has been established in the literature (Hofstede, 1991; Hampden-Turner, and Trompenaars 1997; Schein, 2010). From the literature it was established that some authors, such as Martins and Terblanche (2003), have depended on qualitative approach to measure and understand organisational culture, while others, such as O’Reilly et al. (1991), favoured quantitative approach to measuring organisational culture. Ways of measuring organisational culture which have been identified by many researchers according to their fields of study and based on different conceptual frameworks.

Accordingly, Hofstede (1991, p. 187) introduced six dimensions, namely: ‘process oriented versus results oriented, employee oriented versus job oriented, parochial versus professional, open system versus closed system, loose versus tight control, and normative versus pragmatic’. However, it is difficult to measure organisational culture according to the dimensions developed, which were influenced by conceptualisation of national culture. In view of this, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1993) came up with the seven dimensions, similar to those introduced by Hofstede, with additional concepts for measuring organisational culture. These dimensions are: “communitarianism versus individualism; particularism versus universalism;
emotional versus neutral; ascription achievement; diffuse versus specific; attitudes toward the external environment, and attitudes towards time”. However, Trompenaars and Hampden-Turners (1993) used surveys did not differentiate between national and organisational culture. Their dimensions were a mixture of measuring national and organisational cultures. Hence, it is difficult to measure organisational culture according to their dimensions.

Based on the literature review of various researches which are related to the dimensions of organisational culture, Van den Berg and Wilderom (2004) proposed some dimensions which are: “autonomy, external orientation, interdepartmental coordination, human resource orientation and improvement orientation” (Van den Berg and Wilderom, 2004, p. 574). In addition, based on the competing values framework (CVF), Cameron and Quinn (1999) developed the Organisational Culture Assessment Instrument (OCAI). Quinn and Cameron (1983) argued that organisational culture is an interdependent, comprehensive, complex and unclear set of factors.

Hence, there is no possibility of including all relevant and related factors when examining, diagnosing and measuring organisational culture. However, the concept of organisational culture is related to common beliefs and shared perceptions in both corporate processes and practices (Sirmon and Lane, 2004). Several studies have proved the reliability and validity of the CVF and its matched scale, Organisational Culture Assessment Instrument (Yu and Wu, 2009). Based on common similarities, this research employs the OCAI to enable identification of the cultural profiles and characteristics of NNPC and how they can impact on the ongoing change.

Since the origin of competing values framework (CVF) in the early 1980s, it has attracted attention from numerous scholars. Cameron and Quinn (1999) introduced CVF as a suitable framework for organising and recognising different organisational phenomena for many reasons which are:

- It matches with a well-known classification system that organises the ways people think, the ways they deal with issues of organisational transformation, and their values and beliefs about what makes a good organisation.

- It classifies the majority of the dimensions being considered.
• It is based on empirical evidence.

• It is valid and summarises the reality being depicted precisely.

Researchers have agreed on the relevance and importance of this framework (Denison and Spreitzer (1991), and that it connects the strategic aspects of organisational life by organising different patterns of share values, assumptions and interpretations that define an organisation’s culture. The main idea of the CVF is that organisational effectiveness, efficiency and capability depend on the organisational capacity to meet the necessary criteria (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Therefore, they have considered that the competing values framework could be used as a common framework for research in organisational change (Dastmalchian et al., 2000).

The CVF framework suggests three value dimensions identified by Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1981) for the understanding of organisational change. Firstly, the means-ends range concerned with the different types of objectives that an organisation seeks to achieve. In addition, this dimension emphasises the methods an organisation can use to achieve its objectives. Secondly, the dimension of organisational structure is related to preferences about structure and distinguishes between values and activities that emphasise an organisation’s flexibility and adaptability, and those that emphasise control and stability. Thirdly, the dimension of organisational focus distinguishes between an emphasis on external issues, such as the development and growth within the organisation system, and an emphasis on internal issues, such as employee work improvement.

As demonstrated in Figure 2.4, the CVF is built upon two axes to reflect different value orientations (Denison and Spreitzer, 1991). The horizontal axis expresses the level to which an organisation concentrates on its external or internal operation and functioning, while the vertical axis expresses the level to which an organisation has a tendency to control or be flexible (Denison and Spreitzer, 1991). Four types or quadrants of organisational culture result from the two dimensions: group, developmental, hierarchical and rational cultures. In Prajogo and McDermott’s (2011) study developmental culture was found to be the strongest predictor among the four cultural dimensions, as it shows relationships with three of the performance measures: product quality, product innovation, and process innovation. Rational culture shows a relationship with product quality, and along with group and hierarchical cultures, it
also plays a role in predicting process quality. These dimensions relate to flexibility and discretion versus stability and control, and internal focus and integration versus external focus and differentiation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Developmental Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Culture</strong></td>
<td><strong>Developmental Culture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork</td>
<td>Flexibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for ideas</td>
<td>Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>External</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralisation</td>
<td>Task Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Clarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predictable outcomes</td>
<td>Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Culture</td>
<td>Rational Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.0 4: The Competing Values Framework**

Adopted from Quinn and Spreitzer (1991)

According to Prajogo and McDermott (2011) while the control and flexibility may reflect the contrast between quality and innovation, the internal and external orientations of the CVF may reflect the distinction between results and process focus. These dimensions create quadrants that are also conflicting or opposing on the diagonal. The lower left quadrant (the Internal Process Model) includes hierarchy culture (which values control and internal maintenance), whereas the opposing quadrant, the upper right quadrant (the Open Systems Model) includes developmental culture (which values an outward-looking direction with a high degree of individuality and flexibility) (Prajogo and McDermott, 2011).

Likewise, the lower right quadrant, (the Rational Goal Model) includes the market result-focused culture (whose values are external and have a high degree of control...
and stability) (Prajogo and McDermott, 2011) whereas the opposing quadrant, the upper left quadrant (the Human Relation Mode) includes the group employee-focused culture (this values emphasis and concern for employees). The values identified in this model are flexible. The above-mentioned types of culture are conflicting and competing: group employee-focused culture competes with market result-focused culture, and adhocracy (developmental) culture competes with hierarchy culture.

On the other hand, Cameron and Quinn (1999) organisational culture assessment instrument (OCAI) was based on the competing values framework (CVF), which has six dimensions, such as: dominant characteristics, leadership style, managing employees, organisational glue, strategic emphasis, and criteria for success. An attempt to analyse these six dimensions produced four types of organisational culture. They are adhocracy culture, group culture, market culture and hierarchy culture. Table 4.4 illustrates the characteristics of these organisational culture types as stated by Cameron and Quinn (Quinn and Kimberly (1984; 1999).

**Table 2.3: The Characteristics of Organisational Culture Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational Culture Types</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Group Culture</td>
<td>A very friendly place to work where people share a lot of themselves. It is like an extended family. The leaders, or the heads of the organisation, are perceived as mentors or even parent figures. The organisation is held together by loyalty and tradition. Commitment is high. The organisation emphasizes the long-term benefits of human resource development and attaches great importance to internal cohesion and morale. Success is defined in terms of sensitivity to customers and concern for people. The organisation places a premium on teamwork, participation, and consensus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Developmental Culture</td>
<td>A dynamic, entrepreneurial, and creative place to work. People stick their necks out and take risks. The leaders are considered innovators and risk takers. The glue that holds the organisation together is commitment to experimentation and innovation. The emphasis is on being on the leading edge. The organisation’s long-term emphasis is on growth and acquiring new resources. Success means gaining unique and new products or services. Being a product or service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
leader is considered important. The organisation encourages individual initiative and freedom.

**The Rational Culture**
A result-oriented organisation whose major concern is with getting the job done. People are competitive and goal-oriented. The leaders are hard workers and competitive by nature. They are tough and demanding. The glue that holds the organisation together is an emphasis on winning. Reputation and success are common concerns. The long-term focus is on competitiveness and achievement of measurable goals and targets. Success is defined in terms of market share and penetration. Competitive pricing and market leadership are important.

**The Hierarchy Culture**
A very formalized and structured place to work. Procedures govern what people do. The leaders pride themselves on being good coordinators and organisers who are efficiency-minded. Maintaining a smooth-running organisation is critical. Formal rules and policies hold the organisation together. The long-term concern is with stability and efficient operations. Success is defined in terms of dependable delivery, reliable schedules, and low cost. The management of employees is concerned with secure employment and predictability.

Source: Cameron and Quinn (1999)

The above culture styles are dominant and not mutually exclusive. Prajogo and McDermott (2005) affirmed that no organisation is likely to reflect only one ‘value system’, but proposes a combination of values, with some being more dominant than others (Quinn and Kimberly, 1984). Scholars have argued that organisations comprise of a mix of the four culture types rather than comprising only one exclusive culture; however (Prajogo and McDermott, 2005), opine that one type of culture may emerge as the dominant one.

This instrument is helpful in increasing the effectiveness of an organisation by diagnosing its culture and determining the required culture style (Quinn and Rohrbaugh, 1983; Cameron and Quinn, 1999). A number of researchers have utilised an organisational culture assessment instrument based on a competing values framework to examine the effects of organisational culture on implementation of organisational transformation (Howard, 1998; Cameron and Quinn, 2006). The
The competition values framework has been used in many improvement approaches, and has been employed for organisational change related processes (Prajogo and McDermott, 2005; Gimenez-Espin et al., 2012).

Hooijberg and Petrock (1993) agreed that this framework provides a diagnostic tool for profiling the culture of an organisation and has helped organisations in preparing and conducting different changes in order to increase organisational effectiveness (Vilkinas and Cartan, 2006). Furthermore, Vilkinas and Cartan (2006) maintained that organisations are able to depict the gap between the existing culture and the desired organisational culture (either between light outline and dark outline), by using the graphical representation adopted (Igo and Skitmore, 2006), as shown in Figure 4.3.

Based on existing gaps, an organisation may desire to close these gaps through establishing suitable strategies (Igo and Skitmore, 2006; Vilkinas and Cartan, 2006). Therefore, these attributes and characteristics support consideration of the competing values framework as an appraisal tool for culture within an organisation, which helps to determine the changes required to create an ideal organisational culture that supports and facilitates the implementation of organisational change.

![The Competing Values Culture Chart](image)

**Figure 2.5: The Competing Values Culture Chart**

Source: Igo and Skitmore (2006)
2.7.2 Organisational Culture and Organisational Change

The literature on organisational culture affirmed that it originated from a union of “organisational psychology, social psychology, as well as social anthropology” (Scott et al., 2003; Martins and Terblanche, 2003). More so, the term ‘organisational culture’ appeared for the first time in an article titled ‘Administrative Science Quarterly’ by Pettigrew in 1979 (Scott et al., 2003). Thereafter, organisational culture appeared in the publication of two books by Deal and Kennedy (1982), and Peters and Waterman (1982). Since the publication of these two books the study of organisational culture spreads into different aspects of study, particularly within the field of organisational behaviour, (Hofstede, 1980; Schein, 1992; Hofstede, 2001; Ribiere and Sitar, 2003; Rashid et al., 2003; Schein, 2004; Speculand and Chaudhary, 2008; Ringov and Zollo, 2010).

In recent times, organisational culture has become very important as it shapes people’s behaviour in line with achieving organisational objectives (Hofstede, 2001; Ringov and Zollo, 2010). This is due to the growing interest of organisations in both the public and private sector wanting response to change (Rashid et al., 2003; Johnson 2004). Therefore, interest in studying organisational culture and its relationship with organisational change has continued to increase in recent times (Vakola et al., 2004; Speculand and Chaudhary, 2008). The results of most of the studies mentioned above show that organisational culture influences the successful implementation of organisational change.

Hong and Park (2010) believe that organisational culture also has an impact on motivating employees and attitude of organisational members. Ribiere and Sitar (2003) consider that organisational culture has a critical and fundamental impact upon the ability of an organisation to adopt and implement new initiatives to complement change process. Simon et al. (2009) add that, ignoring the impact of organisational culture is one of the largest and most common barriers to the effective change. Taking these reasons into consideration, it is very important for leaders of organisations identify and measure their organisational culture in order to successfully implement change.
2.7.3 The Relationship between Organisational Culture and Organisational Change Implementation

Change is defined as the implementation of well thought out plans and policies (Davis and Porteus, 2009) that require a fundamental change in the way a business operates by overhauling the entire system. Mitki et al. (2008) noted that in organisational change, service delivery should be upmost as a key item, and should be led with comprehensive and contemporary information that will drive the process hence reduce bureaucratic bottlenecks (Hughes, 2011). So, it is important that organisational leaders break past values which are no longer supportive as they drive change initiatives (McKeown and Philip, 2003).

Authors such as Shah and Shah (2010) believe that most change failures in any organisation occur because of unsuitable organisational culture. Harris and Ogbonna (1998) believe that cultural mismatch with a low willingness to change is a major hindrance for successful organisational change. Also, creating a significant culture change within an organisation to match with the organisation change agenda is a major requirement for enhancing effective change (Elwing, 2005; Miller and Xiao, 2007; Carlstrom and Inger, 2012). Therefore, organisational culture stands as a major factor for influencing and implementing organisational change (Shah and Shah, 2010).

Organisations who failed to recognise that organisational change culture must involve the culture of readiness for change are bound to fail in their effort for actualising effective change (Holt et al., 2009; Weiner and Linnan, 2009; Erwin and German, 2010). So, effective change can only be successful with a due consideration of a culture of readiness for change. Shah and Shah (2010) viewed that organisational change should affect employee attitude and behaviours because in the change process, they are transferred from a situation that is known to one that is unknown which can lead to uncertainty, strain and anxiety among them. Again, Shah and Shah (2010) suggest that, prior to the launching of a change programme, leaders/managers must know about employees’ intentions towards the change so as to build a sustainable change culture around it. The following have been deduced from the literature as predictors for the success of an organisational change programme (Miller et al., 2006; Cunningham et al., 2002; Holt et al., 2007).

- Knowledge and skills.
- Social relations in the workplace.
- Organisational culture.
- Management leadership relationships.
- Social support.
- Ability to cope with change.
- Job demands.
- Ability to solve job-related problems.
- Self-efficacy.
- Active versus passive job.
- Management support.
- Personal valence.

The literature cited above reveals some of the expected relationships between employee and organisational leader/managers which can be developed on the basis of the work environment (Cunningham et al., 2002; Holt et al., 2007). This can further stimulate the individual to utilise his or her abilities, efforts, experiences and skills (Yukl, 2013). The work environment may support employees to develop commitment to the organisation because employees see the possibility of accomplishing their desires, needs and future expectations (Shah and Shah, 2010). If employees achieve their desires and needs they may develop positive attitudes and behaviours towards organisational change (Miller et al., 2006).

Previous research has largely neglected the direct link between employee readiness and supervisor and peer relations in organisational culture (Eby et al., 2000; Cunningham et al. 2002; Madsen et al., 2005; Miller et al., 2006; Rafferty and Simons, 2006). They consider that supervisors will have to transform themselves from bosses to trainers or instructors. In addition, managers must change from authoritarian and remote to participative and accessible. Table 2.3 shows the areas of cultural change implied in organisational change practice.
Table 2.4: Organisational Culture and Change Practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secrecy</td>
<td>Open communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of staff</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection and fire fighting</td>
<td>Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal focus on rules</td>
<td>External focus on stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost and schedule</td>
<td>Quality of Conformance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability seeking</td>
<td>Continuous change and improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adverbial relations</td>
<td>Co-operative relations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Pike and Barnes (1994)

With the reference above, this research concludes that the implementation for organisational change requires a fundamental change in organisational practice and dominant organisational culture. However, studies have noted that organisational change is very difficult to achieve because attempts to replace an organisational identity with a new one is often met with resistance (Bolman and Deal, 2003). This is obvious where there is a clash between the underlining assumptions of a new approach of implementing a change programme with an existing organisational culture (Strebel, 1994; Maurer 1996).

If the new organisational identity supports the implementation of all requirements then that can lead to effective change (Fraser and Hemmings, 2010), more so, Kekale and Kekale (1995) suggested that it is important to understand the phrase introduced by Reger et al. (1994), the “change acceptance zone”. They maintained that the possibility of an organisational member accepting essential change increases when the difference between existence and ideal identity falls within the change acceptance zone. In contrast, it will show more resistance if the previous difference is bigger; i.e., not within the “change acceptance zone”. Robinson (1997) pointed out that in order to achieve and apply a successful change programme and a new system with minimum resistance, it is about “where you are, deciding where you want to be, then finding the best means of making the transition between the two states”.

Source: Pike and Barnes (1994)
This study supports the research assumptions that: organisational change is characterized by the introduction of new organising and working arrangements (Dawson, 2003) that have potential and significant impact on people’s working conditions. This is because organisational change provides opportunities for growth and development establishing new relationships, skills, and activities guided with a dominant organisational culture type (Kiefer, 2005). Many organisational change efforts fail to meet proposed objectives leading to negative impacts on organisations productivity. The existing organisational culture can also have a great influence on organisation’s activities and quality practices. If organisations could assess their current cultural practices and try to generate a supporting culture, environment and climate before implementing a change strategy, would help them to improve the success implementation for effective change. Studies have indicated a high failure rate of 70 percent for all change initiatives (Beer and Nohria, 2000; Argyris, 2004).

2.7.4 The Impact of Organisational Culture on Readiness for change and Change Implementation

This study takes the view that organisational culture influences the implementation of an organisational change initiative and that organisational culture can function as a driver or a barrier towards the implementation of effective change. Many studies have tested the impact of the four culture types of the CVF model, namely group, developmental, hierarchical and rational, as a mediator for organisational readiness for change in order to determine the most supportive organisational culture types for change implementation (Armenakis and Bedeian, 1999; Bovey and Hede, 2001; Bouckenooghe and Devos, 2006; Armenakis et al., 2007). Many researchers have found that organisational change is positively related with different organisational culture types (Elwing, 2005; Naor et al., 2008; Saame et al., 2011; Carlstrom and Ekman 2012; Smith et al., 2012).

Saame et al. (2011) adopts the CVF model to understand the values which are characteristic to one or another culture type that could be combined for implementing organisational change. Saame et al. (2011) believe that a rapidly changing environment and restructuring processes inside an organisation have impact on values shared in an organisation and this in turn may influence the organisation’s readiness for change. In a related study, the findings of Kyriakidou (2011) reveal that employees
interpret change as either attractive or non-engaging rather than as either a threat or an opportunity. The findings highlight the importance of actively managing the attractiveness of the new organisation (its corporate identity and image) as an integral part of the change effort rather than focusing solely on strategic issues.

In order to determine the effect of organisational culture on change requirement, Carlstrom and Ekman (2012) use the Organisational Values Questionnaire (OQV) which was developed by (Reino et al., 2007) and the Resistance to Change Scale (RTC) developed by Oreg (2006) to measure the impact of culture on change. In their measurement, the OVR was based on the Competing Values Framework (CVF) to determine the organisational profile as a determinant for change. They found that a culture of flexibility, cohesion, trust and belongingness were among dominant factors for organisational change.

Similarly, Prajogo and McDermott (2011) used two steps of analysis suggested by Anderson and Gerbing (1988) to test and structure the relationship between organisational cultures. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was employed to test the construct’s validity. A total of two CFAs were run separately for the four cultural dimensions of CVF as the independent variables with the four performance measures as the dependent variables. In their analysis, it was found that rational culture shows a relationship with product quality, and along with group and hierarchical cultures, which is said to place an important role for predicting change. From a managerial perspective, these findings help organisations to identify the specific cultural dimensions they need to develop and support their change strategy, or alternatively, how they might choose to position their organisation to compete given their particular cultural characteristics. In this study, organisational culture types of the competing values framework were used to assess the impact of readiness for change and organisational change implementation, a full detail of the assessment is show in the analysis part (chapter five) to ascertain the extend to impact each culture type have on readiness for change and organisational change implementation.
2.8 Managerial Skills

This section reviews the literature of managerial skills, three dimensions of managerial skills and their impacts on readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

Katz (1974) defined skill as an ability which can be developed and which is manifested in performance, not merely in potential, but in the ability to translate knowledge into practice. Numerous studies have considered the need for all change implementation personnel to be familiar with management skills because they are very crucial for organisational success (Livingston, 1971; Katz, 1974; Lewis and Kelly, 1989; Armstrong, 1994; Analoui et al., 2000; Burke and Colins, 2001). This study considers managerial skills as critical factor capable of influencing change readiness and organisational change implementation.

2.8.1 The Influence of Managerial Skills

Yukl (2013) linked managerial skills to leadership behaviour and characteristics that could lead to leadership advancement and effectiveness. Scullen et al. (2003) conducted an in-depth construct validity to identify a coherent and reliable set of managerial skills, and identified dimensions of managerial skills which are technical skill, administrative skill, human skill and citizenship behaviour. Similarly, Yukl (2013) limits these to three dimensions of managerial skills which he described as taxonomy (classification) of managerial skills. They are Technical skills, Interpersonal skills and Conceptual skills. Yukl described these skills as a strategic management skill that includes aspects of the other three categories and are defined in terms of the ability to perform managerial function and behaviour such as planning, negotiating and coaching which are critical for change implementation (Tonidandel et al., 2012).

Managerial skills are linked to the knowledge about methods, processes, procedures and techniques for conducting a specialized activity, and the ability to use tools and equipment relating to a particular activity to influence organisational change (Yukl, 2013 p. 155). More so, it is concerned with knowledge about human behaviour and interpersonal processes, the ability to understand the feelings, attitudes and motives of other people from what they say or do (empathy, social sensitivity), the ability to communicate clearly and effectively (speech fluency, persuasiveness), and the ability
to establish an effective and cooperative relationship (tact, diplomacy, listening skill, knowledge about acceptable social behaviour) to strengthen readiness for change and change implementation (Yukl, 2013).

Furthermore, managerial skills benefit organisational members with general analytical ability, logical thinking, proficiency in concept formation and conceptualisation of complex and ambiguous relationships, creativity in idea generation and problem solving, ability to analyse events and perceive trends, anticipate change, and recognize opportunities and potential problems (inductive and deductive reasoning) which organisations who want successfully implement change required (Tonidandel et al., 2012).

2.8.2 Dimensions of Managerial Skills

Earliest studies on managerial skills pointed out similar aspects of managerial skill and their relevance in organisational change (Mann, 1965). Mann (1965) introduced a three-skill aspect, consisting of administrative competence, human-relations competence, and technical competence, to describe the essential functions of a manager. Other researchers such as Katz (1974) proposed a similar three-skill aspect replacing administrative skill with conceptual skill but retaining the other two skill dimensions.

Some empirical support for these managerial skills comes from works of Lau et al. (1980). They factor analyzed responses to 50 items, describing Mintzberg’s ten managerial roles, resulting in four factors. One factor comprised technical problem solving similar to Mann’s technical competence. The second factor, labelled supervision, appears to parallel the human-relations skill. While the final two factors identified by Lau et al. (1980) were information gathering and planning and decision making which are closely related to conceptual skills.

However, a recent study found about 50 managerial skills which are critical for organisation change, effectiveness and development (Barhem et al., 2011). The skills which include: strong desire to work and contribute to organisational change, knowledge about organisational culture; apply appropriate business models; views change as an opportunity; ability to think critically and creatively about complex
issues; Good language skills influences the capacity to implement organisational change.

Lau et al. (1980) study also adds that mentoring people, positive attitude towards skill requirements, behavioural flexibility helps organisational members to increase their capacity for change implementation. Adapt to change requires change drivers to acquire managerial skills because such skills increases the ability for a full participation of change implementation (Carmeli and Tishler, 2006; Yukl, 2013; Haro and Turgut, 2012; Parente et al., 2012). One of the recent in-depth empirical investigations of managerial skills was that conducted by Scullen et al. (2003) which found a four factor dimension of managerial skills that consists of technical skill, administrative skill, human skill, and citizenship behaviour. Their study was based on the works of Mann (1965), Katz (1974), and Coleman and Borman (2000) to enhance organisational effectiveness and development.

Scullen et al. (2003) refers technical skill to two types of proficiency, the first proficiency is where the manager who has the ability to perform also has core substantive and technical tasks that pertain directly to the organisational function in which the manager works. This is concerned with managers’ knowledge, skills, and analytical abilities that are normally associated with professional roles and affiliation in his or her specific discipline. The second type of proficiency is more general and refers to proficiency in financial, quantitative, and other types of data analysis that are common to managers in all organisational functions (Scullen et al., 2003).

Administrative Skills (conceptual skills) are the ability to think and act in terms of an organisational system in which the manager operates. This requires an understanding of how the people, structures, procedures, and policies operate in his or her organisation to attain certain objectives. These skills include planning, programming, and organising work; setting goals for the work unit; working through non-technical problems or crises that threaten goal attainment; delegating tasks and authority; inspecting work; and coordinating the efforts and activities of different organisational members, levels, and departments (Scullen et al., 2003).

An interpersonal skill (human skills) is the ability to work with people with the spirit of accomplishing organisational goals (Leong, 2008). This includes both the ability to work effectively as a group member and the ability to elicit effort within a team. This
dimension facilitates the understanding of the general principles of human behaviour, as it involves motivation and maintaining interpersonal relationships and the skilful use of these principles while interacting with people in a given situation (Scullen et al., 2003; Tonidandel et al., 2012). This includes the manager’s ability to anticipate possible reactions to various actions in decision making processes.

Citizenship Behaviours refers to three types of acts that managers may perform which most of the time are beyond what is expected of them. These are: interpersonal (assisting, supporting, developing, and cooperating), organisational (demonstrating commitment, loyalty, allegiance, and compliance), and job task conscientiousness (persistence, dedication to one’s job, and desire to perform well). This is similar to what Van Scotter and Motowidlo (1996) described as interpersonal facilitation, while Yukl (2013) classified it as interpersonal skills.

Tonidandel et al. (2012) believes that these skills are pertinent to those responsible for driving change so they can better facilitate effective change implementation. Furthermore, Barhem et al. (2011) believes that such skills able change drivers to adhere to corporate beliefs, solve problems quickly in new circumstances, communicate well with members of their units, understand their organisation’s policies and convey respect and enthusiasm when dealing with other members of the organisation (Barhem et al., 2011).

2.8.3 The Impact of Managerial Skills on Readiness for Change and Change Implementation

Yukl (2013) argued that technical skills are primarily concerned with technical skills required by those responsible to drive and implementation change. Technical skills include knowledge about methods, processes and equipment for conducting specialized activities necessary for change implementation (Yukl, 2006). More so, technical skills are associated with factual knowledge about the organisation i.e. the structure, rules, management systems and the character of the employee. This provides organisational members with the capability and opportunities that will enhance readiness for change and change implementation (Leong, 2008). Leong (2008) believes that in order to cope in a changing environment, it is necessary to rebuild confidence and competence of organisational members through the introduction of a participatory management style and investment in the necessary technical skills that
will enhance the functions that are related to the technical aspect of organisational change.

Conceptual skills are involved with good judgment, foresight, intuition, creativity, and the ability to find creative solutions to organisational problems (Yukl, 2013). Specifically, conceptual skills are measured with aptitude tests include analytical ability, logical thinking, concept formation, inductive reasoning and deductive reasoning used to reinforce readiness for change in order to impact more of organisational change implementation (Barhem et al., 2011). Yukl (2013) equally believe that conceptual skills are essential for effective organisational planning, organising and coordinating administrative responsibilities, to understand how various parts of the organisation relate to each other and how change in one unit can affect other units.

Managers that are associated with conceptual skills are those who can comprehend change and how change can affect the organisation as a system (Gentry et al., 2008). Managers with high conceptual skills are able to develop a better mental model of their organisation to help understand the most critical factors and the relationships among them (Yukl, 2006). Such models are designed with the capacity of leading the organisation through the change process in order to help decide how to get from one point of change to the other.

Self (2007) viewed that the role of a change manager is to demonstrate that a proposed change is the right solution for eliminating the existing gaps in the organisation. Therefore where skills such as conceptual skills, which give the manager a sense of good judgment, foresight and creativity, will be appropriate to provide the relevant information, thus showing that the organisation is no longer meeting its expectations, but needs to close the gaps by meeting the requirement for change (Yukl, 2006). This will demonstrate the need to replace old services with new and improved services will lead to an increase in the readiness for change. Also, this will ensure that the organisation has the right organisational structure, policies, procedures, technology, and management talent in place to successfully implement the change (Self, 2007).

Interpersonal skills are necessary for influencing people by understanding their feelings and motivation in a work environment (Yukl, 2006; Haro and Turgut, 2012). These skills include empathy, social insight, charm, tact and diplomacy,
persuasiveness and the ability to communicate effectively to develop and maintain a cooperative relationship between managers and subordinates during the change process (Yukl, 2006; Robbins and Hunsaker, 2012). These skills can be used to strengthen the confidence of organisational members, reinforcing them to successfully make change feasible (Self, 2007). Self (2007) believes that effective communication from skilled organisational managers and leaders will build the confidence that will enable them to persuade subordinates to actualise the change programme as well as increasing their capacity, right knowledge and abilities to involve in change implementation.

The empathy dimension of interpersonal skill enables drivers of change to understand other employees’ motives, values and emotions as well being useful in resolving conflicts, whereas, social insight gives them the ability to understand the types of behaviour that are socially acceptable in a situation to avoid unnecessary hindrances (Parente et al., 2012). Persuasiveness and oral communication which are elements of interpersonal skills influences those responsible for change by attractive more change results, this is because it enable leaders to listen in an attentive and nonjudgmental way to co-workers’ complaints or criticisms. Tactics, enable the leaders to be proactive by getting the required people involved in the change (Yukl, 2006). Change comes with new ideas and new procedures in achieving tasks, therefore, the tactic can be employed to provide assistance and support the others during the change (Gentry et al., 2008). Table 2.4 shows the relevant associate skills and their impact on readiness for change.
Table 2. 5: Associate Managerial Skills and Their Impact on Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Organisational outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability to establish a sense of urgency</td>
<td>Members will know about the need to make changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to form a powerful high level coalition to guide and lead the changes</td>
<td>Will produce a group with enough power and influence in the organisation to lead and promote the change effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to create a vision of the organisation’s future and continue keeping the pace</td>
<td>Will help focus, direct and sustain the change efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to communicate the vision widely repeatedly and consistently</td>
<td>Spread the change down through all organisational levels, in language and in actions and behaviours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to empower people in the organisation to act on the changed vision</td>
<td>Change obstacles removed to improve the processes and systems, encourage and enable people to take risks, engage in non traditional thinking and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to plan for visible short-term performance improvements</td>
<td>Keep enabling these to occur and recognise their achievement and the work of those who have enabled that achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to consolidate improvements and produce more change</td>
<td>As change takes effect, build on the credibility and confidence that results; extending the reform or structures, systems and processes and encouraging and growing change agents in the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to institutionalise new approaches</td>
<td>Clearly articulate the connections between the new ways of working and organisational successes; encourage and develop the ongoing change structure and anchor the changes into the organisational culture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The importance of the managerial skills as discussed above show that all dimensions are very critical for change readiness and change implementation as they are of increasing organisational members’ commitment and change efficacy to implement organisational change. The discussion equally shows that the dimensions of managerial skills enable organisational members to shared and pursue the courses required to actively involve in change implementation.
2.9 Organisational Trust

Organisational trust has been identified in the literature as a factor for increasing the relationship among employees in the workplace (Mayer et al., 1999; Ellonen et al., 2008). For example, Erturk (2008) confirmed that the theory of trust is widely recognised with increasing confidence among organisational members. Consequently, this section will review the impact of organisational trust on individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

In this research, organisational trust is considered as one the associated variables for determining organisational readiness for change and organisational change implementation. The literature viewed that organisational trust is an important and critical component in the context of organisational effectiveness and survival (Erturk, 2008). The concept of organisational trust has been discussed extensively in the literature (McCauley and Kuhnert, 1992; Sako; 1992; Costigan et al., 1998; Atkingson and Butcher 2003), and is used to increase team building, efficiency, effectiveness and productivity. Other researchers viewed that organisational trust enhances creativity and critical thinking in organisations as well as freedom of expression (Reina and Reina1999; O’Brien, 2001), capable of sustaining values for increasing organisational change implementation.

2.9.1 Meaning of Organisational Trust

Early studies on the concepts of organisational trust were drawn from the sociology and social psychology perspectives (Luhmann, 1979; Blau, 1964). This is considered as a one dimensional view of trust in organisations which appeared to preclude the need for trust to be an issue in organisational settings and, as noted by Grey and Garsten (2001 p. 233): Bureaucracy will “inculcate into organisational members the necessity for rules following, identifying and punishing those that do not”. Trust in organisations enables organisational members to rely on organisational policies and respect for organisational members (Mayer et al., 1995). McKnight et al. (1998) defined organisational trust as the positive expectations individuals have about the competence, reliability and benevolence of organisational members, as well as the institutional trust within the organisation.
Hosmer (1995) defined organisational trust in five different contexts which are: individual expectations; interpersonal relationships; economic exchanges; social structures; and ethical principles. These have been described in the following ways;

**Individual expectations:** This arose from the view that trust depends on vulnerability where the person who places his trust in another will be worse off if the trust is not fulfilled than he would have been had he not trusted the other party (Deutsch, 1958). Barber (1983) expanded on this and came up with a set of optimistic expectations which might determine the outcome of an event and, they are:

1. Expectation of persistence of the existing social order: thus, the “rules of society” will not change to such an extent as to alter the basis for trust.
2. Expectation of technically competent role performances by those being trusted: this has to do with “competency” which is someone’s ability to do the job and right behaviour.
3. Expectation of a “morally correct” performance from those being trusted.

The concept of expectancy is drawn from the agency perspective, where trust is based upon as expectation of competence, predictability and fairness (Gambetta, 1988). In this context, trust is seen as particularly relevant when the two following conditions are applied:

1. When there is a relationship of interdependence and obligation between parties and where a party has the freedom not to trust the other. A relationship where an individual has no choice but to enter into a risky relationship. When no alternatives are available, it is not so much a trusting relationship, as one of dependency (Gambetta, 1988). It has been proposed that the development of trust is affected by the way in which power and authority are exercised within an organisational context (Kelley, 2007). This limitation and the general lack of institutional leverage over their behaviour raised some concern that the relationship between organisational managers and their subordinates may be in line with the characteristics of dependency (Davies and Mannion, 2000).
2. When there is ignorance or uncertainty over the motives and behaviour of others, trust will be seen as a coping mechanism in response to “the limits of our foresight” (Shklar, 1984). Where trust exists, behavioural uncertainty can be reduced and the likelihood is increased that promises will be honoured.
Trust assumes a great significance among organisational members when their trustworthiness for proving the quality of work is needed (Mannion and Smith, 1997).

**Trust as interpersonal relations**: trust is frequently acknowledged as a central construct in the framing and dynamics of managerial relationships (Creed and Miles, 1996) and developing and maintaining trust is seen as especially important to managerial effectiveness and organisational change (McAllister, 1995; Brockner et al., 1997; Daley and Vasu, 1998; Davis et al., 2000). According to Atkinson (2004) it is difficult to ascertain precisely how much trust plays a part in managerial relationships and indeed, whether it is practically possible. Child (2001) viewed that the growing stream of interest in trust has also produced a good understanding of the value of trusting relationships. This aligned with Barber’s (1983) concept of a trusting person, interacting with a trusted person, forms the basis of a trusted relationship, acting to strengthen the spirit of readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

**Trust as commercial transactions**: Williamson (1985 p. 47) affirmed that the economic transaction of trust is based on the premise of distrust, where the individual or enterprise is not to be trusted, and that their behaviour will be opportunistic “self interest seeking with guile”. Williamson’s (1985) affirmation was based less on the idea that nobody in business could be trusted. His empirical work confirmed that many do act on the basis of trust, while others found it difficult to identify those who they can trust and those who cannot be trusted. On this basis contracts and other controls, termed substitutes for trust must be put in place to protect the individual and the enterprise. The costs associated with these strategy transaction costs could be reduced if partners trusted each other (Kelly, 2007). Where one partner trusts the other, the idea of highly specific contracts will be reduced. The empirical foundations to the economic transaction model comes from the game theory of Axelrod (1984), which was based on the “prisoner’s dilemma” game in which aspects of cooperation and trust can be modelled via either or/win lose contests.

Within the literature, trust between economic agents is often linked with the notion of social capital which is an institutional response to facilitating efficient production through coordinating joint action and smoothing of economic exchange (Bowles and
From this viewpoint, organisational trust is cast as an intangible social capital asset, which facilitates efficient economic production and serves to mediate, complement and substitute for a range of economic institutions. Agents can interact in such ways that cannot be regulated by complete contracts due to the complexity of the interactions, or the unverifiable nature of the information available on the relevant transactions (Mannion, 2005).

**Trust as a social construct:** because our interactions are complex, we implicitly trust others, who will themselves trust others, creating a “social organisation of trust” (Coleman, 1984). As these complex networks of trust develop so the actors within them find their behaviour guided by their experiences and trust in the past will lead to trust in the future (Granovetter, 1985). Such a model moves away from the notion of trust as individual and calculative and towards one that is also social and normative.

In another development Cruz and Costa-Silva (2004) maintained that trust could be approached from numerous theoretical frameworks, such as transaction cost theory (Williamson, 1975), social exchange theory (Blau, 1964), agency theory (Eisenhardt, 1989), the resource based view of the firm (Barney, 1991), system theory (Luhmann, 1979) and attribution theory (Kelley, 1967). For Rousseau *et al.* (1998) the theory of trust development has been more disparate focusing on a range and level of analysis from the interpersonal point of view to the inter organisational point of view. Saunders and Thornhill (2003) noted that Rousseau *et al.* (1998) view of trust has resulted in a variety of definitions which exhibit a number of common elements such as notion of “favourable expectations” and a “willingness to become vulnerable”. However, the various dimensions of organisational identified above have been summarised to two dimension such institutional and interpersonal trust (Saunders and Thornhill, 2003; Vanhala and Ahteela, 2011).

A study by Mollering (2001) who develops these elements argued that trust develops from favourable expectations which are based on interpretations of the reality in which trust relates, enabled by a suspension of disbelief and related faith, which suggests that the process through which trust is developed is informed by the interpretation of reality which includes the willingness to think about unresolved issues and take a leap of faith with unknown ones (Saunders and Thornhill, 2003). For this approach, it implies that trust is based on the acceptance of interpretations about
the awareness that information is imperfect (Saunders and Thornhill, 2003). However, for trust to be substantiated, it requires an interpretation that trust is actually developed (Mollering, 2001).

Herriot et al.’s (1998) four demonstrations of trust are closely related to Mollering’s (2001) process based definition of organisational change. From their first demonstration, they emphasise that the expectation of an outcome of change will be favourable when obligations are fulfilled. Secondly, they believe that the spirit of deception should be eliminated the third emphasis however viewed a willingness to become vulnerable, focusing on the trust placed in the ability on people managing the change process to undertake that role. Their final assertion is that trust originates from a belief that people are compassionate, that such people will not harm their co-worker or subordinates but rather they will care for their welfare during the change process. Their assumptions have been considered as having strong implications for organisational readiness for change and change implementation (Saunders and Thornhill, 2003).

Studies have indicated that trust exists in three dimensions, which are firstly, impersonal trust, which is based on the roles, systems and reputations from which assumptions are drawn about the trustworthiness of organisational members (Atkinson and Butcher, 2003). Secondly, that interpersonal trust, which is based on the interaction between two or more persons and used to increase concepts such as (integrity, character, ability and truth of a person), and thirdly, institutional trust which is determined by the efficacy and the fairness of an organisational system such as the policies, rules and regulation that glue the organisation together (Costigan et al., 1998).

Atkinson and Butcher (2003) argued that institutional trust is measured on perception of an employee’s competence to fulfil roles or task. Institutional trust is viewed on specific dimensions such as in top management (McCauley and Kuhnert, 1992; Tyler, 2003), in an organisation and its capability to perform and respond to change (Robinson, 1996; Lee, 2004). Under this assumption, it is presumed that organisations will increase some practical steps that can be tailored to building a trustworthy organisation. In line with this, McKnight et al. (1998) posit that an organisation’s emphasis on institutional trust is likely to succeed because it enhances a normal
situation as well as structural assurance. It also enhances a situation where promises are made and kept in line with contractual evidence.

Vanhala and Ahteela (2011) believe that organisations operate within a rapidly and dispersed complex environment. Therefore, institutional trust becomes necessary as a potential source of increasing competitive advantages. Institutional trust is thus used to increase interpersonal trust because the criticality of interpersonal help organisational members to increase the personal character as related to their respective jobs. According to Vanhala and Ahteela (2011), employees, who are able to trust the organisation they work for, can as well trust their future in the organisation even if there is less perceived interpersonal trust. Kramer (1999) noted that employees can trust their organisation without having much to do with the organisation’s decision making process. This, on the other hand, leads to institutional trust which is often referred to trust of the organisation’s policies and regulations.

While interpersonal trust increases the trust in both subordinates and leaders/managers, institutional trust is characterised by organisational practices and processes which are not personalised to members of the organisation. Rather, they are the organisation’s strategy, competence, technology and human resource practices the organisation’s communication system as well as the organisation’s vision. In the current study, interpersonal and institutional trust is viewed as elements of organisational trust to increase readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

2.9.2 The Impact of Organisational Trust on Readiness for Change and Change Implementation

Scholars have linked the study of trust to organisational change (Mollering, 2001; Saunders and Thornhill, 2003; Erturk, 2008; Ben-Gal and Tzafrir, 2011; Smollan, 2013). In a contemporary organisational setting, the introduction of change comes alongside a lot of expectation (Smollan, 2013) where a positive outcome is expected from management. Therefore, the level of trust becomes a critical factor expected to increase or decrease the feeling, thinking and reactions of the employees in respect to change. This is why Saunders and Thornhill (2003) and Neves and Caetano (2009) viewed trust as one of the most important elements or as a recipe for change readiness and organisational change implementation.
However, Nyhan (2000) is of the view that trust is very crucial in organisational change but does fail in some instances, especially when quality measures have been put in place to enhance the change process. Erturk (2008) equally argued that some change projects fail because managers or organisational leaders failed to put trust at the centre of activities; they remain resolute in not realising the importance of trust and its effectiveness in line with the change. More so, when the emphasis on trust is slow, change attempts are muffled leaving the standard of management to decline (Erturk, 2008), which still left many managers failing to make a strong association between trust and the creative spark that fosters change in organisations.

Lester and Kickul’s (2001) study found that people respect open and honest communication and fair treatment as important terms of engaging in organisational members’ relationship in the form of increasing their readiness for change and change implementation. However when these perceived promises are not met, people may tend to act negatively (Robinson, 1996) and reduce the level of readiness for change and change implementation. Employees or subordinates may view these as a deliberate violation of an assumed psychological trust which is unfair to them (Kickul et al., 2002). Smollan (2013) believes that frustration, anger, shock, fear and feelings of betrayal can result when employees lose confidence and the trust they have in management is devastated as other factors within the organisational trust framework capable of reducing the level of organisational members readiness for change, consequently reduce the impact of organisational change implementation.

Kelley (2007) noted that where employees are satisfied with established rules, they may engage in excessive individualistic or competitive behaviour which might in turn undermine a good working relationship among co-workers towards achieving common goals which the organisation seeks to achieve. This is in line with Lewis and Weigert’s (1985) view of the emotional outrage which is a testimony to how the “betrayal of trust strikes a deadly blow at the foundation of the relationship itself.” So, where people do not get the kind of treatment or attraction of a reward system expected, they lose courage, which leads to an intention to resist or leave the organisation (Kelley, 2007). On the other hand, if trust is adequately considered or taken seriously by organisational leaders, it will help both old and new members level of socialisation (Griffin et al., 2000). The work of Griffin et al. (2000) suggests that good organisational socialisation and interaction only help to increase organisational
communication process. This further strengthens individual and collective desire to accomplish organisational tasks, because organisational collective and honest information sharing process hence structure, performance and change implementation (Ostrff and Kazlowsk, 1992).

Therefore, the drive for organisations to have shared belief or behavioural norms with its employees will impact strongly if trust is developed and shared (Kelley, 2007). This leads to a situation where members of the organisation will regard themselves as part of the network of mutually reciprocal relationships where everyone will have a common understanding of how to achieve the objectives of the organisation. Erturk (2008) used the trust-based model to discuss the relationship impact of managers/organisational leaders and subordinates. The model proposes that an increased participative management and managerial communication practice will lead to an increased trust and in turn openness to change.

The model recognises that the trust-based interaction between organisational leaders and subordinate employees plays a critical role during the change process (Erturk, 2008). He affirmed that the trust-based model is an important substitute for increasing readiness for change. The model suggests that a shift from control-based management approaches to a new perspective is based on a cooperative working relationship established on trust between organisational leaders and their employees. Nyhan and Marlowe (1997) argued that trust in organisational leaders is a measure of an employee’s own perception and can be referred to the extent that organisational leaders act for the interest of their subordinates. Therefore, where subordinates trust their leaders, there is an increased belief that their leaders and their organisation in general will do what is right for them (Erturk, 2008).

2.10 A Critical Observation from the Literature Review and Identification of Research Gaps

The purpose of this section is to provide a brief yet thorough review of the current literature focusing on the area of this research study, and to identify the research gaps. Table 2.5 summaries a representative sample of various studies on the relationship between the research construct, showing the main focus and research approach, methodologies and key findings and limitations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Purpose of Study</th>
<th>Country (data setting)</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Organisation Type</th>
<th>Main finding</th>
<th>limitation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lok and Crawford</td>
<td>This study examined the effects of organisational culture and leadership styles on job satisfaction and organisational commitment.</td>
<td>Hong Kong and Australian</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Public and Private</td>
<td>Leadership style have a positive impact on commitment, with the effects of an innovative culture on satisfaction and commitment, and the effect of a considerate leadership style on commitment, being stronger in the Australian.</td>
<td>This study confirms that organisational culture and leadership styles are important organisational antecedents of job satisfaction and commitment. However, how this will impact on organisational change implementation was not emphasized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dulewicz and Higgs</td>
<td>Investigating new leadership dimensions in an organisational context in relation to assessing an individual’s leadership style in the context in which the leader works.</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Private Sector</td>
<td>Leadership is identified as a potential for implementing change in both public and private sector organisations. These results suggest that the adoption of a leadership style could become more accurate in line with followers’ commitments.</td>
<td>Majority of the sample were male manager or leaders, hence the views of their female counterpart were not adequately represented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jones et al.</td>
<td>Exploring the impact of organisational culture and reshaping capabilities on change implementation success and the</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
<td>Government department</td>
<td>It was found that group culture and human relations culture have a positive influence on change implementation.</td>
<td>It was observed that the sample size is relatively small. Hence, limiting the findings and conclusions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. 6: Summary of Key Research and Identified Gaps
<p>| Mediating role of readiness for change | It was equally found that individual readiness for change impacts on change implementation; more so the higher the readiness for change the higher the change the level of change implementation. Individual readiness for change mediates the relationship between organisational culture and change implementation success. | Edwards (2005) | The purpose of the paper is to demonstrate the suitability of an integrated construct as the basis for a multilevel and multi-paradigm framework for the study of organisational change. | UK | Qualitative | Government | Implementing organisational change requires a theoretical framework that will contribute to a complex nature of organisational life. | The study developed numerous concepts and dimensions as a guide for organisational change implementation, but there was not enough data to empirically show the relationship of the dimensions. |
| Gentry et al. (2008) | The study shows how changes in the workplace may have coincided with shifts in the importance of managerial skills over the past 15 years and identifies managerial skills needed at different levels and | Iran | Quantitative | Government | The study affirmed that managerial skills perceived in the 1980s are relevant to date. However the study posits that, the importance of “relationships,” “administrative/organisational ability” and “time management” have shifted | The study recommended that managers should emphasize skills development rather than asking how important the skills are. However, the study did not mention which skills are important for senior and middle managers. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Study Title</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Results and Discussion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Limsila and Ogunlana (2008)</td>
<td>The study examines how project managers’ leadership styles and subordinates’ organisational commitment correlates with leadership outcomes and work performance of subordinates on construction projects and how this can provide a significant value for both practitioners and academics.</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Qualitative Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erturk (2008)</td>
<td>The study explores the role of managerial communication, employee participation and trust in enhancing organisational change.</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Quantitative Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Research Focus</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amagoh (2009)</td>
<td>The study identifies some leadership development initiatives, as an important element of organisations needs and to be embarked upon to enhance leadership development programmes in order to increase leadership effectiveness.</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and Schraeder (2009)</td>
<td>Providing guidance on specific ways by which organisations can overcome resistance by matching readiness strategies with forms of resistance.</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greasley et al. (2009)</td>
<td>The study examined the impact of organisational change on public sector</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This paper demonstrates that using a trust-based approach during change initiatives could be very effective for organisations in collectivist cultures. Specify the type of organisational trust needed or appropriate in such a collective culture.
employees utilising the implementation of the UK Government’s “Back to work” programme (BTW).

increasing and becoming more radical. Numerous organisational changes are related to the introduction of new initiatives that require amendments to existing working practices.

The study adopted the qualitative method to explore the views of DWP employees as well as to capture their perception on change implementation. Quantitative methods should be considered as well to explore a unit’s characteristics in line with organisational change implementation.

The purpose of this paper is to appraise the current status of enterprise risk management (ERM) in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) oil and gas entities and develop a practical, region-specific, and systematic action plan for the GCC oil and gas industry

This finding from the study establishes the understanding of the current existing ERM models while identifying the determinants of ERM adoption and the most significant challenges for its implementation. The study also develops the best practice approach for successful ERM implementation in the GCC oil and gas entities by steering the way forward for an improved understanding of the ERM system in a strategic industry dealing with a strategic commodity.

The analytical methods used are deductive and discursive in nature, limited to the nature of the methodology of case study used, and could not apply rigorous statistical methods such correlation regression analysis and SEM for data analysis and compare related models of change management. The study lacks adequate sample size consequently reduces research quality.

The paper examines the relationships between organisational and

Variables were based on organisational justice factors such as distributive and procedural and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedural justice along with demographic factors towards the employee readiness for organisational change in a developing country.</th>
<th>and behaviours for organisational change on the basis of distributive and procedural justice. Gender, age and marital status have no positive and significant relationships with employee readiness.</th>
<th>employee’s demographic variables alone. It would have benefited from other variables perceived to drive organisational change.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parast et al. (2011)</td>
<td>The study empirically investigates the effects of quality management practices on operational and business performance of the oil and gas industry.</td>
<td>Iran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The study adopts the quantitative approach and makes significant findings, but faced with a few setbacks related to low sample size of 61 top managers. A consideration of mix methods and an adoption of moderator variables with moderation regression analysis would have benefited the study towards expanding variables capable of enhancing quality management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurn, (2012)</td>
<td>The purpose of the study is to comment on models of change management, overcoming resistance to change, the necessary skills and commitment to implement change and stages in</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuntz and Gomes (2012)</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlstrom and Ekman (2012)</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dai (2013)</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Trust can lead to organisational commitment and both trust and organisational commitment have a positive impact on organisational culture. Link individual readiness for change in mediating organisational change implementation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Research Focus</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmad and Elhuni (2014)</td>
<td>The study investigates quality factors that are absolutely essential for successful implementation of total quality management (TQM) in Libyan oil and gas companies (LOGCs).</td>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>Quantitative Government</td>
<td>The findings suggest that the TQM critical success factors should be implemented completely as a whole package rather than on a fragmented basis to get the full potential of the TQM. The study adopts the quantitative perspective and frequency distribution and range analysis as a method for data analysis. However, a consideration of more sophisticated tools for data analysis such as a regression would have help to explore more options as well as add more quality of findings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This review which is related to the research issues under consideration as illustrated in Table 2.5 have highlighted a number of gaps that this research aims to investigate. As shown in Table 2.5, various studies have tested the influence of organisational culture on the implementation of organisation change both in developing countries and also in the Western nations. The review however affirmed the claim that research testing the impact of organisational culture, leadership, managerial skills organisational trust and commitment in developing countries such as Nigeria is relatively low. This study examines the influence of organisational culture on organisational change implementation in the Nigerian oil and gas sector. So, this research will present new data and empirical insights into the relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation.

The second issue underpinning this research as a mediating variable for implementing organisation change is individual readiness for change. The literature has evidence that individual readiness for change is critical for organisational change implementation, however, there seems to be lack of systematic empirical studies recognising individual capability in line with relevant organisational skills requirements as a capacity for implementing organisational change in developing countries. This study will attempt to fill this gap by empirically examining the impact of managerial skill on individual readiness for change on the impact of effective organisational change implementation (Mueller et al., 2012).

The third issue underpinning this research is the impact of organisational culture types on individual readiness for change, mediating the implementation of organisational change. As identified in the literature, there are limited empirical researches that have examined that impact of organisational culture type on the implementation of organisational change especially in developing nations. For example studies that examined the impact of organisational culture on change implementation concentrated on the connection between organisational culture and employee resistance to change (Carlstrom and Ekman, 2012), the human relation model (Prajogo and McDermott, 2011) and as a link for the information delivery process on implementing organisational change (Hughes, 2011). But not enough has been mentioned about organisational culture types and their relative impact on individual readiness for change mediating organisational change implementation. This research will attempt to fill this gap by empirically examining the influence of the four organisational culture
types of the CVF model which are group culture, developmental culture, hierarchical culture and rational culture on individual readiness for change as well as examining which among each culture types have a greater influence on individual readiness for change.

The fourth issue associated with this research is the impact of leadership styles on individual readiness for change on the impact on organisational change implementation. Studies have related the impact of numerous leadership styles to organisational change (Schraeder et al., 2005; Stewart and O’Donnell, 2007; Eriksen, 2008), but there is a substantial lack of empirical examination of the impact of leadership styles on individual readiness for change mediating organisational change implementation. Hence, this research will address this by empirically exploring the influence of leadership styles on individual readiness for change. It is expected that a dominant leadership style(s) will emerge from the study in line with perceived organisational culture type, for consideration, in leading the implementation of organisational change.

The fifth issue is the impact of managerial skills on organisational change implementation. Numerous studies including Barhem et al. (2011) have examined the influence of managerial skills on organisational change (concentrating on the impact of skills on understanding cultural dynamics), critical thinking and being creative about complex issues relating to organisational change. Apart from reflecting on the importance of managerial skills on capacity building, the research will also examine the influence of managerial skills on individual readiness for change mediating organisational change implementation. The research will equally examine relevant skills in line with organisational culture type and leadership style as behaviours for organisational change implementation.

The sixth issue considered in the research is organisational trust. This has been examined by various scholars for its impact on organisational change implementation. For example, Smollan (2013) examined the relationship between organisational trust and organisational process change implementation, where trust was viewed as a variable for increasing the space for change implementation. Also, organisational trust has been explored as an important element for change implementation (Erturk, 2008; Neves and Caetano, 2009). However, this was not examined in line with the types of
trust, either interpersonal or institution trust, and how they influence individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. This research will fill this gap by examining the influence of the various types of trust on individual readiness for change mediating organisational change implementation.

With the above, it is clear that there is a gap in the organisational change literature in not investigating the impact of leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills, organisational trust on individual readiness for change and mediating organisational change implementation. Based on this, this research will go further into the relationship between the above variables and organisational change implementation by exploring both the direct and indirect effects of all variables in order to give a robust analysis and explanation.

The aim of this study is to find out the factors that can help organisations effectively implementation change. More so, the study anticipates that the mediating role of individual readiness for change will have a great impact in informing people of the relationship and activities of organisational change implementation. Also, the influence of leadership styles, organisational types, managerial skills, organisational trust are expected to have both direct and indirect impacts on the level of individual readiness for change.

Studies in the organisational change area have used different research methodologies to explore the influence of variables and their impact on implementing organisational change (Madsen, et al., 2005; Miller et al., 2006; Oreg, 2006; Harris, 2007; Grentry et al., 2008). More so, other researchers such as Timmor and Zif (2010), Shah and Shah (2010) and Gregoe et al. (2012) have used questionnaire surveys to measure employees and organisational readiness for change. Based on this, this research will adopt the quantitative questionnaire approach to study the relationship between the research constructs. Also, quantitative methods will enable the research to measure the variables in each of the business units in the organisation under study.

In addition to the variables mentioned above, some conceptual factors were introduced in this study to help moderate the impact of change readiness and change implementation, they are social norms employees and units/departments characteristic. Below is a detail discussion of the moderating variables.
2.11 The Moderating Role of the Contextual factors

This section explores the strength of the contextual factors in the relationship between the independent variables on the mediating variable in order to increase the outcome. The contextual factors as considered in this study are: social norms and employee and unit characteristics, and their strength on individual readiness for change are expected to increase the level of organisational change implementation (van Birgelen et al., 2005). Below is a detailed discussion of the relationship of the contextual factors and readiness for change in predicting organisational change implementation.

The Impact of Social Norms

Social norms are referred to as the shared values of an organisation by its members as it influences work attitudes towards achieving a set of objectives (Hardina et al., 2006). Parikh (2010) equally viewed that social norms are beliefs, assumptions and the organisational role that influences individuals in the workplace. In other words, social norms are the organisational practice that shape employees or the collective activities of employees towards achieving goals and objectives. Social norms have been linked into the study of organisational change or change implementation over the years (Senge, 1997; Wilson, 2001; Alas and Vadi 2006; Schien, 2010). Wilson (2001) affirmed that employee’s beliefs, norms and values are derived from the organisational culture which influences their action and the informal message that they communicate. Similarly, Harrison and Carroll (1991) viewed that if an employee is employed in an organisation where employee work is strong, that employee is likely to adapt to that environment as a strong working environment. Whereas, where there is a weak work pressure, the employee is equally likely to accept that the norm has been encouraged by management. On the other hand, Alas and Vadi (2006) argued that most definitions of organisational culture are defined in line with social norms which were referred to as the basic shared values that form part of the organisation. However, these beliefs, values and expectations produce norms that shape the behaviour of individual employees in the organisation. This is why scholars, who define organisational culture, define it by mentioning those shared assumptions which are the beliefs and values that help to move the organisation forward.
An example of such popular definition is by Schein (1989) who shows how these shared values enhance employees’ relationships toward problem solving, thus the pattern of basic assumptions that a group has invented, discovered, or developed in learning to cope with its problems of external adaptation and integral integration, and that have worked well enough to be considered valid, and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel in relation to these problems (p. 78). This therefore implies that social norms can turn an organisation into a strong or weak working environment as the case may be. A study by Vadi (2001) compared different studies of organisational culture in relation to social norms as practiced in the organisations and pointed out common criteria to characterise organisational culture through positive-negative and strong-weak orientations. The study argued that the positive-negative orientation of organisation reflects to what extent all members of such organisation are willing to support the achievement of that organisational goal. Strong-weak orientation of organisational culture indicates a sense of belongingness. So, it is pertinent to say that for an organisation to respond to change effectively the individual readiness of each employee to adhere and collectively share beliefs and values must be high, which in turn increase the impact of change implementation. A strong adherence to organisational social norms is a strong indication of strengthening readiness for change and change implementation (Hardina et al., 2006). In line with this, this study assess the level of organisational adherence to the norms capable of increase their readiness for change and change implementation.

**The Impact of Units/Departments Characteristics**

Organisations are made up of departments/units which carry out many functions and network together to create synergy that leads to the success of the overall organisation’s objectives (Clorley et al., 2008). The force to push for change depends highly on the organisational component units (Singh, 2009) and how such units or departments are integrated to achieve the common goal of the organisation. Such integration deals with the coordination and conduct of integrated activities of individuals within each unit, work groups, and organisations (Elbanna, 2007). This increases the ability and willingness of members of an organisational unit to work together to strengthen the organisation’s effort to change (Clorley, 2008). However, where the network of the business units are not well designed to meet the objectives of the change, this might lead to a unit level of resistance to change (Elbanna, 2007).
Antony et al. (2012) argued that one of the main reasons for ineffectiveness at a unit or department level is a lack of data management and ineffective communication systems, size of units, structure (Temtime, 2003), culture and economic issues (Rad, 2006), lack of concentration of the change requirement and system utilisation among some business units. Lu and Betts (2011) observed that where departments/units have the same or very similar responsibilities then this can cause confusion and hinder the change implementation process. Temtime (2003) equally argued that an increase in size would lead to an increase in resources, investment and expertise that would affect the planning and change implementation process.

Also, Aspinwall and Elgharib (2013) maintain that the size of each unit or department and size of workforce is a determinant factor for change implementation, because if the size is small it might lead to a heavy workload and slow down the implementation process. On the other hand, where the workforce is smaller than actually needed this might make some employees very worried about their future and hence lose their concentration on the implementation process. Ahire et al. (1996) found that the size of an organisation may not affect its ability to effectively implement change. But, Pun et al. (2012) viewed that while considering the size of an organisational department/unit, organisation rules and regulations, policies and procedure should be properly emphasized in order to increase the level of change readiness. This shows that where the unit sizes of the organisation are compatible with the organisational change structure, might lead to increasing level of change implementation. In this study, the departments/units of organisation are considered as an element of the contextual factors for either increasing or reducing change implementation.

- The Impact of Employee Characteristics

Various behavioural models have been proposed to measure the strength of relationships in an organisations change implementation (Dwyer et al., 1987; Hakansson, 1987). Studies suggest that employee’s factors or characteristics such as job function, level of education, years of experience, age and gender have a relationship on implementing organisational change (Shah and Shah, 2010). Similarly, Jawahar et al. (1992) argue that the success of implementing change in organisations is positively related to employees’ personal factors which activate the individual
internal resource for maximum expected contribution. On the other hand, studies have shown that one of the hindrances of organisational change implementation is non-recognition of gender balance (O’Neil et al., 2008; Orser and Leck, 2010). In this study, job function, level of education, years of experience, age and gender are viewed as variables that may increase or decrease the level of change implementation, and therefore, will be tested in the conceptual model to show the level of impact they have on readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

Previous research suggests that personal factors or characteristics such as job function, level of education, years of experience, age and gender have a bearing on organisational transformation (Shah and Shah, 2010). Similarly, Jawahar et al. (1992) argue that the success of organisational transformation and organisational development is positively correlated with employees’ personal factors which thus activate the individual internal resource for maximum expected contribution.

- The Impact of Employee Years of Experience

In an organisational context, years of experience refers to the number of years an individual employee has spent working for a particular organisation. The literature affirms that employee’s years of experience is a strong predictor for performance and organisational transformation (Gillespie et al., 2011; Alas and Vadi, 2006). The level of organisational participation for improvement and change is based greatly on those who have a considerable level of work experience because it is assumed that they have acquired some required skills that are necessary in driving the change process. Smith (2005) found that organisational change will be imperative if members of such organisations have the capability and capacity to drive the process. Smith (2005) viewed that employees in such organisation can either be the key to transforming the organisation or dealing with obstacles to success. However, some researchers believe that years of employees’ work may not impact on an organisation’s response to change or transformation (Vakola et al., 2004). Bass (1990) and Tichy and Devanna (1985) believe that employees’ years of work experience may not guarantee a prerequisite for transforming the organisation, especially where that employee does not have a vision, and use the symbolic role to enact the required change. Other researchers believe that years of experience remain a mediating variable for organisational transformation (Gillespie et al., 2011). Also the discussion about
personal variables for organisational transformation cut across the level of education, job function, age as well as the gender of the employee.

- **Impact of Employee Level of Education**

The debate on employee level of education as a moderation variable for organisational change has not attracted attention in the literature, however, related literature has attempted to record aspects of employees’ work experience as a factor for organisational change. For example, Kroom et al. (2009) found that employees’ level of education is significantly related to organisational change. Also, Pantouvakis and Bouranta (2013) confirm that the level of education of an employee is a moderating variable for organisational transformation. However, a study by Vakola and Nikolaou (2005) found a negative relation of years of experience and the organisation responding to change. But other researchers allude that organisational change could also be related to employee level of education which enhances the level of experience that employees have (Alan and Vadi, 2006; Lam and O’Higgins, 2012). Araujo (2001) viewed that employees’ level of education helps to improve the use of available resources which equally increases efficiency and effectiveness. More so, Boselie (2010) is of the view that a high employee level of education often means a high performance level and the expectation to sustain a transition period is usually high.

- **The Impact of Employees’ Job Function**

Job function has helped organisations to ascertain employees’ responsibilities. For example, an employee who is given the responsibility of team facilitator is expected to ensure effective process and dynamics by ensuring that the group he or she leads keeps moving in the right and constructive direction (Reissner, 2011). More so, facilitators act as coaches to their team as they put all that is required into transforming the organisation. Those who are executive members or champions equally act as the bridge between senior management and their related team in helping to ensure that resources are available to sponsor projects as well as help in removing barriers. A good leader ensures that personnel needs are always met through critical analysis of performance objectives (Lunenburg, 2012).

Middle managers have the obligation to implement policies and strategies as required (McConville, 2006), also, other managers do hold a responsibility to influence the
decision making process, especially in a time of transformation, and hence produce real improvement in team performance. The middle manager works closely with their staff whom they represent in the line of management and whom they must represent to senior management. McConville (2006) posits that a manager who sometimes carries a huge workload does bring about increasing conflict at both personal and professional level if job descriptions are not properly stated. This is why Chapman (2001) affirmed the need for an understanding of the work managers do with the context of organisational structure. But, where managers’ jobs are not in line with organisational challenges then it becomes instructive for the organisation’s structure to be restructured to overcome the challenges. Also, various research included age and gender of the employee as moderating variables for successful organisational change (Moyes et al., 2006; Waleh and Bartikwski, 2013).

- **The Impact of Gender and Age**

Studies have shown that gender balance has an impact on the way organisations achieve their objective (Orser and Leck, 2010; Riquelme and Rios, 2010). Powell and Butterfield (2003) add that gender recognition motivates men to take up male dominated occupations that have prescribed masculine personal qualities, while women seek to enter the feminine occupations indicated by norms of their society. Orser and Leck (2010) found that women executives are more encouraged to seek clarification about compensation than their male counterparts. Cummings et al. (1993) found that men and women generally behaved differently, especially when working in their respective units. However, the relationship between the male and female work relationship in organisational change implementation remains unexplored (Dawley et al., 2004). Some research suggests that women do not seek organisational change compared to their male counterparts (Hagan et al., 1989). However, studies have confirmed that the number of woman in middle management has grown significantly in the last two decades, but females in top management positions remain relatively low (Eagly and Carli, 2003). Attempts to find out why, show that traditionally masculine characteristics are generally considered to be more positively valued than traditionally feminine characteristics, especially in most of the developing countries (Dawley et al., 2004). Such gender stereotypes “depict men as high in traits that reflect competence, while
women are rated higher in traits that reflect warmth or expressiveness” (Dawley et al., 2004 p 679). Pathak et al. (2013) recommend that changes may be needed in this gender imbalance especially in the countries in which cultural values create barriers for women to participate. As stated above, gender as a moderating variable is considered in this study and will be tested to show if it has an impact in the implementation of change. On the aspect of age, Lamm and Meeks (2009) linked age of people to workplace improvement in that some characteristics attracted to readiness for change are highly related to the age of employees.

Wu et al. (2011) also confirm that job related diversity such as; level of educational, age and background have a significant effect on the strategy for change implementation. Emphasizing on the aspect of individual responsibility and the requirements for organisational change implementation, Sullivan et al. (2002) maintain that age and gender are factors that increase individual experience and readiness.

2.12 Summary

This chapter has reviewed the relevant literature on organisational change, including the concept of leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills, organisational trust and organisational commitment. The chapter reaffirms the contributions of these variables to organisational change as pointed out by previous researchers. The chapter addresses the reasons for change and various methods in which an organisation adopts when responding to change. It was also revealed that in order to implement organisational change, individual readiness for change must be emphasised to mediate the implementation. More so, strategic structure must be put in place to help enhance individual readiness for change in mediating the implementation of organisational change. However, most changes fail due to the fact that some organisations did not put much emphasises on individual readiness for change.

It was also revealed that leadership styles are necessary for adoption as a strategy to lead organisational change implementation. However, it was perceived that specific leadership styles are likely to be appropriate in leading specific change processes if the right attitudes are to be maintained. Leadership influences people to achieve organisational change by increasing subordinates’ relationships in the spirit of meeting
set objectives. It was perceived that among other leadership styles transformational and transactional leadership styles have attracted more attention in the literature as an adoption for leading organisational change. More so, it was observed that those adopting both transformational and transactional leadership styles are likely to master all components and principles of the implementation of organisational change.

The literature on organisational culture types was reviewed to show the relationship of organisational culture types on individual readiness for change. It was ascertained that organisational culture types may have both a positive and negative impact on individual readiness for change. However, a strong impact on organisational culture types is expected to mediate the implementation of organisational change. This involves all the activities that play important roles in determining the success of organisational change implementation. These are where the individual and the organisation are agents of change and both the individual and the organisation would need to constitute key targets of change as well as introducing the aspect of specific targets of the change initiative and the benefit that it has for both the individual and the organisation. Individual readiness for change was found to have a positive influence on organisational change implementation.

Also, this chapter addresses the impacts of managerial skills, organisational trust and organisational commitment on individual readiness for change which will be developed to create an understanding of the implementation of organisational change. It was found that organisations would need to identify the types of skills and trust and that this influences individual readiness for change in mediating organisational change implementation. Aligned to this, moderating variables such as social norms, facilitator, leadership, subordinates and unit characteristics are considered in this study in order to increase the relationship of strength between the independent variables and the mediating variable on the dependent variable.

In the next chapter, the relationship between the research construct will be discussed in detail and the research hypotheses driven from the review of the literature will be formulated. In addition, the conceptual framework which presents the relationship between leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills, organisational trust and the contextual factors will be developed.
CHAPTER THREE

Conceptual Framework and Research Hypotheses

3.1 Introduction

A study may go astray if assumptions are examined inappropriately or where key aspects of the study are not conducted with due consideration (Sreejesh, 2014). For example, Robson (2002) confirmed that conceptual framework of a study informs the assumptions, expectations, beliefs, and theories that support the study. In this study, the proposed conceptual framework is derived by a systematic review of core change theories and factors that can lead to organisational change implementation. This will then be used to inform a framework for understanding change implementation in NNPC. Consequently, the discussion in this chapter will be used to predict the relationships amongst the variables that underpin the proposed conceptual framework.

The previous chapter has reviewed the literature in the related fields of organisational change, leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust as well as the contextual factors for increasing the level of individual readiness for change and change implementation. In addition to this, the research gaps found in the combined literature were identified and discussed in section 2.5. In this chapter, the relation between leadership styles, organisational culture types, dimensions of managerial skills, dimensions of organisational trust, individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation will be discussed in full detail. Also, the impact of the contextual factors on the relationship between the independent variables, mediating and dependent variables will be discussed. In this regard, the different research hypotheses showing the relation between cause and effect to determine which variable is independent, dependent, mediating and moderating. Furthermore, following the relevant review of literature, this chapter will develop and present the conceptual framework for this study.
3.2 Research Hypotheses Development

This section will discuss the hypotheses development of the relationships between leadership styles, organisational culture types of the CVF model, dimensions of managerial skills, and the dimensions of organisational trust (independent variables) on organisational change implementation (dependent variable) via individual readiness for change (mediating variable). Also, the relationship between the contextual factors (moderating variable) on the independent variable, mediating variable and the dependent variable will be discussed.

3.2.1 The Effect of Leadership Styles on Organisational Change Implementation

The core argument of the extensive organisational change literature affirmed that, by engaging specific leadership behaviours, change leaders are able to engender employees’ support for change success, which will then lead to a successful organisational change implementation (Kotter, 1996; Burke, 2002; Herold et al., 2008). Hence, creating a relationship between organisational members on need to involving in the decision making, dealing with the challenges associated with change, and sharing relevant information on change process, leaders are able to reduce organisational change related uncertainty but increase the capacity for every employee to engage in change implementation process.

However, in spite of the large amount of literature on leading change, there has not been one acceptable measure that captures the best leadership behaviours in organisational change implementation (Herold et al., 2008). Herold et al. (2008) developed a change leadership construct based upon practice oriented recommendations, the construct including specific leadership behaviours which are in line with various leadership styles. The behaviours are: visioning, enlisting, empowering, monitoring, and helping individual to adaptation in change. These leadership behaviours are targeted at implementation of a particular change at hand, rather than at other organisational events.

The work of Oakland and Tanner (2007) suggests that leadership is a key factor for increasing readiness for change (see Figure 3.1). The framework suggests that in order to break through the circle of change there is need to start with leadership which is the main drivers to drive the change process. As indicated in the framework, achieving
organisational change requires a process driven by a predominant leadership style. Leadership is found revolving around readiness for change in line with other variables mediating change implementation (Oakland and Tanner, 2007). Leadership as a major factor driving readiness for organisational change and implementation is been linked to leadership styles such as transformational, democratic and transactional leadership among others (Bass, 1985; Kotter, 1996; Muchiri et al., 2012). Other researchers have also found leadership to be an important variable in facilitating change by increasing people’s confidence, commitment and opportunities to participating in the decision making process that would lead to change implementation (Seijts and Roberts, 2012).
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**Figure 3.1: An Organisational Change Framework**

Northouse (2010) theorises that leadership has increased employee commitment, motivation and behaviour expected to mediate the individual creativity in change implementation. More so, researchers argued that leadership increases employees’ commitment which in turn increases the attitudinal behaviour required for change implementation (Muchiri et al., 2012; Farkas, 2013). This further suggested that there
is a relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation. Therefore, it is necessary to link leadership with readiness for change to change implementation as a process of developing an appropriate conceptual framework for the current study and also illustrate the interrelationships between the constructs and test the hypothesised relationships. Hence, Figure 3.2 below presents the relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation in order to examine the influence of leadership on the level of individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

**Figure 3.2: The Relationship between Leadership and organisational Change Implementation**

Based on this theoretical empirical positions and the relationship between leadership and organisational change as discussed in (section 2.5.3) above, this study proposes that leadership impact on organisational change implementation through readiness for change, thus the following hypothesis is formulated to test the level of the relationship:

**H1:** There is a relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation.

Studies have affirmed that transformational leadership style is associated with visioning, empowerment, and individual consideration as elements of sustaining organisational change implementation (Pastor and Mayo, 2008). Avery (2004) agreed that transformational leaders promote and encourage vision for the future and establish the difference between success and failure. While the literature on organisational change has focused on change leadership behaviours, the leadership literature posits that transformational leadership has been characterised for particularly being effective in driving organisational change (Bass, 1998; Nemanich and Keller, 2007; Raoprasert and Islam, 2010).
Studies on transformational leadership did not investigate leader behaviours in terms of a particular change (Herold, et al., 2008), however they assume that transformational leaders are naturally good at handling any kind of change especially implementing organisational change (Nemanich and Keller, 2007; Herold et al., 2008; Caldwell et al., 2009). Also, studies that compared variations leadership styles believes that the elements of transformational leadership style have a relationship with organisational change implementation (Bass and Riggio, 2006; Detert and Burris, 2007; Herold et al., 2008), generally influenced subordinates attitude and behaviour in responding to implementing organisational change. Other researchers believe specifically that, transformational leaders are able to transform subordinates’ beliefs and values by creating a vision of the future and inspire them to work toward achieving organisational change (Cardona, 2000; Ivey and Kine, 2010).

Agle et al.’s (2006) study viewed that leaders associated with the transformational style are able to overcome the ‘inactive work nature’ that often keeps individuals away from working hard and adapting to organisational change mechanism. In another development, Avolio and Gibbons, (1988) and Shamir et al. (1993) conclude that the transformational leader increases subordinates self-efficacy and confidence as well as encouraging a positive change implementation process.

Researchers have also found empirical support of transformation leadership style in change related issues and link transformational leadership to change related attitudes, for example, Grove (2005) found a positive relationship between transformational leadership styles to general openness to organisational change. Also, Caldwell et al. (2009) demonstrated that transformational leadership style enhances readiness for change. Herold et al. (2008) found transformational leadership style to be significantly mediating employee commitment to change.

The above empirical findings clearly evidence that transformational leadership style could have a positive impact on employee attitude to organisational change. Based on this, the following sub hypotheses are proposed:

H1a: Transformational leadership style will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.
The literature on organisational development confirms that organisational change is determined by a good quality leadership style(s) (Crawford et al., 1997; James and Connolly, 2000). However, Burns (1978) contrasts between transformational and transactional leadership style through moral and commitment and concluded that transactional leadership style is little more than exchange relationship between reward and effort and hence not much effect is made by transactional leaders to develop or motivate employees.

Recent research has demonstrated that transactional leadership style has both direct and indirect impact on employee involvement in strategic decisions towards organisational success (Gu et al., 2012). However, it was specifically reported that transformational leadership style has a greater impact than transactional leadership when it comes to employee’s behavioural integration towards decision making leading to change (Gu et al., 2012), and plays a significant role in mediating organisation change.

Riaz and Haider (2010) found that transactional leaders provide vision and model organisational business units, but could not motivate employee’s involvement and participation in organisational change implementation compared to the transformational leaders. More so, another study found that the transactional leader does focused on employees innovation but centres more on the role of supervision and group performance which is dominated by exchange between leader and subordinates and only motivated by rewards (Walumba et al., 2007). James’s (2005) study equally confirmed this position and added that transactional leaders focus more on contingent reward when the job is completed. This is further confirmed in the works of Eid et al. (2008) which shows that transactional leaders only pay attention to reward in the form of getting the work done.

A comparison of transactional and transformational leadership styles suggest that both add values to workplace environment, but the transformational leader is better because there is more attempt to provide subordinates with opportunity to contribute to workplace improvement and change implementation (Limsila and Ogunlana, 2008). This position is contained in James (2005) when he concluded that the transactional leader only recognises employees after tasks are completed. This clearly shows that both transactional and transformational leadership styles are important, but the
arguments empirically evidenced that the transactional leadership style may have lesser impact on organisational members compared to transformational leaders especially when engaged in change implementation. Based on this, hypothesis H1b is formulated:

**H1b**: Transactional leadership style will have a lesser impact on organisational change implementation than transformational leadership style.

The leadership literature also compared democratic and autocratic leadership styles and confirmed that participative leaders are more associated with democratic leadership behaviour, while despotic leaders are more autocratic in nature (Marshall, 1986; Alder et al., 1995). Also known as authoritarian leadership style, autocratic behaviour is said to have absolute powers over team members (Oyster, 1992). Either the subordinate has little or no contributions in decision making even where such decisions would create an opportunity for them (Sapru, 2013). Vito et al. (2011) posit that autocratic leaders often obtain and maintain power. The leader is always at the centre of authority, dictating methods of work and limiting employees’ suggestions. Oshagbemi and Ocholi (2006) add that this leadership style usually leads to high staff turnover or absenteeism. Other studies equally viewed that managers adopting autocratic style force or impose changes on organisational members with insufficient or no consultation, taking action without considering the effects on the members (Ellinger et al., 2008). This category of leaders are seen as uncaring, self-serving management/undermining, with depriving and intimidating behaviour who always omit giving recognition or praise for the good work of their subordinates (Ellinger et al., 2008). In spite of these views, the autocratic leadership style is recommended in a bureaucratic culture as it helps leaders to achieving results (Awan and Mahmood, 2010).

Unlike the autocratic style, the democratic leaders are more compliant and consider the views and suggestions of other members of the organisation in decision making. Sapru (2013) confirmed this when he conclude that democratic leadership style encourages feedback and gives opportunity for training or coaching. Oshagbemi and Ocholi (2006) affirm this and added that democratic leadership style increases employee’s job satisfaction and enables skills development, which often leads to self-confidence and passion to accomplish organisational goals. Avery’s (2004) view is in
conformity with this when he confirmed that organisational member who are associated with democratic leadership style are better motivated and can effectively and efficiently engage with their job.

Yukongdi (2004) work further suggests that organisational members who are comfortable and participating more in organisation success were those attached to democratic leadership behaviour. In contrast, Bosiok (2013) viewed that autocratic leadership behaviour is determined by a leader who has absolute power among team members and consequently reduces employee’s participation when engaged with change implementation. Bosiok (2013) equally believe that autocratic leadership style is characterised with unidirectional communication channels and the leader is mostly not interested in feedbacks, while the democratic leadership is characterised with two way communication such as exchange of feedback among members (Avery, 2004, Northouse, 2010).

Another critical observation of the impact of democratic leadership style shows that it encourages a situation where a team is guided by leaders who allow all individuals to involve in decision making process that determine the future of the organisation (Erwin and German, 2010). More so, democratic leadership style is believed to enable organisational members to share managerial skills in order to bring the best out of them (Saame et al., 2011). This position supports the view that the democratic leaders attempt to organise and disciplined their subordinates in the right direction, whereas the autocratic leader is undisciplined and poorly organised with less attention paid to developing skilful subordinates (Moore et al., 2005; Weyer, 2007). Autocratic leadership is further linked to a situation where the leader achieves the organisational objectives through people (Bourantas and Papalexandris, 1990; Eagly and Carli, 2003; Moore et al., 2005; Weyer, 2007), whereas the democratic leader achieves goals with people (Eagly and Johnson, 1990; Savery, 1993 Oshagbemi and Ocholi, 2006; Stephens and Greer, 1995; Miramontes, 2008). This empirical position which is equally confirmed by Northouse (2010) suggests that democratic leadership style is characterised with more organisational member’s participation in organisational change implementation than autocratic leadership styles. Based on this empirical position the following hypotheses are formulation:
**H1c**: Democratic leadership style will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

**H1d**: Autocratic leadership style will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.

Studies in leadership and organisational change found that laissez-faire leadership is less effective compared to other leadership styles (Deluga, 1992; Kotter, 1998; Rozin and Royzman, 2001). For example, Judge and Piccolo (2004) conclude that laissez-faire leadership is less effective, motivation and can reduce performance compared to democratic and transformational leadership styles. Other researchers equally ascertain this view and further suggest that laissez-faire leadership is more of hands off approach that allows employees to set rule and make decisions without proper consultations (Avolio and Bass, 1998; Avolio et al., 1999; Bass and Avolio, 1993; Curphy, 1992; Kane and Tremble, 1998).

In Edwards and Gill (2012), Laissez-faire leadership was not mentioned amongst other effective leadership style when managing organisational change, but was found to be ineffective and which often lead to low productivity. In another development, Bass and Riggio (2006) concluded that laissez-faire leadership is the most ineffective and inactive leadership style to adopt when engaging employees with organisational change. But, this position seems inconsistent with the findings of Epstein (2005) and Oluokun (2003) who affirmed that there is significant correlation between laissez-faire leadership and subordinates’ turnover. Again, Xirasagar (2008) compared transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles and found laissez-faire leadership to be effective in supporting management decisions because leaders have some level of trust on their subordinates.

Irrespective of those views, several other studies appeared to take a contrary position, that laissez-faire leadership has a negative influence on subordinates and possibly devastating consequences for the organisation as a whole (Rayner and Cooper, 2003; Skogstad et al., 2007; Overbey, 2013), that it encourages management by exception where the leader establishes job expectations and standard and then makes directions in a one way top down approach which may not work in where adequate cooperation is needed for change implementation. In such laissez-faire approach, the leader
emphasizes punishments which are associated with not meeting standard (Skogstad et al., 2007), there is lack of interest of the part of employees due to the fact that they sense of more non-involvement in decision making. These empirical positions give an indication that the laissez-faire leadership style may have a negative impact on employee’s participation on organisation change implementation compared to leadership styles such as democratic and transformational. Therefore, hypothesis H1e is put forward:

**H1e:** Laissez-faire leadership style will be negative associated with organisational change implementation.

### 3.2.2 The Effect of Organisational Culture on Organisational Change Implementation

This study takes the view that organisational culture influences the implementation of organisational change initiatives and that organisational culture can function as a driver or a barrier to organisational change implementation. Many studies have tested the impact of the four culture types of the competing values framework (CVF) model, namely; group, developmental, rational and hierarchy culture as a mediating variable for individual readiness for change in order to determine the most supportive organisational culture types for implementing effective change (Armenakis and Bedeian, 1999; Bovey and Hede, 2001; Bouckenooghe and Devos, 2006; Armenakis et al., 2007). Many researchers have found that organisational change is positively related with different organisational culture types (Elwing, 2005; Naor et al., 2008; Saame et al., 2011; Carlstrom and Ekman 2012; Smith et al., 2012).

Smith (2005) believes that people will either embrace or resist change, so if organisational change is to succeed then organisations and people must be ready for such change. However, people can be either the key to achieving effective change, or the biggest obstacles to change success. More so, change readiness might not be automatic and it cannot be assumed (Smith, 2005). A failure to assess organisational and individual change readiness may result in managers spending significant time and energy dealing with resistance to change, therefore reducing the impact of readiness for change (Smith, 2005). Organisational culture has been investigated as the highest instrument for organisational change implementation (Mitroussi, 2003; Stewart and
In the same vein, Scott et al.’s (2005) study shows that organisational culture has a great impact on building strong and organisational readiness for change. Erez and Gati (2004) equally add that the relationship between different levels of cultures is a dynamic entity in change processes, and that an organisation with a supportive culture has a huge impact on the processes of change (Firth-Cozens, 2001).

Cultural variables are also involved in organisational development and the creation of new behaviours (Carlstrom and Ekman, 2012). Such variables have been shown to be of strategic importance during organisational changes. Also, issues related to organisational change have been studied in terms of the need for organisational culture change at levels of organisations (Ramon, 2011). A study by Nonaka and Konno (1998) emphasizes that organisation culture helps organisations to impact knowledge creation and change strategies. This shows that there is significant impact of organisational culture and organisational change implementation. Therefore, this study initiates a link between organisational culture, readiness for change and organisational change implementation as a primary process for developing an integrated conceptual framework for the interrelationships between the constructs and tests the hypothesised relationships. Hence, Figure 3.3 below presents the relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation, to examine the influence of organisational culture on readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

In line with the discussion presented in chapter two (sections 2.6.3 and 2.6.4) which demonstrated the relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation, this study presumed that organisational culture can be integrated in as a model for increasing the level of readiness for change in order to increase the impact of organisational change implementation (Den Hooff et al., 2004).

![Figure 3.3: The Relationship between Organisational Culture and Organisational Change Implementation](image-url)
However, in order to test the extent of the relationship the study formulated the following hypothesis:

**H2:** There is a positive relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation.

An organisation dominated by group culture stresses the importance of morale and strives to achieve long term organisational goals than organisational culture type that focused on short term goals (Cameron and Quinn, 1999). Such organisations enable organisational members to get involved in the change process and contribute to general organisational objective (Prajogo and McDermott, 2011). Due to elements of collectively and beliefs for organisational values, organisation with group culture are more likely to increase the level of readiness for change and implement organisational change practices and to behave in a manner consistent with change principles as discussed in the literature review chapter (Hostetler, 2007; Prajogo and McDermott, 2011).

According to Cameron and Quinn (1999, p.58): “an organisation dominated by group culture emphasises long term benefit of human resources development (e.g. training) and attaches great importance to cohesion and morale”. More so, such organisation places a premium on teamwork and increased participation than organisations that emphasize on the values of individualism (Prajogo and McDermott, 2011). Therefore, organisational members associated with this type of culture are likely to have higher levels of readiness for organisations preparing for change (Holt *et al.*, 2007) because they believe that they are capable of involving and achieving a process of change implementation.

So, organisational members dominated by a group culture are likely to have positive attitudes towards a proposed change implementation because they are confident that their organisation will not introduce or implement any change that might result in any form of negativism towards them (Cameron and Quinn, 2006). This means organisations with group culture will put more emphasis on collective responsibility where every person’s input to change will be appreciated and regarded. Other related studies also confirmed this that members of organisation that are dominated with group culture believe that they will benefit from their organisation when the change is
effectively implemented (Jones et al., 2005; Gimenez-Espin et al., 2012). The behaviour characteristics attached to organisational members associated with organisation group culture type led to the following sub hypothesis:

**H2a:** Group culture type will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

Stock et al. (2007) agreed that developmental culture supports organisational change practices and high resource acquisitions. In the same vein, Roh, *et al.* (2008) agreed that an emphasis on developmental culture will likely increase creativity and passion for creating mechanisms for problem solving which to a great extent impacts on the organisational change process. In comparing rational, developmental, and hierarchical culture types, Park and Kim (2009) posit that organisations that associate with developmental culture better increase the chances of being more creative as well as providing more strategies, vision, organisational loyalty, idea sharing, self confidence and striving to accomplish organisational change objectives.

Park and Kim (2009) viewed that rational culture emphasizes only results and getting the job done, and characterised with a structure to achieve organisational goals and strategies, facilitating the function of each specialty more effectively, improving business processes and stick adherence to organisational rules. This shows that rational culture suggests work efficiency, clear and a detailed work manual by increasing the readiness for organisational change. But, Cameron and Quinn, (1999) believe that developmental culture is strongly and positively association with employees readiness for change because it is linked to knowledge acquisition, creating an organisational strategy for change than rational culture which is focused on organisations that want to increase productivity against external competition (Rusly *et al.*, 2012).

Other researchers also confirmed that organisations dominated by rational culture type often focus on achieving the biggest market share with less confederating and care for the morale and development of the human resources within the organisation (Zammuto *et al.*, 2000; Prajogo and McDermott, 2005). Consequently, the members of such organisations are more likely to have low levels of readiness for organisational change. This comparison has shown that, while rational culture focused on
competitive advantage and external control, developmental culture is geared toward greater effect on organisational commitment, innovation and creativity. Based on this empirical views the following hypotheses were formulated:

**H2b:** Developmental culture type will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

**H2c:** Rational culture type will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.

Park and Kim (2009) observed that organisations associated with hierarchy culture are often formalised with rigorous working structure, hence sometimes making it difficult for subordinates to have a free flow of information with their superiors. Cameron and Quinn (1999) equally noticed that hierarchical culture is closely related to bureaucracy and formal and high complex rules, policies and procedures. Also, Zammuto *et al.* (2000) agreed that organisations dominated by hierarchy culture may not encourage innovation and creativity. It is also difficult to adjust and decision-making is often a top down approach (Park and Kim, 2009).

In a study on organisational learning, Fiol and Lyles (1985) posit that members of organisations associated with hierarchy culture are likely to result in resistance to change because members of such organisations find it difficult to adjust to new technology and organisational innovation. Quinn and Spreitzer (1991) found that organisations that emphasise a strong hierarchy culture are likely to have low performance. Cameron and Quinn (2011), who emphasised the importance of organisational values, viewed that organisations with a hierarchical culture will inhibit values and reduce innovation and hence cause problems in the organisation’s internal structure as a barrier to change.

In contrast, Prajogo and McDermott (2011) believe that hierarchy culture has a positive association with process quality. That process quality would enhance an organisation’s internal activities. The main characteristics of hierarchical culture are efficiency, adherence to norms, rules and regulations (Senz-Valle *et al.*, 2011). Liu *et al.* (2006) are also of the view that hierarchical culture is internally-focused and is concerned with organisational stability and control. This is associated with procedures
that govern what people do in an organisation, where formal rules and policies hold the organisation together (Liu et al., 2006). This argument led to the next hypothesis:

**H2d**: Hierarchical culture type will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.

### 3.2.3 The Effect of Managerial Skills on Organisational Change Implementation

The literature on managerial skills links an employee’s ability to translate organisational knowledge into practice (Katz, 1974; Livingston, 1971; Lewis and Kelly, 1989; Analoui et al., 2000; Burke and Colins, 2001). Also, Yukl (2013) linked managerial skills to people’s behaviour and characteristics that could lead to organisational effectiveness. Studies have equally identified three types of managerial skills such as technical skills, administrative skills, and human skills to organisational change success (Scullen et al., 2003; Yukl, 2013). Various studies often address these (skills) in more general terms with their impact on organisational change (Nadler, 1998; Jones et al., 2005; Miller et al., 2006; Chreim, 2006; Colville and Millner, 2011). However, few studies have addressed the impact of the three managerial skills on organisational change implementation (Scullen et al., 2003; Yukl, 2013) (Self and Schraeder, 2009; Weiner, 2009; Shah and Shah, 2010; Liao et al., 2010). This study assumed that the three identified managerial skills (technical, conceptual and interpersonal skills) will have a positive impact on individual readiness for change and change implementation.

Scholars have argued that technical skills increase employee’s knowledge, methods and processes of involving the technical aspects of managing organisational change (Self, 2007; Yukl, 2013). Conceptual skills which include planning, programming, and work organisation, setting goals, crisis management, delegating of authority and work inspection are regarded as administrative skills that have a high level of readiness for effective change (Scullen et al., 2003; Yukl, 2013). Also, interpersonal skills some time regarded as human skills which facilitate the understanding of the general principles of human behaviour, employees’ motivation and enhancing employees interaction in line with achieving readiness for change and change implementation (Scullen et al., 2003; Tonidandel et al., 2012; Parente et al., 2012; Yukl, 2013).
It is believed that the three managerial skills identified above are capable of influencing employee’s responsibilities, beliefs and confidence of readiness for participating in organisational change processes (Parente et al., 2012). Studies support that these skills help employees to increase their knowledge such as analysis, critical problem solving, planning, organising and controlling (Robbins and Hunsaker, 2000; Michalisin et al., 2004; Whetten and Cameron, 2007). For example, Stumpf et al. (1991) posit that managerial skills help managers to increase skills necessary to contribute individually to their organisation in supporting and expanding levels of organisational success. Holt et al. (2007) believe that members of an organisation who are trained to acquire various degrees of managerial skills will be confident in their ability to participate in organisational change implementation. In addition, such organisational members are likely to have the right attitude towards the planned change because they believe that they are capable of aligning themselves with proposed change and participate effectively (Wallace, 2004; Halbesleben et al., 2003; Stockdale and Crosby, 2004).

Studies in numerous organisations have viewed that a major impediment of organisational success was a lack of managerial skills (Hunt and Baruch, 2003; McKenna, 2004; Skinner, 2005; Rogerson, 2008). Pansiri and Temtime, (2008) confirmed that lack of managerial skills result in lack of experience, lack of manpower, lack of clear understanding of organisational ethics and norms, lack of proper organisational structure, low level of formalisation of work procedure and inadequate work standard. Since readiness for change cannot be automatically assumed, organisational members’ leaders are expected to emphasise developing employees with the required skills necessary to achieve a proposed change. More so, a failure to develop individuals with needed skills may result in spending significant time and energy in the wrong direction (Tonidandel et al., 2012).

Therefore, organisational members who are dominated with managerial skills such as administrative skills are likely to coordinate work effectively, communicate effectively, and enhance feedback delivery as well as influencing others to participate effectively in a team (McKenna, 2004). On the aspect of interpersonal skills, researchers argued that it helps to identify factors constraining growth and used as inputs through training to improve managerial effectiveness or measure behavioural
outputs (McKenna, 2004; Scullen et al., 2003; Yukl, 2013). While, some researchers argue that interpersonal skills develop self-awareness, managing stress, solving problems creatively and implementing change (McKenna, 2004; Self, 2007); others agreed that conceptual skills increase the ability to be creative and applying analytical and logical abilities help to solve potential organisational problems (Yukl, 2013). Consequently, organisational members who acquired all necessary managerial skills are likely to have higher levels of readiness for change (Scullen et al., 2003). These empirical investigations further establish the relationship between managerial skills, readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

The conclusion made by Gentry et al. (2008) and Yukl (2013) that managerial skills psychologically, administratively and technical prepared organisational members on the criticalities in change implementation shows that managerial skills have a positive influence on organisational change implementation. More so, the evidence from the literature view in (section 2.7.3) further revealed that managerial skills can be used as associate concept to form a conceptual model for organisational change implementation. Therefore, Figure 3.4 presents the relationship between managerial skills, readiness for change and organisational change implementation, to examine the impact of managerial skills on organisational change implementation.

![Figure 3.4: The Relationship between Managerial Skill and Organisational Change Implementation](image)

Thus, in order to test the impact of managerial skills on organisational change implementation, the following hypothesis is formulated:

**H3**: There is a positive relationship between managerial skills and organisational change implementation.
This main hypothesis is further divided in three sub-hypotheses to ascertain the extent each dimension of managerial skills impact on organisational change implementation, they are:

**H3a**: An emphasis on technical skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.

**H3b**: An emphasis on conceptual skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.

**H3c**: An emphasis on interpersonal skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.

### 3.2.4 The Effect of Organisational Trust on Organisational Change Implementation

The literature on organisational trust viewed it as is a critical component of organisational effectiveness, change and survival (McCaulley and Kuhnert, 1992; Sako; 1992; Costigan *et al.*, 1998; McKinght *et al.*, 1998; Atkingson and Butcher 2003). As indicated in chapter two, organisational trust has been linked to the study of organisational change (Mollering, 2001; Saunders and Thornhill, 2003; Erturk, 2008; Ben-Gal and Tzafrir, 2011; Smollan, 2013). On the other hand, readiness for change has been defined in line with employee’s beliefs, thought and behaviours to accept the needs for organisational change (Faghihi and Allameh, 2012). According to Armenakis *et al.* (1993) readiness is a cognitive precursor to behaviour of either resistance or support to organisational change, therefore the role of organisational trust is viewed as an enhancer to increase the level of change participation between managers and subordinates (Erturk, 2008). It has also been viewed that employee readiness has a significant impact in preparing employees to be both mentally and physically ready for organisational change implementation processes (Madsen, 2003).

Erturk’s (2008) study of 878 employees in Turkey’s public sector found that organisational trust was a major factor influencing the participation and openness to change. Trust increases people’s belief of efficacy to participate in change initiatives (Shah and Shah, 2010). Change comes with a lot of expectation, therefore success fully lies on the level of trust leaders/manager and subordinates have in working together in line with organisational policy towards organisational change.
implementation (Saunders and Thornhill, 2003; Neves and Caetano, 2009; Smollan, 2013).

Studies about organisational trust defined it in numerous dimensions, for example interpersonal and institutional trust (Brockner et al., 1997; Davis et al., 2000; Bowles and Gintis, 2002; Mannion et al., 2005). This research adopts both the interpersonal and institutional types of organisational trust (Ellonen et al., 2008). Interpersonal trust enhances the relationship between leaders/managers and subordinates increase employee’s competence, benevolence and reliable working environment (Mayer et al., 1999). Interpersonal trust has been identified with the following dimensions; ability, capability, integrity, truthfulness and goodwill, hence increasing the openness of individual readiness for change (Ellonen et al., 2008). Cochran et al. (2002) posit that employee readiness for change is significant when associated with ‘openness’ to change. More so, the perception of readiness for change may predict the employee’s level of receptivity to change (Faghihi and Allameh, 2012).

On the other hand, institutional trust is determined by the efficiency and the fairness of organisational entire systems such as various business units, organisational structure and human resource policies (Costigan et al., 1998; McKnight et al., 1998). Institution trust is closely associated with employee’s attitudes and commitment (Pearce et al., 2000), and it is characterised as the trust of members in the organisation’s vision and strategy, technological and commercial competence, processes and structures (Ellonen et al., 2008). This type of trust is based on the roles, systems and reputations from which assumptions are drawn about the trustworthiness of individual employees (Clegg et al., 2002). The sense in this type of trust is that, it enhances the interlinkages between various business units and organisational polices attached (Ellonen et al., 2008).

In addition, the implication of organisational trust is that it increases the interest of member of the organisation and their expectations from the change initiatives, as well as sharing the benefit of the change (Clegg et al., 2002). A high level of trust in the organisation will increase the level of trust among the leaders as well as among subordinates (Tan and Tan, 2000). Levin and Cross (2004) found organisational trust increases the concern and competence among employees, and mediates a strong link between knowledge sharing. In this regard, both leaders and subordinates are expected
to increase the belief in their relationship to successfully implement change. Faghihi and Allameh (2012) believe that readiness for change is reflected in organisational member’s beliefs, attitudes and intentions regarding the extent to which change is needed in their organisation. However, if they do not trust themselves and the change initiative, they may not be ready for the change, at which point the change might encounter resistance. This argument and discussion has reaffirmed the significant link of organisational trust on change readiness and change implementation as reviewed in (section 2.8.2). Therefore, it become necessary to link organisational trust to change readiness and organisational change implementation as a process of developing a conceptual framework alongside with other variables in order to examine the impact of organisational trust on organisational change implementation.
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However in order to text this relationship the following hypothesis and sub-hypotheses were formulated:

**H4**: There is a significant positive relationship between organisational trust and organisational change implementation.

**H4a**: Interpersonal trust will positively influence organisational change implementation.

**H4b**: Institutional trust will positively influence organisational change implementation.

### 3.2.5 The mediating role of Individual Readiness for Change

The literature review suggests that leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills, and organisational trust have indirect relationship with individual readiness for
change in order to predict more of organisational change implementation (see chapter two).

Studies have indicated that individual readiness for change has been considered and utilised as a variable for increasing people sense of readiness (Armenakis et al., 1993; Eby et al., 2000; Shah and Shah, 2010) and can mediating between other variables to contribute more on organisational success. An example of such studies is Jones et al. (2005), Rusly et al. (2012) and Haffar et al. (2013). In Jones et al. (2005) they examined the mediating role of individual readiness on implementing a new information system, whereas, Rusly et al. (2012) studied the influence of readiness for change on knowledge management processes and knowledge management effectiveness. Similarly, Haffar et al. (2013) investigates the mediating role of individual readiness for change on the success of implementing total quality management and found that individual readiness for change mediates the relationship between organisational culture and total quality management implementation.

This study viewed that individual readiness for change will influence leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills and organisational trust in order to predict more of organisational change implementation. Shah and Shah (2010) noted that organisational change does affect the attitude and behaviour of organisational members because they are transferred from a situation that is known to one that is unknown, which can lead to uncertainty, strain and anxiety among them. Weber and Weber (2001) noted that organisational change may affect the attitude of organisational members either positively or negatively. Several studies have examined various variables that influence organisational change implementation; they are: knowledge and skills, social relations in the workplace, organisational culture and leadership relationships, emphasizing that these factors increase the ability to cope with proactive measure capable of enhancing change implementation (Hanpachern et al., 1998; Cunningham et al., 2002; Miller et al., 2006; Holt et al., 2007), but could increase with influence of readiness for change (Timmor and Zif, 2010; Haffar et al., 2013).

In the same vein, Oakland and Tanner (2007) believes that employee readiness factors have a significant impact in preparing them mentally and physically in order to contribute more when participating on change implementation. They argue that
organisational member’s readiness for change has a significant impact on commitment. This means that, employees who have positive attitude to change implementation are likely to increase their commitment in supporting change implementation. Likewise, employees with a negative attitude to change will have a low level of change implementation and consequently resist change implementation (Herold et al., 2008; Seijts and Roberts, 2012).

Therefore, organisational members who participate in an environment with the right culture, appropriate leadership style and have the necessary skills with the right attitude are better prepared for change readiness (Oakland and Tanner, 2007). This, in turn will lead to a stable way of engaging employees to be active in organisational change implementation practices (Herold et al., 2008). When organisational members feel that they are better prepared on the job their efforts will be redoubled and their sense of readiness will increase (Shah and Shah, 2010). Researchers believe that the concept of organisational change implementation must be driven by organisational members who have the right mind and attitude for change implementation (Jones et al., 2005; Carnall, 2007). So, organisational member who have received adequate training on effective change implementation will have more self-assurance in their ability to cope with the process of organisational change implementation. Based on the empirical investigations of the impact of individual readiness for change, this study proposes that organisations individual readiness for change will increase the level of organisational change implementation. Thus, following hypothesis is formulated:

**H5:** Individual readiness for change has a positively influence on organisational change implementation.

### 3.3 Relating the Contextual factors on Organisational Change Implementation

Section 2.10 discussed the moderating role of the contextual factors considered in this study and their impact on organisational change implementation. This section will related each of the stated factors which are social norms and departments/units characteristics on organisational change implementation through the impact of individual readiness for change. Studies have viewed that the contextual factors help to increase the level of organisational change implementation (Wilson, 2001; Smith, 2005; Liozu and Hinterhuber, 2013). For example, Alas and Vadi (2006) believe that
social norms help organisations to stick to organisational beliefs and values in order to remain consistent with change implementation processes. Antony et al. (2012) is of the view that size and structure of organisational departments or units is a strong motivational factor for change implementation. Based on this empirical views and the views in section (2.10), this study believe that an integration of the contextual factors alongside other concepts adopted in this study will help to further increase the level of organisational change implementation, therefore, the following hypothesis is formulated:

**H6**: The contextual factors will help increase the level of organisational change implementation.

### 3.3.1 The Strength of Social Norms on Leadership and Organisational Change Implementation

The reason to increase individual readiness for change could be to embrace change and reduce resistance (Armenakis et al., 1993). Again, when individual readiness for change persists, organisations increase their chances of implementing change strategies (Self and Schraeder, 2009; Shah, 2011). On the other hand, if organisational members are not ready for change, then the chances of rejecting change might just increase (Jones et al., 2005) leading to sabotage, absenteeism and output restriction. Armenakis et al. (1993) noted that readiness for change is a reflection of positive beliefs, feelings and intentions regarding the extent to which change is needed and implemented. Therefore, the need to strengthen the norms and shared values which influences attitudes towards change implementation cannot be over emphasised (Hardina et al., 2006), because it thus helps to increase the readiness for change which is regarded as the triadic attitude required from organisational members (Oreg, 2006).

In line with the notion that social norms help organisational members to increase the required attitudes and practice needed to implement change (Wilson, 2001; Alas and Vadi 2006; Parikh, 2010). It is therefore pertinent to note that the characteristics of leadership can be influenced with the emphasis of social norms in order to achieve the cognitive and intentional dimension required from adopting such leadership styles. For example, if democratic and transformational leadership styles increases the relationship between leaders and their subordinates to either effect radical change or motivate them, then such leadership characteristics must be demonstrated as the norm
for increasing such leadership styles (Northouse, 2010). The leadership literature has extensively reviewed the advantages and disadvantages of different leadership styles and their impact on organisational change implementation. For instance, democratic and transformational leadership styles have been viewed to increase people’s readiness for change and sustain a long term change process, while on the other transactional leadership encourages short term change practices (Avery, 2004; Bratton et al., 2005; Jabnoun and Rasasi, 2005; Raoprasert and Islam, 2010).

More so, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership, which appear to be other relevant leadership strategies, have been criticised for discouraging readiness for change and organisational change implementation (Bass and Avolio, 1994). Researchers argued that such leadership styles most times lack the characteristics instigating the emotional readiness for change that would have captured the affective reaction required from members of organisations to drive effective change (Edmunds and Yewchuk, 1996; Grint, 2005; Oshagbemi and Ocholi, 2006; Bass and Bass, 2008; Hofstede et al., 2010). So, increasing the norms of those encouraging leadership styles will enhance the belief and thoughts for change since the practices of such characteristics are already familiar with them (Wilson, 2001; Alas and Vadi 2006; Parikh, 2010).

Thus, this study proposes that social norms will increase the relationship between leadership, readiness for change and organisational change implementation as illustrated in Figure 3.6, to examine the impact of social norms on the level of leadership and organisational change implementation.
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Consequently, the following sub-hypothesis is formulation to text the relationship:

**H6a:** Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation.

### 3.3.2 The Strength of Social Norms on Organisational Culture and Organisational Change Implementation

The literature on organisational culture types shows that group, developmental, rational and hierarchy culture types have influence on readiness for change and change implementation (Cameron and Quinn, 2006; Gimenez-Espin *et al*., 2012). For example, the literature confirmed that the characteristics of group and developmental culture types emphasizes long-term organisational achievement, therefore organisations dominated with group and developmental characteristics are expected to increase change readiness and implement change effectively (Cameron and Quinn, 1999; Zammuto *et al*., 2000). Also, the literature affirmed that rational culture increases organisational commitment than hierarchy culture type, at some point reduces the confidence of human resources development consequently reduces the level of change readiness and change implementation (Prajogo and McDermott, 2005). Nevertheless, it has helped organisations to improve strategies, functions of business processes in recent times (Park and Kim, 2009). On the other hand, hierarchy culture increases organisations inner stability to enable organisational leaders gain control over existing organisational structures (Senz-Valle *et al*., 2011).

Social norms have been referred to the shared values of an organisation’s behaviours (Hardina *et al*., 2006). So, it is important that the characteristics of perceived organisational culture types are increased significantly, and in doing so the norms of such cultural value needs to be embedded in members of the organisation (Alas and Vadi 2006; Schien, 2010). The beliefs and values of adapted organisational culture types are the main drive for entrenching characteristics in members of such organisation. Therefore, an emphasis of the social norms of group, developmental, rational and hierarchy culture type will increase the likely hood of change readiness and change implementation. Therefore, this study proposes that social norms will strengthen the relationship between organisational culture, readiness for change and organisational change implementation as demonstrated in Figure 3.7, to examine the
relationship of social norms on the level of organisational culture and organisational change implementation.

![Diagram showing the relationship between organisational culture, organisational change implementation, social norms, and H6b]

**Figure 3.7: The Impact of Social Norms on Organisational Culture and Organisational Change Implementation**

However, in order to examine the impact of this relationship the following hypothesis is formulated:

**H6b:** Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation.

### 3.3.3 The Strength of Social Norms on Managerial Skills and Organisational Change Implementation

Studies on managerial skills viewed that the increase in values for technical, conceptual and interpersonal skills increases readiness for change as well as change implementation (Carmeli and Tishler, 2006; Yukl, 2013). Technical skills are concerned with factual knowledge which organisational members require to increase their capacities (Yukl 2013). Conceptual skills increase employee’s sense of judgment, foresight and creativity as well as the ability to find potential solutions to organisational problems (Self, 2007), while interpersonal skills enable members of an organisation to understand feelings and motive about their work environment. So, it is necessary that organisational leaders imbibe the norms of consistent training to increase the various dimensions of managerial skills in those responsible for change. If the employee works in an organisation where the norm for consistent training is high, such employees will be consistent with workplace improvement (Harrison and Carroll, 1991). The link of social norms into the perception of skills improvement and change readiness will constantly maintain an accelerated change implementation in organisations (Wilson 2001; Alas and Vadi, 2006).
Therefore, it becomes relevant to propose that social norms will strengthen the relationship between managerial skills, readiness for change, and organisational change implementation as demonstrated in Figure 3.8, to examine the strength of social norms on the level of managerial skills and organisational change implementation.

**Figure 3.8: The Impact of Social Norms on Managerial Skills and Organisational Change Implementation**

Thus, the following hypothesis is formulated to test the impact of this relationship:

**H6c:** Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between managerial skills and organisational change implementation.

### 3.3.4 The Strength of Social Norms on Organisational Trust Organisational Change Implementation

The dimensions of organisational trust identified in this study are linked to readiness for change and change implementation (Erturk, 2008; Ben-Gal and Tzafrir, 2011; Smollan, 2013). Organisational trust is useful when considering increasing commitment and organisational improvement (Smollan, 2013). Interpersonal trust which is associated with competence, integrity, and trustworthiness among organisational members is used to increase their capability to work among themselves, more so, institutional trust which is associated with organisational procedures, human resource processes, the organisational justice system and commitment is used to strengthen organisational structure (Kelley, 2007; Ellonen et al., 2008). The need to maintain the norm of consistently improving the skills employees need for fast track change implementation processes is highly important (Neves and Caetano, 2009).
Therefore, the study view that social norms will strengthen the relationship between organisational trust, readiness for change and organisational change implementation as illustrated in Figure 3.9, to examine the strength of social norms on the level of organisational trust and organisational change implementation. This means that, adherence to norms that will increase the values of interpersonal and institutional trust will help sustain necessary characteristics among members of the organisation.

![Figure 3.9: The Impact of Social Norms on Organisational Trust and Organisational Change Implementation](image)

The following is formulated to examine the impact of social norms:

**H6d**: Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between organisational trust and organisational change implementation.

### 3.3.5 The Strength of Units/Departments Characteristics on Organisational Change Implementation

Studies have measured the impact of organisational departments/units and conclude that the size of organisational departments or units have a major impact on employees readiness for change and change implementation (Temtime, 2003; Bugdol, 2005; Rad, 2006; Elbanna, 2007). Antony et al. (2012) add that where there is an inadequate communication system department of organisation or a situation where the actual workforce is smaller than actually needed may lack the requisite structure to increase change readiness and change implementation effectively. Self and Schraeder (2009) view that organisational change implementation required the necessary structure and strategies which also include the departmental/unit characteristics must be in line with the change plan.
Also, studies show that one of the driven forces for change readiness is the power of delegation in each department or units and people’s attitude of responding to duties (Carnall, 2007; Holt et al., 2007). Jones et al. (2005) posit that portraying a negative attitude at the workplace will have a negative impact on change readiness and change implementation. Therefore, the key elements for an increase in individual readiness for change and change implementation are the understanding of how each departments/units work and reducing a nonchalant attitude at the workplace (Weiner et al., 2008; Mueller et al., 2012). This shows that organisational departments or units characteristics are critical and necessary for change readiness and change implementation as shown in Figure 3.10.

![Figure 3.10: The Impact of Dept/Units Characteristics and Organisational Change Implementation](image)

This discussion shows that departments/units’ characteristics are critical for increasing readiness for change and change implementation, thus the following hypothesis is formulated:

**H6f**: Department/units’ characteristics are contingent on the relationship between readiness to change and organisational change implementation.

### 3.4 Summary of Research Hypotheses

This research aims to find out what factors can help organisational change implementation. Based on the existing gap in the organisational change literature, the following research hypotheses were developed and considered in the design of the research model. Below is a summary of hypotheses formulated for the research:
H1: There is a relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation.

H1a: Transformational leadership style will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

H1b: Transactional leadership style will have a lesser impact on organisational change implementation than transformational leadership style.

H1c: Democratic leadership style will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

H1d: Autocratic leadership style will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.

H1e: Laissez-faire leadership style will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.

H2: There is a positive relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation.

H2a: Group culture type will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

H2b: Developmental culture type will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

H2c: Rational culture type will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.

H2d: Hierarchical culture type will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.

H3: There is a positive relationship between managerial skills and organisational change implementation.

H3a: An emphasis on technical skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.
**H3b**: An emphasis on conceptual skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.

**H3c**: An emphasis on interpersonal skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.

**H4**: There is a significant positive relationship between organisational trust and organisational change implementation.

**H4a**: Interpersonal trust will positively influence organisational change implementation.

**H4b**: Institutional trust will positively influence organisational change implementation.

**H5**: Individual readiness for change has a positive influence on organisational change implementation.

**H6**: The contextual factors will help increase the level of organisational change implementation.

**H6a**: Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation.

**H6b**: Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation.

**H6c**: Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between managerial skills and organisational change implementation.

**H6d**: Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between organisational trust and organisational change implementation.

**H6f**: Department/units’ characteristics are contingent on the relationship between readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

### 3.5 Conceptual Model

In order to test the research question for this study and describe the research problems outlined in chapter one above (section 1.2), and in order to advance and authenticate
the relationship of variables a conceptual model was developed in line with the theories and concept which underpin this study, see Figure 3.11. The conceptual framework shows the direct and indirect impact of the various variables considered in this study. The conceptual framework will also be used to explain and examine the relationship between variables.
Figure 3.11: Proposed Conceptual Framework for the Study

This Conceptual Framework is showing the relationship among Leadership styles, Organisational Culture types, Skills, Trust and Individual Readiness for Change and Organisational Change Implementation.
As demonstrated above, the model collectively brings all the research hypotheses together in the following manner. Firstly, it assumes that for an organisation to successfully implement change, the members of such an organisational must be equipped to have the required capacity and readiness in order to participate in the change implementation. Theories of organisational change suggest that people make change happen and not that changes make people happen. Based on this premise, this study further postulates that to increase the degree and intensity of organisational change implementation is context dependent on leadership styles (transformational, transactional, and democratic) which are positively related to individual readiness for change, while laissez-faire and autocratic leadership styles may be negatively related to individual readiness. Secondly, based in the CVF (Quinn and Spreitzer, 1991; Prajogo and McDermott, 2005) of organisational culture, this study assumed that in order to increase the degree and intensity of organisational change implementation, group and developmental culture styles are positively associated to individual readiness for change, while rational and hierarchical culture might be positively or negatively associated to individual readiness for change.

Thirdly, this framework presumes that under the dimensions of managerial skills (Genry et al., 2008; Leong, 2008; Yukl, 2013) organisational change implementation will benefit from people’s knowledge, creativity, ability as well as the processes of implementing change. Based on this premise, technical, conceptual and interpersonal skills are positively associated to individual readiness for change. Fourthly, the framework hypothesises that based on the existing literature on types of organisational trust (Erturk, 2008; Ben-Gal and Tzafrir, 2011; Smollan, 2013), the process of organisational change implementation will benefit from an increased emphasis on interpersonal and institutional trust. Therefore, interpersonal and institutional trust is positively associated to individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

The framework proposes the integration of the following: (1) social norms, which is are perceived to increase organisation member’s readiness for change as it increases the level at which members pledge to shared values of the organisational, and (2) unit/departmental characteristics, which refers to the size, workforce organisational department and their determinant to implement change.
This integrated theoretical model is offered as an extension of what numerous authors have specified such as Edwards (2005), Jones et al. (2005), Prajogo and McDermott, 2011, Erturk (2008), Gentry et al. (2008), Self and Schraeder (2009), Shah (2011), Dia (2013), Haffar et al. (2013) regarding the influence of leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills and organisational trust on readiness for change and organisational change implementation. As demonstrated in (Figure 3.11), the innovative theoretical model was developed by combining the indirect effects of leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills and organisational trust to individual readiness for change and how that mediates organisational change implementation. More so, the model combines the direct effect of social norms and unit characteristics for organisational change implementation and their impact on readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

In this sense, the innovative model seeks to provide explanations of the adoption of a predominant leadership styles and organisational culture types on organisational change implementation. Also, it seeks to provide explanations on the effect of managerial skills and organisational trust on organisational change implementation. Therefore, it is envisaged that this innovative model would make a novel contribution by giving a more refined understanding to the relationship between leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills, organisational trust, individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

The existing literature on organisational change noted a lack of empirical studies on the relationship between the variables perceived in this study on the implementation of organisational change in the oil and gas sector in Nigerian. Therefore, examining of the relationship between leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills, organisational trust and individual readiness for change will help provide to the management of NNPC with useful suggestions and measures that will help them effectively implementation change.
3.6 Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to achieve a major objective of this study by discussing the relationship of the variables considered in the study. Also, the relationship between leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills and organisational trust to individual readiness for change were discussed in detail. Based on the literature review, the research hypotheses were formulated and defined into an integrated conceptual framework which presented a clear relationship of all the independent variables to individual readiness for change to mediating organisational change implementation, as presented in Figure 3.11.

This innovative theoretical framework combines the direct effect of leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills and organisational trust to individual readiness for change and how this directly mediates the implementation of organisational change. Also, the moderating role of social norms to change implementation was discussed, including the moderating role of unit/departmental characteristics to organisational change implementation. Importantly, this innovative theoretical framework is offered as an extension to the works of Edwards (2005), Jones et al. (2005), Prajogo and McDermott, 2011, Erturk (2008), Gentry et al. (2008), Self and Schraeder (2009), Shah (2011), Dia (2013) in relation to the influence of leadership styles, the organisational culture types of (CVF), managerial skills, and organisational trust on readiness for change to mediate organisational change implementation. In order to validate the hypotheses and conceptual framework, empirical research is followed. Therefore, the next chapter describes the research design and methodologies to enable the study achieve its full objectives.
CHAPTER FOUR

Research Methodology

4.1 Introduction

The previous chapter discussed and developed the conceptual framework and research hypotheses of this study. This chapter discusses and explains the rational and justifies the research philosophy, approach and design adopted in this study. The chapter explain and justify method of data collection and analysis. Also, the chapter provided information about the NNPC and how it will benefit from the study. Finally, the chapter conceptualised the variables and presents instrument for measurement.

4.2 Research Philosophy

According to Saunders et al. (2009), a clear understanding of research philosophy is important for conducting a study because it helps the researcher to clarify the overall research strategy applied to the research. Research philosophy helps the researcher to evaluate different research methodologies and methods. Also, research philosophy helps the researcher to be more creative and innovative in selection and application of methods applied in previous studies (Creswell, 2009). Saunders et al. (2009) viewed three schools of thought on research that are most prevalent in relevant literature, that are realism, interpretivism and positivism.

Interpretivism suggests that the social world of business and management research is complex and theory formation which is based on methods used in the social sciences (Bryman and Bell, 2007). Also, complexities should not be reduced entirely to a series of law-like generalisations as this precludes the possibility of gaining richer insight into the profound realities of occurrence (Saunders et al., 2009). On the order hand, positivism is related to natural sciences and observable social reality (Densin and Lincoln, 2008). Gill and Johnson (2010) describe positivism as characterised by well-structured methodology. Collis and Hussey (2003) posit that most researchers who assume a positivistic paradigm do so because it enables them collect experimental observable data for statistical analysis. But, the interpretivism paradigm is more of qualitative approach which enables researchers to discover the hidden details of the
phenomenon (Saunders et al., 2009). Galliers (1990) added that realist is characterized with formal hypothesis testing, quantifiable variables and inference, which can be drawn from population samples.

In contrast, the interpretivism perspective suggests that it is more likely for researchers to assume information, collect small sample and describe it in a meaningful manner (Creswell, 2009), whereas a realist sees beyond the object of the research and considers social forces, factors and processes that influence peoples’ interpretations, attitudes, behaviours and decisions (Bryman and Bell, 2007). In addition, realism adopts some of the interpretivism positions to ensure that meanings are shared and knowledge can be progressed in a social environment. Again, while interpretivist researchers are associated with qualitative investigation, the realist is concern with both qualitative and quantitative inquiries (Saunders et al., 2009).

An application of realism helps the researcher to recognise the importance of understanding socially constructed interpretations and meanings, or subjective reality, within the context of seeking to understand the broader social factors, structures or processes that influence or constrain the nature of people’s views (Johnson and Duberley, 2000), as well as the realities that influence people’s social interpretations and behaviour. Saunders, et al. (2009) agreed that business and management research often applied a mixture of both positivist and interpretivist approaches with the view of reflecting the stance of realism.

The above argument supports the paradigm of qualitative and quantitative research approaches. This makes it clear that in order to explore the factors that can help organisational change implementation, the current study will adopt a paradigm or methodology that determines both the way in which inquiry is conducted and an understanding of the explanation and inference drawn from the results produced (Gill and Johnson (1997). In that way, this research adopts the position of a realist on the basis that the philosophical approach can best reflect the principal purpose of the study and account for the context in which the inquiries take place.
4.3 Research Design

Saunders et al. (2009) confirmed that research design is concerned with the structuring of the methods and techniques applied for data collection in order to achieve research aims and objectives. This helps the researcher to create knowledge in line with the principles of a mixed methods approach. Business and management research identifies two research approaches hypothetico-deduction and induction (Bryman and Bell, 2011). With the inductive approach, data are collected and theory is developed as a result of the data analysis (Gill and Johnson, 1997), this approach is less concerned with the need to generalise, and small samples might be more suitable. In the hypothetico-deductive approach a theory and testable hypotheses about causal relationship between variables are developed and a research strategy is designed to test the hypotheses (Sekaran and Bougie, 2010), and at the end results are confirmed (either positive or negative). The advantage of this approach is that it expresses the hypotheses in operational terms and collecting the quantitative data primarily to test the hypotheses. Another advantage of the hypothetico-deductive approach is that it enables the generalisation of statistical conclusions by selecting appropriate samples (Sekaran and Bougie, 2010).

Consequently, hypothetico-deductive approach will enable the study make possible predictions that can be verified or disproved by empirical evidence either from testing theories or hypotheses. The research will not build or formulate theory as bases for data gathering and analysis rather it will formulate hypotheses to ascertain the relationship between variables and theory explored in the literature review. The hypotheses were tested empirically to confirm or disconfirm them. The hypotheses tested and ascertained the relationships between leadership styles, organisational culture types of the CVF, managerial skills, organisational trust, and the mediating role of individual readiness for change to organisational change implementation, as well as the moderating effect of the contextual factors.

This equally describes the cause and effect associations between variables; between leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills and organisational trust (independent variables), individual readiness for change (mediating variable), social norms, employees and units/departments characteristics (moderating variables) and organisational change implementation (dependent variable). With this, (primarily
quantitative data) are collected in order to increase the validity and reliability of the findings and to decrease the degree of bias (Bamberger, 2000). Moreover, this study aims to generalise the results and findings of the research sample to the whole population of employees in the NNPC. The representative samples of 450 managers (change implementation personnel) across the NNPC were the targeted population for the research. Therefore, the research adopts the mixed methods approach in order to provide an in-depth understanding of how to effectively implement organisational change in the NNPC through qualitative method and measurement through quantitative method.

The knowledge acquired via a qualitative research approach is employed to inform the design of survey questions for the questionnaire (Bryman and Bell, 2011). Hence, the information gathered at interview sessions with the review of related literature was used to inform the development of the questionnaire used for this study. Maxwell and Delaney (2004) believes that the choice of a quantitative approach should be consistent with the way scientist treat physical phenomena, which values time and content generalisations that cause scientific outcomes to be reliable and valid.

Furthermore, the study adopts a cross-sectional research design for data collection because it involves the collection of data at one point in time (Polit and Back, 2008). Saunders et al. (2009) add that in this design the phenomena under study are captured during one period of data collection, unlike the longitudinal research design which relies on studying the change and the development of a phenomenon over time. Polit and Back (2008) argued that the cross-sectional design is appropriate for describing relationships among phenomena which often affected by time and manageable resource limitation, compared to longitudinal research design that is time consuming and resource demanding. However, the inherent problem of the cross-sectional research design is that it is difficult to know which variable or set of variables influences the other during the process of measurement (Babbie, 2007). Hence, the research would need to gain adequate knowledge about the topic under investigation through an extensive review of the related literature in order to observe the effect and impact of behavioural change among variables considered in the study (Gravetter and Forzano, 2011).
4.4 Quantitative and Qualitative Data Collection Techniques

Quantitative and qualitative techniques have significant impacts on business and management research and are considered potentially important and relevant for data collection (Yin, 2003), hence applying both creates a balanced research and provides an in-depth representation to support research findings (Naoum, 2002). While a qualitative technique is acquainted with a notion that available theory may be inaccurate, inappropriate, and incorrect or biased, a quantitative technique helps to substantiate problems and suggest possible questions or hypotheses that need to be addressed (Creswell, 2009). This research adopts both quantitative and qualitative approaches to enable the researcher to employ a systematic and empirical investigation of the relationship between the independent, moderating, mediating and dependent variables as proposed in Figure 3.11 above.

In line with this, the quantitative and qualitative approach was sustained and helped in the scientific inquiry in the NNPC change implementation agenda. With the adoption of the qualitative approach, a semi-structured interview was adopted to help the researcher have one-on-one discussions with high ranked managers in the NNPC to help provide some in-depth information to draw conclusions from this investigation. The questionnaires were distributed to provide a clear picture of the extent that organisational change implementation is necessary in the NNPC. To this end, all the results were analysed and compared to give a clear picture (see chapter 5) below. This design was developed after an initial pilot study was conducted at the NNPC during the preliminary stage of the investigation. Also, this study is strongly informed and driven by existing theories with no manipulation of setting by the researcher (Robson, 2002). Hypotheses were formulated after an extensive literature review was carried out. This led to the design of the innovative theoretical framework to help guide the entire study.

The final stage of the study features an extensive data collection and analysis guided with the example in Table 4.1 as well as focusing on building a complex and holistic picture that is formed with words and detailed information centred on a preferable situation where an understanding is established in the phenomenon of the study of organisational change implementation (Bryman et al., 1996).
Quantitative and qualitative techniques which some researchers described as mixed approach will enable the research be more pragmatic and reduce the weakness of adopting a single research method. The mixed approach allows the researcher to minimise the weaknesses of qualitative and quantitative data (Miles and Huberman, 1994). It will also help to overcome the potential bias and sterility of a single-method approach (Collis and Hussy, 2003), and provide more viewpoints and perspective as well as deeper and broader information on the phenomenon (Bamberger, 2000; Creswell, 2009) and also to increase the quality, validity and reliability of the findings and decrease bias.

4.5 Mixed Method Research Design

This study aimed to find out factors that can help organisational change implementation. The pilot study conducted at the preliminary stage of the study has helped to construct research hypotheses and redefined the research questions. More so, a conceptual framework helps to link the theoretical assumption that informed the whole of the research. It is imperative that a mixed method is adopted to enable the involvement of collecting both quantitative and qualitative data. Creswell (2007) described mixed methods research as:

_A research method designed with philosophical assumption as well as methods of inquiry. As a methodology, it involves philosophical assumptions that guide the direction of the collection and analysis of data and the mixture of qualitative and quantitative approaches in many phases in the research process. As a method, it focuses on collecting, analysing, and mixed both quantitative and qualitative data in a single and series of studies. Its centre premise is that the use of both approaches in combination provides a better understanding of research problems than either approach alone (p.5)._  

This recognises the integration or combination in the sense that two forms of data are blended together. The philosophical position adopted in this study acknowledges that the approach is actually a combination of both methods which affirms such instruments as questionnaires and interview questions for data collection (Saunders _et al._, 2009). The above definition aligned with Onwuegbuzie and Johnson’s (2006) view of mixed research which also affirmed that mixed methods of research combines quantitative and qualitative research techniques in a single study. It is believed that the
mixed methods will add value in this study by providing comprehensive and richer understanding of the research problem under study (Creswell and Clark, 2007) also, it will help explore the problem with the perspectives of quantitative and qualitative research technique.

Klenke (2008) emphasized the need for mixed methods research when undertaking a study in business management. From the debate, Maxwell and Delaney (2004) argue for quantitative purist articulate assumptions which are consistent with positivism, hence they believe that social observations should be treated as entities in the same way that physical scientists treat physical phenomena. They added that quantitative research values time and content free of generalizations, stating that the causes of scientific outcomes can be determined reliably and validly. This school of thought believes that an observer is separated from the observed and maintains that social science should be objective and equally believe that researchers should eliminate any biases, remain emotionally detached and uninvolved with research participants and test and empirically justify their hypotheses.

On the other hand, qualitative purists also called (constructivist or interpretivist) argue for the superiority of constructivism, idealism, relativism, humanism and hermeneutics. This group believes that the knower and the known cannot be separated, that time and context free generalisation are neither desirable nor possible, that research is value-bound and it is impossible to differentiate fully between causes and effect. But Moran-Elis et al. (2006) argued that mixed methods and an epistemological stance, equally confirmed it as the use of two or more methods that draw on different multi-theoretical assumptions and can include standard positivistic-quantitative and interpretive-qualitative components. With this combination, the mixed approach is emphasized to complement the quantitative and qualitative nature to form a consolidate design. With this focus, the study can draw conclusion in line with the data collected from the interview and questionnaire questions.

In order to achieve the purpose of this investigation, primary data were accessed in a small scale through interview to inform the questionnaire survey of the larger sample of the second stage of the investigation. Therefore, the study follows a sequentially less qualitative approach where quantitative methodology dominates (Jogulu and Pansiri, 2011; Bryman and Bell, 2011).
Table 4.1: Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tend to or Typical</th>
<th>Qualitative Approaches</th>
<th>Quantitative Approaches</th>
<th>Mixed Methods Approach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use these philosophical assumptions</td>
<td>Constructivist/Advocacy/Participatory knowledge claims</td>
<td>Postpositivist knowledge adoption</td>
<td>Pragmatic knowledge claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ thesis strategies of inquiry</td>
<td>Phenomenology, grounded theory, ethnography, case study and narrative</td>
<td>Surveys and experiments</td>
<td>Sequential concurrent and transformative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employ these methods</td>
<td>Open-end questions, emerging approach, text or image data</td>
<td>Close-end questions predetermined approaches numerical data</td>
<td>Both open and close-ended questions, both emerging and predetermined approaches, and both quantitative and qualitative data and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use these practices of research, as the researcher</td>
<td>Focuses on a single concept or phenomenon Brings personal values into study Studies the context or setting of participants to validate the accuracy of the findings Makes interpretations of the data Creates an agenda for change or reform Collaborates with the participants</td>
<td>Test or verify theories or explanations Identify variables to study relate variables in questions or hypotheses Use standards of validity and reliability Observe and measure information numerically Use unbiased approaches Employ statistical procedures</td>
<td>Collect both quantitative and qualitative data Develop a rationale for mixing Integrate the data at different stages of inquiry Present visual pictures of both qualitative and quantitative research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sounders et al. (2009), Bryman and Bell, (2011)
4.6 Research Plan

The interview session led to an appropriate development of a research plan suitable for the current study. The research plan presented in Figure 4.1 demonstrates a sequential and analytical order in which this study was conducted. The aim is to help with a “road map” for completing the entire study. This shows the design specifying the methods and procedure for collecting and analysing data. Zikmund (1997) defined a research plan as a framework for a research plan of action, where the objective of the study, determined during the early stage of the research, is included in the design to make sure that all information collected is appropriate for solving the problem. Similarly, Yin (2003) defined it as an action plan for getting from here to there, where here defined a set of questions to be answered, and there forms the set of conclusions. This plan helps to sequentially carry out the research in order to meet the aim of the research which is to find out the factors that can help organisational change implementation.
Figure 4.1: The Research Plan

4.7 Pilot Study

The literature affirmed that it is always desirable for researchers to conduct a pilot study before preparing the stage for a proper questionnaire or interview administration (Bryman and Bell, 2007). Apart from ensuring that survey questions operate well, the piloting ensures the reliability and validity of the entire research instrument as a whole as well as ensuring that they function well (Bryman and Bell, 2011). In a related
development Zikmund et al. (2013) add that a pilot study is a descriptive process where results are preliminary and assists the researcher to design and explore the subsequent study.

In order to explore the factors that can help organisational change implementation, a pilot study was undertaken to ensure that the main study will be able to identify clearly the research questions as well as determining the adequacy of instructions to respondents who will be completing the questions. Saunders et al. (2009) believe that the initial piloting will help the researcher to refine the questionnaire so that respondents will find it easy when responding to the questions, see section 4.7.1 for more details concerning the outcome of the pilot study.

4.7.1 Pilot Testing

Scholars have established the need to pilot test all parts of the questionnaire before data collection takes place to ensure validity and reliability of the questions (Tuomela and Salonen 2005; Saunders et al., 2009). According to Tuomela and Salonen (2005) a pilot study reveals any insufficiencies in the intended future study which aims to provide significant insights, refine data collection plans, and develop relevant lines of questioning for the basic issues in the future study. Saunders et al. (2009) equally add that a pilot study is a small scale study that tests a questionnaire or interview checklist or observation schedule to minimise the likelihood of respondents having problems in answering the questions and to ensure the validity and reliability of recording data.

A pilot study is a small experiment designed to test logistics and gather information prior to a larger study in order to improve the quality of the subsequent study (Au et al., 2010). The pilot study focused in the NNPC corporate headquarters in Abuja Nigeria, the data collected enhanced an in-depth analysis in the study and helped with a significant approach in exploring the issues involved in organisational change implementation. The pilot study is generally smaller compared with the main larger body of the study, and therefore provided only limited information on the sources and magnitude of variation of response measures (Au et al., 2010). It is unlikely, for example that this pilot study alone can provide adequate data for analysis that would evident what would be required for organisational change implementation. However, the
pilot study provided vital and reliable information that led to the modification of materials for the completion of the study.

The pilot study has helped to address issues concerning the study which were factors to be resolved prior to the main study such as:

1. To help prove the consistency of the research and enhance a comprehensive study.
2. To check if the techniques adopted in the study are capable of yielding the anticipated results.
3. To check and measure the ongoing change programme in the NNPC and ascertain areas of weakness and strength in order see how the current study can investigate it.
4. To check the reliability and validity of the piloted results to see if that is in line with the anticipated aim of the study.
5. To assess appropriate levels of intervention.
6. To identify other areas to explore within the study.

The pilot study actually led to a modification of materials and procedures which were incorporated into the main body of the study. From the pilot study conducted, the respondents were selected across personnel responsible for change implementation in the NNPC (middle managers). A total of two hundred and twenty (220) questionnaires were distributed and one hundred and twenty five (125) were returned for analysis. The feedback of the respondents regarding the questionnaires was useful in revising the questions hence some changes were made after the pilot study in order to avoid unnecessary confusion but to offer better understanding to ensure that respondents answered the questionnaires to achieve the purpose of the study.

4.7.2 Feedback from the Pilot Testing

It was ascertained generally that the questionnaire was clear and simple to understand, however reasonable comments were observed and received for improvement. The feedbacks are:

1. Eleven new items were added, with a new section.
2. Some of the questions were reviewed due to the length of the words.
3. Some words were clarified to ensure easy understanding for the respondents.

4. Some of the questions were restructured to ascertain the personal view of respondents in line with the way they view the organisation instead of the way the organisation works.

5. Repeated questions were deleted.

The data gathered from the pilot study help the research understand the concept and research construct. This also helps to ensure that the research questions are valid and are worthwhile to carry out the research. This is consistent with Rubin and Rubin’s (2012) assertion that researchers should first examine what they will learn from an initial set of interviews and draw out the principles that would be of interest if they help more generally. In line with this, the current study conducted a pilot study in two phases with an initial interview with 5 middle managers in the NNPC which formed part of the sample target for the entire study was conducted. Below are responses from respondents and the author’s comments on those responses:

1. “Attitudinal change in some team players towards organisational objectives may be required. Some good values of our culture may be pivotal for the required change in the organisation. A holistic adaptation of the agenda with alien cultural values may slow us down. Another issue to consider is trust. There is a high level of distrust among employees which militates against our change efforts”.

   This shows that the organisation may need to emphasize the need to increase the level of trust among employees and at the level of the organisation.

2. “Employee commitment remain a key issue toward that change programme, our current structure has not encourage commitment at all levels which is why there is this slow pace of change implementation”. This could be the already existing inappropriate leadership and cultural structure within the organisation. This is related to absence of individual readiness for change which could as a result of lack of increasing the level of individual readiness for change to mediate change implementation (Madsen et al., 2005).

3. “Our current leadership culture in the NNPC still believes in bureaucracy that delays important decisions and project implementation. Also, deployment of
electronic communication devices to enable work completion is still relatively low compared to other counterpart organisations”.

This is a clear indication that there is an absence of an accepted or predominant leadership style that could align with ongoing change. Secondly, the respondent indicated that there is less skilled manpower to facilitate modern communication technology to help enhance change.

4. “More transformation is also being adopted by NNPC management to inspire members of staff. Quarterly participatory “town hall” meetings are carried out by NNPC management to inform and to carry staff along on major decisions”. This statement shows that individual readiness for change remains a challenge in the corporation. Where employees are not inspired and are not carried along in the decision making process, their interest is often disconnected during commitment to change implementation (Holt et al., 2007; Rusly et al., 2012).

5. “In NNPC, few works has been done on our challenges and the way forward, but implementation is not undertaken. The culture of change implementation is lacking. Politics plays a major role in our activities and decisions, there is devoid of best practice”.

Again, this is an indication of lack of adaptation of a culture type that is consistent and can help lead the change implementation.

The above five statements are direct quotes from the officers of the NNPC. The issues raised are not far different from the lingering issues confronting organisational change implementation in the literature. For example, the interview have revealed that the NNPC lacks the adoption of a predominant leadership style, organisational culture type as well as employees skills and trust that would help facilitate change implementation. The absence of these variables has the capacity to reduce the level of individual readiness for change and therefore slow the dawn the process of change implementation. Studies have shown that if the level of readiness for change is increased, it will play a significant role in mediating change implementation (By, 2007; Shah, 2011; Rusly et al., 2012). The persistent issues discovered during the interview with the NNPC key officers establish the major constrains on implementing change.
The second phase pilot was followed with a small scale questionnaire distribution within the targeted population to help have an in-depth understanding into the issues explore in the qualitative view. This helped to establish the anticipated research problem and ascertained if the findings from the literature review are applicable within the NNPC context. The pilot study serves as a guide to understanding the major constructs of the study and helped to develop the proposed conceptual framework for the study as illustrated in Figure 3.11. However, the finding from the quantitative pilot is presented in Table 4.2.

**Validation of Research Hypotheses and Conceptual Framework**

The outcome of the pilot study revealed that members of the organisation has a good knowledge of organisational change implementation, readiness for change, leadership, organisational culture, skills, organisational trust and the contextual factors constructs. The findings from the pilot equally revealed that the respondents believed that there are different leadership styles and they positively and negatively influence change implementation. However, they identified transformational, transactional and democratic leadership as predominant leadership styles in the organisation. The respondents also believe that there are various organisational culture types and can influence the organisation either positive or negatively. Most of them believed that hierarchy culture which is a predominantly culture type in Nigeria is relatively high in the organisation, and may lead to low level of change implementation.

The outcome of the pilot revealed that the respondents believed that readiness for change influence change implementation positively, meanwhile most of them indicated that the low level of individual readiness for change in relation to change implementation is as a result of negative attitude toward change implementation. Thus is one of the reasons why the NNPC is unable to implement change.

In addition, the pilot study revealed that the respondents are familiar with criticalities of managerial and significance of organisational trust. However, it was revealed that change personnel are yet to acquire the relevant managerial skills that would increase readiness for change and the capacity for understanding change implementation. Therefore, they believed that the low level of acquaintance of the relevant managerial skills is responsible for the low level of change implementation in the NNPC. Also, the respondents are believed that organisational trust is a key aspect of increasing people
consciousness in relation to change implementation. The low level of their perception of organisational trust shows that they believed that the low level of trust is a factor militating against change implementation in the organisation. The respondents believed that the norms for the perceived variables are relatively low therefore causing the low level of change implementation in the NNPC.

So, the findings of exploratory pilot study with change implementation personnel in the NNPC in addition to informal discussions with academia and practitioners validated and supported the initial framework and hypotheses as formulated and illustrated above. To this end, the researcher’s view about the theoretical framework adopted is convinced that the literature is relevant and acceptable hence no need for alternation.
Table 4.2: A Summary of Results from the Quantitative Pilot Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predominant Leadership Style</th>
<th>Readiness for Change</th>
<th>Organisational Culture Types</th>
<th>Managerial skills</th>
<th>Organisational Trust</th>
<th>Contextual Factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
<td>RPD</td>
<td>Freq</td>
<td>Valid %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>STD</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSL</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>SLA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DG</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Freq. = frequency  
SA = strongly agree  
SLA = slightly agree  
SD = strongly disagree  
STD = slightly disagree  
RPD = respondents  
AG = Agree  
DG = Disagree
4.8 Questionnaire Development

Saunders et al. (2009) acknowledge that the survey method is one of the most widely accepted strategies and is usually associated with the deductive approach. Jabnoun and Seadrani (2005) viewed that questionnaires have been used to influence studies related to organisational change success. In addition, Timmor and Zif (2010), Shah and Shah (2010) and Gregoe et al. (2012) employed quantitative questionnaires to measure individual readiness for change and organisational change success. In their studies, they measure the attitude of employees and organisation towards change. The use of a questionnaire in a descriptive and explanatory as well as analytical research has attracted most attention in business and management research (Saunders et al., 2009).

For example, in explanatory research questionnaires are used to examine and explain the relationships of two or more variables to ascertain connecting or effective relationships (Saunders et al., 2009). More so, questionnaires provide insight into individual perception, attitude and permits a wide range of response in a dispassionate nature (Richman et al., 1999; Saunders et al., 2009).

Saunders et al. (2009) noted that the major advantage of adopting the questionnaire approach is that it is relatively less expensive to administer especially the self-administered questionnaire. It is less time consuming and allows the respondents to take their time to complete it at their own convenience. Also, questionnaire data are more numeric and more objective in interpretation with the use of a statistical process to generate and interpret research results (Oppenheim, 1992; Shaughnessy, 2007). With the questionnaire approach, a small sample provides broad generalisations and inferences, but such a sample must be a representative of the population under study, so to avoid inaccuracy and research bias (Curwin and Slater, 2003).

Some of the important aspects of the interview approach are: maintaining a relaxed manner, asking clear research questions, taking notes alongside each interview session, appropriate use of follow-up research questions, establishing trust and keeping track of responses (Drew et al., 2007). The interview enhances the discussion which centres on the research problem and allows the researcher to raise questions that induce the respondent to employ his/her mental mechanisms to give reasonable information that can be used by the researcher in the course of the research findings. The researcher
familiarity with the knowledge about the nature of the study determines the structure of the interview questions which in this current study are semi-structured (Creswell, 2009).

However, the interview method has been associated with a number of limitations such that both the interviewer and the respondents can be subject or sources of bias through either the kind of questions the researcher asks or his perceived role and presence (Drew et al., 2007). Also, the respondents’ perception of the interview, their memory of the situation in context, their motivation in taking part of the interview and their ability to answer the questions (McCormick and James, 1988), can insert bias. In furtherance to this, McCormick and James (1988) suggest that whatever procedure of data collection is selected, either questionnaire or interview, it should be examined critically to effectively assess whether it is likely to be reliable and valid. Also, this should be communicated clearly in a language that is well known to the respondents. In this research the interview approach was used to reveal a line of thought that could be missing during the surveying process, as shown in Table 4.3.

Bryman and Bell (2011) agreed that using the questionnaire method will help fill the gaps in the qualitative approach adopted in the same research. For instance, they stated that an interview research approach can be used to help source research hypotheses, which are subject to further test using the questionnaire approach. Also, the in-depth knowledge gathered during the interview session informs the bases of designing the survey questions for either structured interview or self-completion questionnaires. In this study, the interview forms part of the preliminary stage of the research, where each member of the NNPC endorses and acknowledges this study with the researcher, hence leading to a high response rate in the final quantitative data collection process.

The benefit of the preliminary stage of this study enables the researcher to explore the respondent’s ability to fill in the survey questionnaires in the second stage of the investigation. The most important benefit of the interview session and discussion of the key officers of the NNPC was the information gathered which helped in writing out the questionnaire. More so, by having a closer contact with some of the respondents, their opinions were used in crafting the questionnaire language so that it will work well in the final quantitative data collection process. This process played a significant role in the questionnaire design process.
4.9 Designing the Questionnaire

Researchers posits that the layout of a questionnaire should be very clear so that the respondents would find it easy to read and answer (Vilar and Zumer 2008; Cappelli and Renzi, 2011). The design and development of the questionnaire should be robust to the extent that it will effectively address the research objectives. Taylor-Powell (1998) view that before a researchers engaged in investigation, it is necessary they know what kind of evidence they will need in line with the purpose of the study and also to understand how information will be used.

Taylor-Powell (1998) viewed the following as important steps to consider when engaging in designing a questionnaire:

1. List clearly the items you want to know, what you really want to find out and the things you want to achieve with the questionnaire.
2. Check if the information you need is available elsewhere.
3. Ask questions that have potential use, either a question that relates to the purpose of the study, as well as avoiding too much information so as not to overload the required information.
4. Think about what you will do with each piece of information at the beginning of the process, what you want to say and the statistics to use, either percentage, frequency, ranking, narrative multivariate analysis or remarks.
5. Write down the questions and try to view them through the eyes of the respondents, and ask yourself if the questions are reasonable and if the respondents will be able and willing to answer the questions.
6. The researcher should be selective and realistic. He/she should know what information is needed, why and how they plan to use such information.

These above principles were considered and followed at the time of designing the questionnaire. This is to ensure that the questionnaire measured the purpose of the study.

Saunders et al. (2009) agreed that a full questionnaire must be capable of extracting rich and relevant information that will make clear and effective conclusions. Hence, this study obtained information from the respondents about what they feel and know about the factors that can help organisational change implementation. The questions on the
questionnaire were short, clear and very easy to read, more so, leading questions and implicit assumptions were reduced (Saunders et al., 2009). The purpose of the questionnaire was made known to the respondents as well as clearly explaining how the questions can be completed. It was equally made clear about issues of confidentiality.
Table 4.3: Advantages and Disadvantages of Questionnaire and Interview Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questionnaire Method</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Interview Method</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardisation</td>
<td>Prone to error</td>
<td>Allows for clarification</td>
<td>Reactive effect: interviewer’s presence and characteristics may bias results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to do with a large group</td>
<td>Requires a separate data-entry step</td>
<td>High response rate</td>
<td>Expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of administration</td>
<td>Does not allow probing or clarification of questions</td>
<td>Able to gather in-depth information and to pursue hunches</td>
<td>Requires strong interviewing skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be inexpensive</td>
<td>More expensive</td>
<td>Can tailor the line of discussion to the individual</td>
<td>Slowest method of data collection and analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity to subgroup differences</td>
<td>Possible “interview evaluation” concern among respondents</td>
<td>Easier to reach those who are considered unreachable (the poor, homeless, high status, mobile, etc.)</td>
<td>Responses may be less honest and thoughtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suitability to tabulation and statistical analysis</td>
<td>Samples require careful selection to ensure statistical meaning</td>
<td>May be easier to reach specific individuals (MDs)</td>
<td>Interviewer should go to location of respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to tap the “unseen”</td>
<td>Subject to misinterpretation, depending on how questions are designed and asked</td>
<td>More personalized approach</td>
<td>Respondents who prefer anonymity may be inhibited by personal approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample can be used to provide much information about a population</td>
<td>Tendency for scope of data to be limited leading to omission of underlying behavioural patterns</td>
<td>Easier to ask open-ended questions, use probes and pick up on non-verbal cues</td>
<td>May reach only a smaller sample</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity for many people to be involved in the decision making process</td>
<td>Time-consuming compared with less formal methods</td>
<td></td>
<td>Difficult to analyse and quantify results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be used to record behaviours as well as opinions, attitudes, beliefs and attributes</td>
<td>The lack of supervision may result to an incomplete response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Saunders et al. (2009)
4.9.1 The Structure of the Questionnaire

In order for the study to achieve set objectives, a final questionnaire based survey was developed. The literature confirmed that the questionnaire is designed in line with the plan to achieve the purpose of the study (Namvar et al., 2010; Cappelli and Renzi, 2011; Khatri et al., 2012). More so, Sarantakos (1988) viewed specifically that every questionnaire should be included with three main parts or sections namely: cover letter, instruction and main body of the questionnaire. The questionnaire development for this study follows Sarantakos’s (1988) view and started with a cover letter containing information about the importance of the study including anonymity: the confidentiality of information provided by the participants as well as the estimated time needed to fill out the questionnaire. The questionnaire was divided into five parts: (1) demographic information; (2) organisational change implementation; (3) individual readiness for change; (4) leadership styles; (5) organisational culture; (6) managerial skills; (7) organisational trust; and (8) contextual factors (social norms, and units/departments characteristics) see appendix (3).

4.10 Operationalisation of Concepts

Yount (2006) posits that in the scale development process the first step should be conceptualisation, which will clearly define the construct of what we want to measure. This will help the scale development process ascertain the reliability and validity of measurement (Westhaus, 2005). However, Netemeyer et al. (2003) argued that this stage is the most difficult stage in the process of scale development process however it helps a study actually know the construct measurement. De Vellis (2011) added that the content of scale measurement requires focusing on the construct being measured. This means that the researcher should choose which end of the scale will be positive, and which end will be negative, hence focusing on the positive end of the scale. More so, Westhaus (2005) and De Vellis (2011) emphasise the need for operationalisation of concepts in order to enhance the understanding of variables to be measured.

At this point, it becomes necessary to understand the concept of organisational change: theories of organisational change and factors that can help organisational change implementation that will be helpful in constructing and establishing the content measurement. Organisational change implementation is considered a multidimensional
one due to the various attributes involved in its measurement. The factors to measure are individual readiness for change (mediating variables for organisational change implementation), leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills, and organisational trust, which are considered as (independent variables). Also considered are social norms, and units/departments characteristics as (moderating variables), employee’s characteristics as (demographic information).

4.10.1 Accessing Readiness for Change

Section 2.4 affirmed that employees are the key parameters for the successful implementation of change in any organisation, this also clearly stated the need for such employees to have the required skills to enable them to act as required towards a successful change implementation. Also, the literature on organisational change management suggests that the factors affecting individual readiness for change is influenced by the readiness of organisational members towards change implementation (Rusly et al., 2012). The literature also indicates that readiness for change in organisations occurs at two distinctive levels which are personal and the organisational level.

Consequently, if readiness for change is not taken seriously it might lead to resistance and cause a big hindrance to the entire change process (Erwin and German, 2010). This makes it vital that leaders introduce the concept of individual measurement of readiness for change to help strengthen, encourage, and effectively align the individuals with the current organisational structure and culture to enable a successful change implementation (Armenakis et al., 2007; Luo et al., 2006). This process equally helps the leaders to check existing gaps for the purpose of creating more strategies that will lead to change implementation.

Holt et al. (2009) Weiner (2009) believe that an assessment of individual readiness for change will create the right attitudes and beliefs thereby enhancing a collective practice and activities to implement proposed or perceived change. Erwin and German (2010) argued that in as much as readiness for change remains an individual level construct, it does require the thoughtfulness of the organisational context. This implies that where individuals have been encouraged by their organisational leaders, it shapes their feelings with the spirit of having the sense of preparedness for the change. This equally
increases their perception of both individual and organisational benefits from the change as well as the capability of their organisations’ readiness for the perceived change.

In their study, Hold et al. (2007) quantitatively reviewed 32 instruments that measure individual readiness for change. In their study, it was assumed the instruments had collectively suggested a comprehensive measurement model which comprised of four factors grounded in the measurement perspectives observed in the existing instruments, namely the change content, change process, internal context and the individual characteristics. This was further used to define a comprehensive attitude that influences all the factors. The first perspective, which is the change content, refers to the particular initiative that is being introduced (characteristics). Content is characteristically directed towards the administrative, procedural, technological, or structural characteristics of the organisation.

The second perspective was directed to how the change is being implemented (the change process) which refers to the steps followed during the change implementation. This emphasis increased employees’ participation toward change implementation. The third perspectives are the circumstances under which change occurs: i.e. increasing subordinates activities towards effective change. The fourth perspective concerns the individual attributes of those directly or indirectly involved in the change process, i.e. the characteristics of such people. Taking the context of individual differences into consideration, Holt et al. (2007) come to a conclusion that individual readiness for change is the extent to which organisational members believe that they qualify and are capable of implementing perceived organisational change projects successfully if the right attitude and behaviour is established alongside other strategies of implementing the change.

More so, subordinates want to see that their leaders are committed and courageous in the change project. In line with this, Rusly et al., (2012) argued that readiness for change should encompass the psychological and structural elements that are present at both individual and organisational level. For example, the understanding of individual psychology and structure of the organisation could be very critical for the consideration of employee training and capacity building to enhance the implementation process.
Researchers believe that individual readiness for change is the centre of organisational change implementation or change resistance (Holt et al., 2009; Erwin and German, 2010; Rusly et al., 2012). More so, Holt et al., (2007) believe that assessment of change readiness must occur at an individual level, because the practice that leads to organisational change is launched and performed by individuals within the organisation. Holt et al. (2007) developed readiness for change instruments which measure the mediating role of the level of employee’s readiness for change. This quantitative readiness for change instrument also covers various aspects such as change process, change-specific content, change context and individual employee attributes (Holt et al., 2007). The current study proposes readiness for change instrument and respondents were asked about their perception as well as the general perception of the organisation. Also asked were: their evaluation of their likely gains from change implementation, the required capacity for performance increase that will bring a successful change and the need for organisational change. The deductions were used to measure the level of individual readiness for change in line with organisational change implementation.

- I am optimistic that the current change is being implemented effectively
- I feel uncertain that the current change will be effective
- I believe that everyone is happy with the current change
- I am working hard to make sure that the current change is effective
- I think the current change does not seem to go well effectively
- I think that the organisation will benefit from the current change.
- I have the skills that are needed to make the current change effective.
- I do not anticipate any problems adjusting to the work that I have with implementing the change.
- I believe that the current change matches my priorities in this organisation
- Our organisation’s top decision makers have put all their support behind the implementation of the change.
- I feel that our organisation’s group managing director is committed to the current change.
- Management made it clear about implementing the current change.
- I have the necessary training that is needed to implement the current change.
- I do not feel that the current change has disrupted my personal work-related relationships.
- I think that there are legitimate reasons for us to implement the current change.

### 4.10.2 Measuring Leadership

Leadership forms an integral part of this study and it is critical in accomplishing the study. Leadership styles are considered as an independent variable (Bass and Avolio, 2004) that will offer the variable responsible to contribute to organisational change implementation. Studies have proven that although, leadership can be regarded as the ability to influence others by controlling the behaviour of members of a particular group, leadership styles extend this beyond influence to increase motivation and enable members of organisations to achieve targeted organisational objectives (Rosette and Tost, 2010; Caldwell and Dixon, 2010). Five leadership styles are viewed to have great impact either positively or negatively in the current study (Bass and Avolio, 2004; Jugulu, 2010). Studies in the past 20 years have indicated a considerable interest in testing this new paradigm of leadership styles. For instance, in the last six years alone, there have been a large number of studies researching on the impact of various leadership styles on organisational effectiveness and success (Jain and Jeppesen, 2013; Wallo et al., 2013; Paulsen et al., 2013).

In his study, Jogulu (2010) adopted the multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) to link the impact of leadership styles on organisational effectiveness. Bass and Avolio (1995) have recommended the adoption of the MLQ for accessing leadership behaviour especially in a situation where the behaviour of a team is the unit of analysis. Kirkbride’s (2006) study used the MLQ to study leadership styles with full range leadership development intervention in organisations. This has been used to assess leadership implication for organisational success and effectiveness. For example, Darvish and Pour (2013) used MLQ to measure employee job satisfaction and outcome of leadership style and came up with the conclusion that leadership is a strong predictor to organisational job satisfaction. However, critics views MLQ to predominantly focus on the impact of leadership on organisational effectiveness (Epstein, 1999), hence emphasized the need develop leadership instrument for of creativity through competencies. More so, Northouse’s (2011) Leadership Styles Questionnaire was added to combine different leadership style when measuring different leadership style in a single study.
A consideration of Epstein’s (1999) Creativity Competencies Inventory ECCI-I and Northouse’s (2011) Leadership Styles Questionnaire leadership instruments is capable of creating a comprehensive leadership instrument for the measurement of leadership behaviours in organisations. But, Creativity Competencies Inventory ECCI-I is more suitable for creativity competence therefore could not adequately measure values of leadership. So, a thoughtful adoption of Bass and Avalio’s (2004) multifactor leadership questionnaire (MLQ) and Northouse’s (2011) Leadership Styles Questionnaire will better measure different leadership styles and their impact on organisational change implementation. Based on this, the current study will measure impact of transformational, transactional, democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles to enable this study evaluate leadership behaviours in the NNPC and how they influence change implementation. Below are the leadership instruments for the considered in the current study:

- Our leaders allocate reasonable time and resources for teaching and coaching their subordinates.
- Our leaders do not see what is good for the future of this organisation.
- Our leaders discuss in specific terms on individual responsibility to achieve objectives.
- Our leaders are enthusiastic about what is needed to be accomplished.
- Our leaders ensure that standards are met at all times.
- Our leaders emphasise the importance of collective decision-making for implementing the current change.
- Our leaders do not support employees to get the best out of them.
- Our leaders often increase the willingness to try harder towards implementing the current change.
- Leaders emphasise the importance of having a collective sense of mission
- Leaders express satisfaction when employees meet expectations.
- Leaders are confident that goals will be achieved.
- Subordinates’ voices are considered during decision making process.
- The Leader’s decision is always considered as the final decision.
- Leaders delay responding to urgent questions.
- Leaders dominate team-members by using unilateralism to achieve a singular objective.
- Leaders maintain servant-master relationships with subordinates.
- Leaders wait for things to go wrong before taking action.
- Leaders avoid getting involved when important issues arise.
- Leaders are absent when needed.
- Leaders do not provide assistance when needed.

**4.10.3 Measuring Organisational Cultural**

Organisational cultural types of the CVF model formed a fundamental part of this study, and hence are critically considered in the questionnaire and are the basis for part of the scale construct. Cameron and Quinn (1999) developed the organisational culture assessment instrument (OCAI) which is based on the CVF model. According to Cameron and Quinn (1999) the model is developed in six dimensions which are: dominant characteristics, leadership styles, management of employees, organisational glue, strategic emphasis and criteria of success. The analysis of the above dimensions resulted in four types of organisational culture. Studies have confirmed the reliability and validity of the CVF and have utilised the OCAI based on the CVF to examine the effect of implementing change (Cameron and Quinn, 2006; Prajogo and McDermott, 2011). This confirmation is a clear indication that the CVF is a means to determine an ideal organisational culture that will facilitate organisational culture implementation. In line with this, this current study adopts the OCAI to identify the cultural profiles of the NNPC, and to determine the dominant organisational culture type of the CVF model. The cultural profiles are: group, developmental, rational, and hierarchical cultures in the NNPC. In line with the OCAI developed by Cameron and Quinn (1999), this study assessed the following culture types through the statements that follow:

- The glue that holds the organisation together can be described as loyalty and commitment.
- Our organisational managerial style is generally characterised by teamwork and team members’ participation.
- Our organisation places more emphasis on human development.
- The success of our organisation is defined on the basis of employee commitment and a general concern for people.
- Our organisation is generally considered to be a result-oriented place.
- The management approach in our organisation is result driven.
- Our organisation is highly competitive.
- Our success is defined on the bases of winning in the marketplace.
- This organisation is perceived as dynamic and entrepreneurial, where people are willing to take risks.
- The leadership in this organisation is generally considered as innovative.
- Success is defined based on interventions and innovativeness.
- Emphasis is placed on acquiring new resources as well as creating new challenges.
- This organisation is a highly controlled and structured environment.
- Management style is characterised by security of employment and stability.
- Members of this organisation seem not to formally adhere to rules and policies.
- The organisation maintains a high standard of business operation.

4.10.4 Measuring Managerial Skills

The literature confirmed that Mintzberg (1973) and Katz (1974) were among the first to research on the need for managerial skills as a measure for decision making or change implementation tools. This was after there were uncertainties in the decision process that could lead to organisation improvement (Nutt, 2011). In recent times researchers have proven that managerial skills are critical in organisations change management (Parente et al., 2012). Mosadeghrad et al.’s (2006) study confirmed that managerial skills increase employee’s attitudes, behaviour and other characteristics that will lead to organisational values, reliability and change. Gentry et al. (2008) found that managerial skills are important at different levels and across different functions of the organisational environment. Researchers have emphasis the need for managers to fully understand managerial skills to enable them to excel in their various responsibilities and adapt to performing effectively in respective job functions (Halbesleben et al., 2003; Stockdale and Crosby, 2004; Ahearn et al., 2004). Yukl (2013) categorised the different dimensions of managerial skills as follows:

Firstly, technical skills: concerns with knowledge about methods, processes, and procedure as well as the techniques for conducting technical activities. The important aspect about technical skills is that they increase the ability to use tools and equipment in relevant work activities in the workplace. Secondly, interpersonal skills: These concern the ability to understand the feelings, attitudes and motives of other employees, the ability to communicate effectively, listen effectively and the ability to establish an
effective and cooperative relationship, and thirdly, conceptual skills: these involve analytical ability, logical thinking and the ability to adopt the inductive and deductive approach for solving organisational problems. In order to measure the impact of managerial skills on organisational change implementation, the study explores various instruments for measuring managerial skills (Sevy et al., 1985; Yukl, 2004; Gil et al., 2005).

The Management Skills Profile (MSP) developed by Personnel Decisions International, (Sevy et al., 1985) has been used to measure management competency and administrative activities as well as motivating organisational members, delegating and controlling, and coaching and development, personal motivation, technical knowledge, cognitive skills, problem analysis and decision making. The critique of these scales which results from the need to improve behavioural implication for organisational change success, Yukl, (2004) designed the managerial practices survey (TRCQ-15G) on the basis of assessing behaviour associated with change-oriented. This is also to measure managers innovative thinking, need for change and envisioning change (Gil et al., 2005). Due to the aim of this current study, both instruments are necessary to assess the impact of managerial skills on organisational change implementation (Kim and Yukl, 1996; Yukl et al., 1990), therefore the following statements are used to assess the impact of managerial skills in this study:

- Management plan in detail on how to accomplish task of the current change.
- Inadequate plans to check work progress against the current change.
- Management organise and co-ordinate work activities to avoid delays and waste resources.
- Management clearly explain expected results from the current change.
- Management provide encouragement and support when employees have difficult tasks.
- Inadequate opportunities to develop subordinates skills towards implementing the current change.
- Management express confidence on the ability to carry out a difficult task.
- Managers do not back team members and support them in difficult situations.
- Management proposes creative ideas for improving services and processes that will lead to implement the current change.
- There is generally a lack of confidence when proposing change.
- Management describe a clear and appealing vision of what the organisation can accomplish.
- There is lack of negotiation with people outside the work unit to get necessary support to implement the current change.

### 4.10.5 Measuring Organisational Trust

Organisational trust is one of the fundamental component parts of this study. Other researchers such as Howell and Shamir (2005), Ben-Gal and Tzafrir (2011) and Smollan (2013) believe that organisational trust is highly important when organisations are responding to change. This is because it increases the level of integrity in the organisation as well as establishing honesty and consistency between employees; hence, increasing the level of readiness for change (Yukl, 2013). Mayer et al. (1995) and McKnight et al. (1998) viewed that adoption of organisational trust will have a positive impact on organisational members by increasing high expectations, competence, reliability and benevolence among them as well as the organisation as an institution. This study identifies two dimensions of organisational trust, they are: impersonal and institutional trust.

Studies have proven that if impersonal trust is strengthened, organisations will increase employee’s perception and competence to carry out their tasks (Atkinson and Butcher, 2003; Kelley, 2007). More so, at the organisational level, it enables the organisation to increase its capability to perform or respond to change (Kuhenrt, 1992, Tyler 2003; Lee, 2004). It also increases the organisations’ opportunity to build realistic relationships with its employees. With this type of relationship, the spirit of trustworthiness and commitment is increased. This is why McKnight et al. (1998) and Kelley (2007) believe that organisations that emphasise organisational trust will likely succeed because it helps to build a structure where employees will have confidence in the organisation and deliver their best in working to implement change. This shows that interpersonal trust has the potential for increasing the chances of implementing change. Based on this, the current study considered interpersonal trust achieving its potential for increasing organisational change implementation.

On the other hand, institutional trust increases the trust of the institution within the organisation (Vanhala and Ahteela, 2011), and helps to increase practices and processes
based on rules and regulations that guide employee’s tasks and relevant organisational policy formulation. Researchers posit that institutional trust is also a good organisational strategy to increase competence and commitment based of its vision and mission (Saunders and Thornhill, 2003; Ben-Gal and Tzafrir, 2011; Smollan, 2013).

Organisational trust has been measured for organisational effectiveness in previous studies using the Mayer and Davis’ (1999) three-component scale (Mahn et al., 2003 Sjahruddin et al., 2013). Also, instruments for measuring organisational trust and effectiveness have been assessed by adopting the organisational citizenship behaviour OCB (Connell et al., 2003; Organ et al., 2006) to the improve the level of trust and acceptance in realising organisational goals. Both instruments are been found worthy for measuring organisational accomplishments (Podsakoff et al., 2003), hence a combination both will be useful for measure and perception of organisational change implementation. Based on this, the study assessed organisational trust with the following statements:

- Integrity is a key value in the operations among employees in this organisation.
- The employees in this organisation are not concerned about my welfare.
- Employees have the required knowledge on what they do.
- Employees are not fair when dealing with each other.
- I feel fine working in this organisation since it generally fulfils its agreement.
- I am not aware of the strategy of the current change.
- Our data systems support our operations.
- This organisation seems not to be technologically competent.

4.10.6 Measuring the Contextual Factors

Social norms have been identified as having a strong impact on employee’s behaviour in influencing work attitude which increases the level of organisational change (Hardina et al., 2006; Kimmerle et al., 2008). They are equally considered as acceptable rules and standards by organisational members (Kimmerle et al., 2008). They often develop from the interactions among members of the organisation. Adkins and Caldwell (2004) posit that norms act as key elements of organisational culture, because culture comprises explicit expectations towards employees. This can be referred to as the social psychological concept of injunctive norms that Cialdini et al, talk about (1990). Thus,
injunctive norms arise out of the expectation about employee’s behaviour which can be positively evaluated by other members of the organisation. On the other hand, norms come out of the organisational climate (Bartels et al., 2007) because of the employee’s behaviour and style of interacting with each other with the organisation, which all helps in establishing a standard. Again, Cialdini et al. (1990) refers to the social psychological concept of descriptive norms that develop from observing other people in certain situations.

This is in line with Park (2000) who views that social norms impact on employee’s attitudes which in turn develop towards a particular behaviour either positively or negatively on task performance (Park, 2000). Accordingly, people can hold various forms of attitudes, but they are limited in the number they can attend to at one time, however, the greater the salience of a particular attitude the more likely it is to influence the individual intentions and behaviour (Doll and Ajzen, 1992; Bagozzi and Dabholar, 2000). This suggests that people who work in a stronger culture will feel more committed. Hence, this theoretically suggests that norms are strong predictors for organisational change.

On the other hand, departments/units characteristics were viewed variables necessary for enhancing readiness for change and change implementation in the NNPC. Clorley et al. (2008) theorised that an organisation which is made up of various units network together and function to meet the organisation’s objectives. Singh (2009) equally believes that the synergy created by various departments or units of the organisation serve as a push for the organisation to arrive at its perceived destination, especially where there is adequate delegation of authority. Researchers have equally argued that the size of the organisation plays a major role in increasing the ability of the organisation to perform (Ahire et al., 1996; Pun et al., 2012). While, Ahire et al. (1996) agrees that the size of various units and attitude of employees serves as a catalyst for change, Temtime (2003) posits that the size of the various units will either increase or decrease the organisation’s capability to achieve objectives. In order to explore the impact of the contextual factors on organisational change implementation, a critical re-examination of Hofstede’s (1991) and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1993) dimension for diagnosing organisations was used to compare organisational commitment questionnaire (OCQ) (Porter and Smith, 1970). It was ascertained that Hofstede’s (1991) and Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner (1993) instruments are
capable of improving human resources management and business improvement. However, the construct of OCQ have received wide attention in organisational psychological research for many years as it enable researchers to increase studies about the need for employees see themselves as belonging to the organisation with the responsibility to participate towards the success of the organisation (Ferris and Aranya, 1983; Tayyab, 2007; Meyer et al., 2013). The studies shows that the construct validity of the OCQ with the help of statistical analysis proves that the OCQ represents a construct that can be empirically distinguished from other work attitudes such as job satisfaction and job involvement hence can help to increase the perception of job performance and job accomplishment (Meyer et al., 2002; Saks, 2006; Hakanen et al., 2008). Hofstede’s organisational culture instrument which measures culture and regional group have been used to measure how organisational culture effect organisational practices and values (Hofstede et al., 1990). It helps to assess how organisational norms are embedded in practices. Studies shows that the organisational culture inventory (OCI) that provides organisations with a visual profile of their operating cultures in terms of the behaviours that members believe are required to fit in and achieve organisational success (Cooke and Szumal, 1993). Such organisational success guide the way organisational members approach their work and interact amongst themselves. Cooke and Szumal (1993) believe that such behavioural norms have a significant impact on the organisation’s ability to solve problems, adapt to change, and perform effectively. Therefore, the current will benefit from these instruments as it will help the study explore individual’s identification and involvement in organisation with a strong belief and acceptance of organisation’s goals and values, with the willingness to use considerable effort to increase organisation change motives. Based on this and the need to increase the level of change readiness and change implementation, the current study measures the contextual factors with the following statements:

- This organisation encourages me to be myself.
- I do not understand what I need to do in order to contribute to the current change.
- The things that are important to this organisation are important to me.
- The current change will not contribute to this organisation’s ultimate purpose.
- I have the information I need to do a good job
- It is always difficult to talk with someone at work when I have a work-related problem.
- This organisation has adequate mechanism for binding itself together.
- I understand my boss’s effort to influence me and members of my team.
- The size of this department can cope with the proposed change.
- There is lack of delegation and empowerment in our department.
- People’s attitude towards the current change is considerably high.
- There is lack of inter and intra departmental coordination.

4.11: Format Determination for Measurement

Researchers have viewed the usefulness of the Likert-scale in management research (Hinkin, 1995; Yount, 2006; Hebert and Chaney 2012), which comprises a set of response categories constructed within the ranges of agree and disagree so that participants can tick appropriately on the level of their agreement in the order of ranking.

Saunders et al. (2009) posit that the appropriate level of scale on the Likert scale is usually on a 4, 5, 6 and 7 point rating scale. The importance of maintaining scaling items is to achieve sufficient variability among dependence for subsequent analysis (Hinkin, 1995). Other forms of scale are equally recommended for management or scientific research such as the Thurston attitude scale and Q-Methodology; which consist of statements that has range of weights from high (usually 11) to low (usually 1) in which its scale usually resulted from computing the average weight item. The Q-methodology is used to gather subjective data in a given sample where ranking of a statement by two or more groups can be compared (Hinkin 1995), rather than studying the differences between individuals like the Likert-scale (Giles, 2013). Studying the differences between individuals can be achieved with the Likert-scale because it enables the study to analyse why a person organises a selection of items which can be statements about a topic (Giles, 2013).

An application of the Likert-scale will allow this study to sum the scores for each respondent to provide an overall attitudinal score for each individual (Brace, 2013). More so, using the 6 point Likert-scale formats will eliminate neutral points which are often hard to interpret. Kulas et al. (2008) argued that neutral points on a Likert-scale
are used as a dumping ground for unsure responses even when participants are instructed to skip the questions if they are unsure of the answers. Kulas et al. (2008) equally believes that a neutral point is often used as a proxy for ‘not applicable’. Based on this, the current study adopts the Likert 6 points scale to measure factors that can help organisational change implementation with specific statements.

More so, adopting the Likert-scale makes it easier for the researcher to administer the questionnaires (Saunders et al., 2009). It gives the respondents a choice to indicate their opinion as well as an easy to code response in numerical form. In the current study, the scale range from 1 being strongly disagree to 6 being strongly agree helped to analyze respondent’s views about the variables for organisational change implementation.

The questionnaire explained and indicated to the respondents what they need to know about the scale, which says; please read each statement carefully and indicate your degree of agreement with each of the following statements by marking ‘x’ on the one that best represents your opinion. The scale ranges from weaker to stronger (1 = strongly disagree and 6 = strongly agree) as illustrated in the following key (Table 5.1):

**Table 4.4: Likert-Scale of Measurement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Degree of Measurement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With this type, the study adopted closed-ended questions. Slavec and Drnovsek (2012) viewed that a proper designed questionnaire facilitates the gathering of relevant data for a study. Mansfield (2009) acknowledged that this type of questionnaire resolves objectives: (1) to keep the questionnaire as short as possible to maximise response rate and (2) to gain the maximum amount of information from each questionnaire, and can be used to represent a degree of satisfaction (Yen, 2009). As represented in the study, the questionnaire consists of a series of introductory questions examining the profile of the responders, for example, their functions, year of experience and qualifications (Tapinos et al., 2005). As stated, the questions are exclusively closed-ended which according to Jenn (2006) are very convenient for the collection of factual data and easy to code and analyse since the range of potential responses are thus limited. The
questionnaire was designed to discover the factors that can help organisational change implementation.

4.12 Sampling

Once issues of primary data collection have been decided, the next stage is to obtain a sample of the representative of the target population in the organisation under study (Protector, 2000). Sekaran (2003) referred to targeted population as the entire group of people or things the researchers want to investigate. The literature identified two major dimensions of sampling designs which are probability and non probability sampling (Saunders et al., 2009). In non-probability or non random sampling, the total population is not known or has no probabilities attached to it and it might not be impossible to address the objective that requires the researcher to make statistical conclusions about the chosen sample (Saunders et al., 2009), indicating that the findings from the study of such sample may not be reliably generalised to the entire population (Hussey and Hussey, 1997).

With probability sampling or random representative sampling, the chance or probability of the case being selected from the population is known and is usually equal for all cases (Saunders et al., 2009). This implies that it is possible for the researcher to answer the research questions and also to achieve the objectives of the research. According to Hussey and Hussey (1997) probability sampling is closely associated with a survey-based research strategy and can be applied to represent the sample of the study in a wider generalisation. The importance of representative sampling is that it represents the entire population of the study and can be achieved through the random selection of cases which also indicates that each element has an equal chance of selection independent of any other event in the selection procedure (Saunders et al., 2009). Hence, random sampling can be adopted in a quantitative research strategy as it will be assumed that data was gathered using a random sampling strategy (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Creswell, 2009; Saunders et al., 2009).

In the current study, the target population consists of all the middle managers in the NNPC who are responsible for implementing decisions that will lead to a successful change implementation. The staff strength of the NNPC is about nine thousand nine hundred (9,900), while managerial staff is about two thousand (2,000) concentrated in 5
major cities in Nigeria at the time of this investigation. However, 70% are mostly based in Abuja (Head Office), Port-Harcourt and Warri where most of the refining and petrochemical business activities are done. Due to this geographical spread as well as time factor and financial limitation of the study, the researcher chose to adopt a random sampling technique and selected a representative sample consisting of 450 in Abuja, Port-Harcourt and Warri which covers a wide section of change implementation officials in the NNPC. This sample will be used as a representative of the population of the entire managerial staff in the NNPC. More so, it will enable the use of some statistical techniques to test the research hypotheses and then generalise the research findings.

Therefore in order to meet the objective of the study, the sample size was adequately perceived as confidence in representing the entire study. Roscoe (1975) proposed the following rules as determining a sample size:

- For appropriate research study, sample size should be larger than 30 and less than 500.
- Where it is necessary for the sample to be broken into subsamples (male, female, juniors and seniors), the minimum sample size for each category of 30 is necessary.

This study presented and determined the sample size as illustrated in the Table 4.6.
Table 4.5: Questionnaires Presentation in the NNPC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units/Departments</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>No. of questionnaires</th>
<th>Expected No. of respondents</th>
<th>Actual respondents received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Services (C&amp;S)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration and Production (E&amp;P)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refineries and Petrochemical (R&amp;P)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Account (F&amp;A)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Investment (C&amp;S)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Technology (E&amp;T)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Services (SS)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas and Power (G&amp;P)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>265</strong></td>
<td><strong>320</strong></td>
<td><strong>225</strong></td>
<td><strong>177</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.13. Questionnaire Administration

Saunders *et al.* (2009) confirmed that the final stage of questionnaire administration is where the researcher has designed his or her questionnaire pilot tested it, amended it, considered the sample and has it ready for data collection. Saunders *et al.* (2009) equally noted that it is important that the researcher abides by professional ethical conduct to ensure compliance. The researcher personally distributed the final version of the questionnaire to the participants at the NNPC corporate headquarters in Abuja, Port Harcourt and Warri. This method was convenient and accepted by the respondents because they were familiar with it during the pilot study, and it was easier to undertake a one-on-one distribution. This approach has been adopted by researchers in the field of organisational change research (Timmor and Zif, 2010; Gregoe *et al.*, 2012). This study considers middle managers as the key drivers for organisational change therefore they were considered the key participants in the study.

Van Oosten (2006) and Tang *et al.* (2011) posit that organisational leaders/managers are the key agents of change and their decisions and direction are capable of leading organisations to the desired destination. Also, they champion the change agenda and
perform the most critical task that will lead to actualising or implementing the change. The literature on agency theory refers to managers as the moral actors whose individual discretion is valued and important in moving organisations forward (Swanson, 1995; Wood, 1999; Moore, 1999; Seifert et al., 2004). The leaders or managers set up the incentives needed for implementing a perceived change and lead the way through. Organisational leaders or managers who are not committed to change will be better described by factors contributing to a failed change agenda (Conner, 1992; Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002). More so, change may not be actualised if organisational leaders/managers do not have the understanding of the change strategy and absolute commitment to it (Parish et al., 2008). If leaders/managers have a full understanding and commitment to the organisation’s perceived change, then the strategy for implementing the change can be fully adopted. Their readiness for implementing change and adopting a model for change must be considered more important when planning the strategy and information for facilitating organisational change implementation.

4.13.1 Questionnaire Response Rate

A response rate has been described as the number of participants who engaged in completing the questionnaire divided by the total number of participants who were asked to participate in the research (Bryman and Bell, 2007; Saunders et al., 2009). However, calculating the response rates might be complex depending on the design of the researcher’s evaluation. Where an adequate response rate is not achieved as designed this may limit the usefulness of the entire results (Bryman and Bell, 2007). The determination of what constitutes an adequate response rate is based on the evaluation design, and how the results will be utilised and standard practices. Saunders et al. (2007) advises that a questionnaire that takes over two hours to complete might be rejected or thrown away. This study follows the suggestion by Bryman and Bell (2011) and Collis and Hussey (2003) who suggest the following to improve questionnaire response rates:

1. A cover letter that explains the background of the study including the importance of the study, the reason why the respondents were selected and what will be the outcome of the study. Confidentiality and sponsorship are two aspects that should be addressed clearly.
2. For a researcher to achieve a better response rate, the questionnaire should be relatively short.

3. An incentive like (monetary) may be helpful to ensure a better response rate, however, the study might not be able to provide such incentives.

4. The need to follow up a non-responsive respondent by either letter or telephone after the first enquiry.

Following this advice, the current study tried to increase the response rate by employing the methods listed below:

1. The questionnaire has been written in the English Language which is the official Nigerian language and every educated Nigerian is fluent in the English Language (as indicated in Appendix 3).

2. The questionnaire was followed with an introductory letter from the Human Resource department of the NNPC to help convince the potential respondents of the importance of the questionnaire (Appendix 1).

3. A pilot study was conducted in the same organisation before distributing the final version of the questionnaire.

4. The questionnaire format, size, layout and presentation were made attractive and interesting to respondents.

5. Respondent data protection and privacy was guaranteed.

6. The researcher encouraged the respondents to complete the questionnaire in record time, and promised to offer a copy of the findings since their organisation was the organisation under study.

7. The researcher adopted a self-administered questionnaire which was paper based and personally delivered to the respondents for data collection. A follow up was undertaken by telephone calls in order to re-engage and motivate the respondents to complete the questionnaire in record time.

These seven items helped the researcher to increases response during the questionnaire design, distribution and collection.
4.13.2 Ethical Consideration

Robson (2002) posits that research needs to be carried out systematically, sceptically and ethically. Ethical means following a code of conduct for research that measures the interests and concerns of those taking part in the same research, or the interest of those who might possibly be affected by the research are safeguarded. In a related development, Saunders et al. (2007) viewed that informed consent to participate and employee confidentiality are three critical areas of consideration of a study, in which this study considered in its entirety. The three areas appear to address the following:

1. It is assumed that in this study all participants are participating voluntarily. The information contained in the cover letter did not otherwise induce the participants to participate if they did not want to.
2. The data obtained through the quantitative data undertaken in the research were held confidentially which was equally made clear in the cover letter attached to the questionnaires. Data were not directly attributed to respondents either in the final report or in any correspondence or face-to-face contact between the researcher and the organisations under study.
3. The participants were assured that their information will not be given to their organisation on which each participant answered. More so, their response would be given a serial number and that only the outcome will be reported. It was assured that the outcome of the findings from the study which is equally going to benefit their organisation will be sent to them freely if they want.

4.13.3 Pre-Testing and Instruments Validation

According to Saunders et al. (2007), apart from using the pilot study to collect preliminary data of a study, the other reason of the pilot study is to refine and improve the reliability and validity of the questionnaire. The process helps to obtain the views of the respondents, recommendation as well as suggestions regarding the questions for the final questionnaire. More so, the pilot helps the researcher to ensure that appropriate words are used, to check the time horizon to complete the survey, check accuracy of the language as well as to estimate the response rate (Gravetter and Forzano, 2011). More so, it enable the researcher to check how well the questions flow and it was be necessary to remove some questions as well as improving some, the scope for
completing the questionnaire has been checked (Saunders et al., 2009; Bryman and Bell, 2011).

A pilot study was conducted in January 2012 which surveyed the managers in the NNPC who represent the targeted sample for the study. The respondents were sampled across middle managers of the NNPC who have knowledge and experience in managerial issues and understand the “nitty-gritty” of the change currently going on in the corporation. It was ensured that the questions contained in the pilot study measured what they were designed for and were interpreted in the same manner to all those who answered the questions. Relevant feedback was equally received from the participants concerning some areas of observation. For example, while some of the respondents applauded the questionnaire, others advised that there should have been more questions in section two of the questionnaire because adherence to organisational culture type is a major factor confronting the corporation. More so, others feel that some questions in other sections should have some modification. This led to an expansion of the questions in section two (organisational culture type). However, after the changes were made, the alternated version was submitted again for academic approval, and was collectively approved by members of the supervisory team for this study. See appendix 3 for the final version of the questionnaire.

4.13.4 Questionnaire Distribution and Collection

As mentioned in section 4.4, four hundred and fifty (450) managers of the NNPC were considered as a sample size for this study. Therefore, the final version of the questionnaire was distributed to target least two hundred and sixty five (265) managers. These managers covered those in the various business units such as: human resources, finance, learning, legal matters, administration, engineering, refineries and petrochemicals, gas and power, exploration and production, commerce and investment, corporate services, research and development, etc. Saunders et al. (2009) recommended that questionnaires can be administered personally to respondents, or by mail, email, telephone questionnaires and structured interview and online questionnaire distribution (survey monkey).

The researcher considered personal administration of the questionnaire as appropriate in the NNPC because it is easy and less expensive. The other options were disregarded for
the following reasons: firstly, posting by mail would be out of the researcher’s budget to carry out the study. Secondly, sending by email and online questionnaire distribution might cause some potential delay due to slow internet function and personal behaviour with the usage of the internet facilities. With these reasons, personal questionnaire distribution became the best option considered in this study, even so some problems were encountered, but it was relatively cheap and can increase enhanced respondents’ interest in the research (Saunders et al., 2009). Another advantage of this method is that it allows the researcher to provide a background of the study, introduction of problem and expected outcome from the study to encourage participants to be straightforward and honest as they answer the questions.

Also, the researcher explained what the questionnaire intended to achieve and the reason why the data is most important. It was equally explained to the respondents about the guarantee of their confidentiality as well as asking them to read carefully the instructions contained in the cover letter attached to the questionnaire before completing the questionnaire. The telephone numbers of the researcher were provided in the cover letter for necessary contact should the respondent experience any form of difficulty filling the questionnaire. Also, contained in the cover letter is a plea which asked the respondents to participate objectively by freely but frankly and impartially respond to the questionnaire. A time frame of after about one month was given to allow the researcher collection of the questionnaire.

4.14 Reliability and Validity of Scale Measurement

According to Bryman and Bell (2007 p. 163) reliability refers to the consistency of a measure of a concept, while validity refers mainly to the level of accuracy of the measuring of a scale. In another development, Klenke (2008) viewed reliability and validity as essential criteria for ensuring that the quality of instrument measurement is ascertained. In this study, the content validity and the construct validity of the questionnaire has been checked, for more detail about the findings of the validity test see chapter 5 (section 5.3 below).

Hussein (2009) referred generally to reliability as the extent to which the same instrument for measurement is likely to give consistent results if the measurement is almost the same phenomenon repeated for a period of time. Similarly, other scholars
show that the reliability of a scale shows the extent to which such scale is free from random error (Saunders et al., 2009; Pallant, 2010). This therefore implies that the less a measure suffers from random error the more it is likely to being acceptable and reliable. The literature identifies three indicators for assessing the reliability of a measurement instrument. They are: test-retest reliability, equivalent reliability and internal consistency reliability (Fellows and Liu, 2008). Among these, the two indicators that appear to be frequently used are test-retest reliability sometimes referred to as temporal stability and internal consistency. Accordingly, a high test-retest correlation indicated scale reliable. Internal consistency on the other hand indicates that the questions that make up the construct are all measuring the same underlying attribute. Consequently, this study applies internal consistency which is closely associated with Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient (Pallant, 2010, Field, 2013).

4.14.1 Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient

Cronbach’s Alpha reliability method was employed to determine the reliability of the questionnaire. According to Field (2013) Cronbach’s Alpha (α) is the most common measure of scale reliability. Numerous authors have considered that Cronbach’s Alpha should not drop below 0.7, and that an alpha value of 0.7 or more signifies reliable measures (de Vaus, 2002; Shah, 2011; Mueller et al., 2012).

4.14.2 Factor Analysis

Chong and Zin (2012) viewed that factor analysis helps to reduce and extract the essential factors affecting the selection of dispute resolution methods. Other scholars agreed that factor analysis examines relationships among variables to identify groups of variables forming a latent factor (Hair et al., 1998). Liargovas and Skandalis (2012) equally agreed that factor analysis explores the relationship among the perceived responses and determines if there is an underlying structure of concern within determinants. The factor analysis as a complex procedure can be achieved through various guidelines that are available within Field’s SPSS framework (Field, 2013).

Consequently, factor analysis is adopted to enhance the scale development process of the study and help contribute to the fulfilment of the fifth research objective of this study, which aims to develop and validate an integrative conceptual framework regarding the relationship between independent, mediating, moderating and dependent
variables considered in this study. The items that made up the independent variables in the current study are: leadership styles, the organisational culture types of the CVF, managerial skills, organisational trust and organisational commitment. Individual readiness for change is expected to mediate the relationship while the contextual factors are expected to moderate the relationship. The model aims to guide the implementation process of the change agenda in the NNPC. The results of the statistical analysis found from these variables are discussed in chapter six below.

In business and management research, factors that make up a study with related variables are often reduced to a number of individual scales in order to form a smaller and understandable number of manageable subscales before processing to further statistical analysis such as regression (Field, 2010), as in the case of the current study. In addition, the technique of Principle Component Analysis (PCA) of factor analysis was also employed in this study to help extract variables and explain the underlying dimensions of data with a minimum number of factors. The PCA technique helped the analysis to produce a smaller number of linear combinations of the original variables and reveal most of the inconsistencies from the correlations (Pallant, 2010; Field, 2013), therefore enabling the researcher to sort out necessary possibilities. In addition, VARIMAX rotation under PAC is equally employed as methods of obtaining the orthogonal of the factor matrix that keeps the underlying factors independent (Field, 2013). Eigenvalue was also used in the extraction process to decide the number of factors to be extracted in the overall factor analysis, thus the yielding factors of an eigenvalue higher than 1 were selected (Pallant, 2010; Sekaran and Bougie, 2010).

Pallant (2010) stated two main approaches of factor analysis which are exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis. The exploratory factor analysis technique is adopted when engaged in a new area and at the early stage of the study for information gathering and to enable the study to explore any interrelationship variables among sets of variables. Exploratory research is often regarded as a process of mutual adjustment of the end concept and theories and to help achieve an integrated result of a study. At the exploratory stage of the study, possible areas of adjustment are taken into consideration so as to guide the end result or outcome from the study. Saunders et al. (2009) emphasised that exploratory study is established to study a situation or a problem to explain the relationship between variables. In another development, Geering (2001) adds that exploratory study takes into account issues of research conceptualisation,
theorisation and investigation, in order to discover more issues with the study and increase sensitivity and research evidence. Brown (2006) further affirmed that most business and management research are centred between exploratory and confirmatory concepts which are basically model analysis based. Where exploratory study is inductive based, it enhances the design of research hypotheses and hence, makes the falsification of theories difficult (Geerring, 2001; Meyer et al., 2005).

On the other hand, the confirmatory factor analysis technique, which appears more complex, is used at the later stage(s) of the study in order to test and confirm hypotheses, theories and variables and relies on statistical inference and more of a deductive approach. A confirmatory study envisions empirical analysis as a process of confirming or refuting a previously stipulated hypothesis (Saunders et al., 2009). Equally, hypotheses are first summarized and then tested to answer designed research questions. So, confirmatory research analysis helps to provide accurate information that leads to the actualisation of the research aim with the use of well-established methods and theory as a guide for the study. However, confirmatory analysis allows rooms for preconceived ideas and the readiness to detect and accept unexpected results’ impact on the analysis (Bryman and Bell, 2011).

Schmacker and Lomax (1996) confirmed that an adoption of confirmatory analysis allows the researcher to test hypotheses, check the requirement for sufficient sample size (e.g. 5-50 cases estimation), determine the instrument for measurement, check missing data and interpretation of models. Scholars found some similarities between confirmatory and exploratory research analysis in business and management research (Schmacker and Lomax, 1996). For example, Schmacker and Lomax (1996) studied the relationship between variables, attempted to assess models, collect data, presentation and resulting interpretation. Exploratory ideas lead to the generation of new ideas and merge them together to form a theory that emerges from the data, on the other hand confirmatory research validates and tests hypotheses to add quality to the research design (Bryman and Bell, 2011; Saunders et al., 2009). This shows that the similarities in both exploratory and confirmatory research are subject to benefit researchers in the field of business and management, and if both are applied in one study this can add more quality to such study.
The current study is in line with the argument that the considerations of both exploratory and confirmatory research are fit for research in business and management. Hence, both and other forms of analysis are adopted in this study. Scholars have viewed that exploratory and confirmatory research can be quantitative or qualitative and are geared towards strengthening research quality (Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie, 2003). Equally, this is in line with Creswell et al.’s (2003) definition of a business and management research process which follows the steps as described below:

**Step one:** where researcher problems and questions are clearly stated.

**Step two:** the method for data collection is decided in line with conformity and consistency with research methodology and data collection techniques in the business and management research field. With this, instruments are designed as well as pre-determined research hypotheses.

**Step three:** this is where quantitative confirmatory data analysis is considered. Descriptive statistics and inferential statistics are considered as the basic procedure for actualising this stage as well as the qualitative exploratory approach to identify the themes and categories and link such themes and categories to make recommendable and workable research, and

**Step four:** data presentation and interpretation, which focuses on generalisation and prediction based on the findings, interpretation or comprehension of theories. However, in a qualitative exploratory approach, the approach focuses on contextualisation, generalisation, interpretation and composition of further enquires.

The above steps suggest composition of a mixed methodology which affirms the use of exploratory inductive process research that begins with empirical evidence of the particular phenomena, and further proceeds to theorisation, generalisation and a confirmatory deductive process of hypotheses testing (Creswell, 2009), which is the position undertaken in the current study, (see chapters 5 and 6 for detail of application of quantitative confirmatory and generalisation of enquires).

**4.14.3 Internal Consistency Reliability**

This refers to the ability of the instrument used for measurement to produce similar results using different samples to measure a phenomenon in a period of time (Cooper
and Schindler, 2001). Malhotro (1996) identified slit-half as a technique for testing internal consistency where items on a scale are divided into two halves and the resulting half scores are correlated. However, a basic problem associated with this reliability test is that the result depends on how the scale items are split. Cronbach’s alpha is recommended to calculate all possible split half coefficients which could be resulting from the different ways of splitting the scale items (Field, 2013).

4.15 Data Analysis

Saunders et al. (2009) refers to data analysis as the ability to break down a set of data collected for analysis and to clarify the nature of the component parts and the relationship between them. Collis and Hussey (2003) equally noted that the steps prior to data analysis are a critical part of research investigation and often guided by the nature of data that is collected. In the current study, a quantitative data analysis was carried out from the data collected from the questionnaires sent to the NNPC as indicated. The data were analysed using the IBM Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS-21). Field (2013) recommended the use of SPSS for business related research. Based on this, the data collected for this study was entered into SPSS and followed with data cleansing, management of missing values and testing for normality of distributions. Also, preliminary analysis was conducted to explore the correlations among variables, and regression analysis was conducted to test the hypotheses predicted in this study.

SPSS Windows (software) was used to manage and analyse the data collected from the group of managers in the NNPC. More so, the software enables options for correlating the findings and making relevant comparisons with similar studies (Field, 2013). Finally, this enables the study to actualize the issues of descriptive analytical statistics with explanations given after each presentation.

4.15.1 Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Unlike the explorative data analysis approach that emphasises the use of diagrams to understand the relationship between data, descriptive data analysis enables the researcher to describe and compare numerical variables (Saunders et al., 2009). Field (2013) noted that descriptive statistics include frequency, mean, standard deviation, skeweness and kurtosis as well as range of scores. Descriptive statistics are obtained in numerous ways such as graphs and tables (Saunders et al., 2009; Pallant, 2010). In the
current study, the descriptive statistics of the variables were achieved by using SPSS to produce the mean, median, standard deviation, range, skewness and kurtosis. Also, tables and graphs were used to describe and explain the relationships of the findings. Below are some of the recommended analytical statistical methods for business and management research and their relevance in the present study (Saunders et al., 2009).

a) Correlation

Generally correlation connotes comparison of the relationship between variables (Field, 2013). Pallant (2010) viewed that the correlation technique is used to explore or describe the strength and direction of the relationship between two variables, and it is suitable for non-experimental research. Field (2013) adds that there are two types which are: simple bivariate correlation and partial correlation. Bivariate correlation, also known as zero-order correlation, enables the researcher to explore the relationship between two variables. More so, the usage of correlation enhances the inclusion of non-linear relationships, outliers, restriction of range, and correlation versus causality as well as statistical versus practical significance (Pallant, 2010). Partial correlation is similar to the Pearson correction except that it allows the researcher to add more variables in the correlation. On the other hand, Spearman’s correlation coefficient refers to a standardised statistical measure of the strength of the relationship between two variables that does not rely on the assumptions of a parametric test (Field, 2013 p 884). Most researchers investigating issues in business and management fields prefer using Pearson’s correlation or Spearman’s correlation coefficient depending on the type of data (Field, 2013). Consequently, and in line with the nature of the researcher objectives, and the independent, mediating, moderating and dependent variables of the current investigation, the researcher employed the Spearman’s correlation techniques to measure the strength of the relationship among the variables.

b) Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regressions are an appropriate and widely used method for investigating the relationship between a dependent variable and two or more independent variables due to their well-developed underlying statistical theory (Montgomery et al., 2001 p. 12; Hair et al., 2006, p. 18). The adoption of multiple regression analysis will help to decrease the likelihood of exaggeration in an overall explanatory power of a set of
given independent variables which may occur with a series of correlation analyses (Hair et al., 2006). Multiple regression models are suitable for predicting a value of dependent variable from one or more of independent variables (Field, 2013). They help to establish the individual influence of each independent variable and their contributions are significant in explaining the variance in the dependent variable. Furthermore, it enables the study to determine the variables that have the highest prediction and explanatory power over the dependent variable in order to make decisions. Montgomery et al. (2001) and Pallant (2010) recommended multiple linear regression as one of the best analytical tools when statistically analysing continuous variables, while other statistical tools such as logistic regression are the best analysis when exploring dichotomous variables. So, given the nature of the current study which is in line with the continuous dependent variables scale along with continuous independent variables and mediating variables, it was necessary to adopt multiple linear regression analysis.

Gaurav (2011) posits that multiple regression analysis provides an equation that predicts dependent variables from independent variables. Similarly, Pallant (2010) confirms that multiple regressions are composed of a group of techniques that are used to explore the relationship between a dependent variable and two or more independent variables. Also, it allows for a more refined exploration of the interrelationship among a set of variables and can benefit a study in the following ways:

Firstly, it reveals outcomes and predicts significant relationship amongst set of variables. For example, this study assumes that; individual readiness for change for change would impact on organisational change implementation. Leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust (independent variables) would predict more of organisational change implementation (dependent variable). Therefore, the multiple regressions would help the research determine the variables with the most significant impact.

Secondly, an application of multiple regressions helps the study with information about the research model as a whole and the relative contribution of each of the variables that make up the model.

Thirdly, an application of multiple regressions provides statistical control for an additional variable(s) when exploring the predictive ability of a conceptual model for
adoption as bases for change implementation. Based on this, this current study applies multiple regressions to enable the study reveal the prediction of the proposed organisational change implementation model for the NNPC change implementation strategy.

The literature identified dimensions of multiple regression analysis which are available for analysing the issues in research or investigations, they are standard multiple regression or simultaneous, hierarchical multiple regression or sequential and stepwise multiple regression (Field, 2013). Pallant (2010) confirms that standard multiple regressions is used where a researcher has a set of variables of either various personality scales and want to know how much variance is in a dependent variable. The approach equally tells the researcher how much unique variance in the dependent variable each of the independent variables could explain.

With Stepwise multiple regression, the researcher allows the programme to select information of the independent variables he/she provided, based on statistical criteria. It allows all variables to be entered simultaneously as an alternative and gives room for elimination of variables and stops when no additional predictor variable or statistically meaningful variable is added.

Hierarchical multiple regression or sequential, enables the researcher to determine the order variables to be entered into the regression equation as specified by theories and related studies (Pallant, 2010). The researcher may want to control some variable or group of variables. This method allows independent variables to be entered in steps or blocks in terms of their predictions of the dependent variable, as in the case of the current study. The nature of study does not have any intention to deliberately influence the analysis in order to achieve a prejudiced outcome from the study. Therefore, the hierarchical multiple regressions may not fit in some instance and give the necessary biased free regression analysis. In line with the strategy associated with the stepwise regression, SPSS was allowed to select which variables it entered and in which order they go into the equation based on the set of the statistical criteria. Researchers have stressed the need to show the regression assumptions to ensure that the process is validly followed and that the outcome can be classified as being reliable (Pallant, 2010; Field, 2013). The next section demonstrates how regression is achieved.
Pallant (2010) recommended that when applying multiple regressions, assumptions about the data should not be corrupted so that results will not be negatively impacted. Pallant (2010) stresses the need for researchers to consider the issues associated with sample size since it is the basis for generating research results. That is, when samples appear too small, the results to be obtained might not genuinely be generalised to other samples, meaning the analysis cannot be repeated with other samples to attain the same results. This shows that where results cannot be generalised to other samples such results might be regarded of less scientific value (Pallant, 2010). This has generated numerous issues in the debate about the number of participants required for multiple regressions. In line with this, Steven (1996) recommended about 15 participants per predictor in order to ensure a reliable equation. Consequently, the study assumed that for successful organisational change implementation, the following predictors are necessary: individual readiness for change, leadership style, organisational culture types, managerial skills, organisational trust and commitment (as independent variables). The sample size is 177 and about 20 participants for each predictor in 12 business units of the NNPC. The business units of the NNPC are classified as directorates or departments of the NNPC. Studies have recommended at least 18 participants for each independent variable for stepwise regression and an approximate average of 30 to 40 participants for each independent variable for multiple regression (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007; Pallant, 2010). Given that the samples of the current study met the criteria stated above, the study can be generalised and therefore proven to be statistically and scientifically valid. See section 5.9 for discussion about the condition used for measuring moderators.

Concerning multicollinearity and singularity of multiple regression analysis, Pallant (2010) noted that multicollinearity exists when the relationships among independent variables are highly correlated, either where r = 0.9 and above. On the other hand, singularity exists where an independent variable is a combination of other independent variables. Field (2013) recommend that the researcher should check for multicollinearity and singularity among independent variables and correlations among them in order to establish relationships. Pallant (2010) noted that in the case where multicollinearity is perceived, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) is employed to eliminate edges that lead to multicollinearity. The VIF value is greater than 10 and is a suitable tool to eliminate such edges. More so, a low tolerance of less than 0.10, shows
that multiple correlation with other variables is high, which shows that multicollinearity might occur. In the current study, multicollinearity and singularity were considered and checked among the independent variables and the effect on correlations of independent variables and the dependent variables to establish relationships as specified by Pallant (2010) and Field (2013).

Other issues recommended to be taken for consideration are normality, linearity, homoscedasticity and independence of residuals (Pallant, 2010). Accordingly, they all related to scores distribution and the nature of the connecting relationship that exist between variables. According to Pallant (2010), these assumptions are checked by closely inspecting the Normal Probability Plot (P-P) of the regression standard and the scatterplot which can be requested as part of the results of the analysis. The result of the normal P-P is expected to have a point that lies on a straight line from left to right which therefore suggests that the outcome is not a major deviation from normality. Homoscedasticity is the variability of the scores of variable X (independent variable) and should be similar at all values of variable Y, and can be checked by a close observation of the scatterplot to see if the points start narrow and the get fatter or whether the pattern is from one end to the other. In which case, data may have violated the assumption of homoscedasticity. Again, Field (2013) posits that independence of errors can be inspected through the Durbin Watson statistic which provides an assumption that independent or uncorrelated errors can be accepted. Moreover, where a value is less than 1 or greater than 3 it should not be accepted. However, such errors can be assumed where the Durbin Watson statistic is close to 2 and lies between 1 and 3.

4.16 The Context of the NNPC and Nigeria

The NNPC was established on April 1, 1977 to control all activities in the oil and gas sector in Nigeria. This includes operations interested in refining, petrochemical, and product transport and marketing. Between 1978 and 1989, the NNPC had constructed refineries in some major cities in Nigeria which are: Warri, Kaduna and Port Harcourt and took over a 35,000-barrel Shell Refinery established in Port Harcourt in 1969. In 1988 the NNPC was commercialised into 12 strategic business units, covering the entire spectrum of its oil and gas operation which includes exploration and production, gas development, refining, distribution, petrochemicals, engineering, and commercial investments. Currently, NNPC’s subsidiary companies are;
2. National Petroleum Investment Management Services (NAPIMS)
3. Nigerian Petroleum Development Company (NPDC)
4. The Nigerian Gas Company (NGC)
5. The Products and Pipelines Marketing Company (PPMC)
6. Integrated Data Services Limited (IDSL)
7. Nigerian LNG limited (NLNG)
8. National Engineering and Technical Company Limited (NETCO)
9. Hydrocarbon Services Nigeria Limited (HYSON)
10. Warri Refinery and Petrochemical Co. Limited (WRPC)
11. Kaduna Refinery and Petrochemical Co. Limited(KRPC)

The NNPC major partners have been Shell, Texaco, Mobil, Chevron, Elf, Total and Agip oil companies. In 2004 the joint venture (JV) of these companies produced more than 90 percent of Nigerian crude oil with other small oil and gas companies doing exploration and production operations on a sole risk bases. (World Bank Figure updated April 2006) The Federal government of Nigeria through the spirit of JV has contributed capital investment proportionate to the equity distribution in specific partnerships businesses.

As a company with the vision to become a ‘world class oil and gas company driven by shared commitment to excellence’ is currently on the verge of transformation which primarily aims to achieve a regular measurement of its organisational and staff performance with the objective of turning the corporation from a cost centre into a profit centre. Other main purposes of the company change programme include the entrenchment of accountability, shaping a new commercially viable enterprise, improvement of performance of core businesses, building a performance based organisation, and developing critical skills and capabilities as well as talents management across the subsidiaries of the corporation (The Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation Transformation News, 2010). Its overall mission is to drive the Nigeria’s economy and technical advancement and leveraging the country’s valuable petroleum endowment. While the corporation’s mission has been impressive, its term of reference has been incoherent for much of its existence with uneven performance. Apart
from the corporation’s role as the heart of Nigerian economy, the corporation and the Nigerian petroleum industry have been one of the key definition phenomena of the country’s post-independence history. The NNPC is significantly positioned in the Nigerian political economy.

At the top of the NNPC structure is the Group Managing Director (GMD) and Board of Directors. Others include the Board of NNPC’s CEO, four Group Executive Directors (GEDs) E&P, Refineries and Petrochemicals, Finance and Accounts, and Corporate Services; and its Group General Manager (GGM) Legal Advisers and Companies Secretaries. Also included in the structure are six government appointees from outside the corporation. The Board is chaired by the Nigerian Minister for Petroleum Resource.

The daily operations of the NNPC centres in the office of the GMD, the powers of other senior executives’ officers under the GMD are often limited with the influence of political leaders outside the corporation. The structure also empowers the GMD with immediate four subordinates who are often regarded as Group Executive Directors GEDs. Also are several other officers immediately below the GEDs, the Group General Managers (GGMs) and those responsible for corporate planning and development and of the division created in the current restructuring process, renewable energy and the Nigerian content act. Included in this group is the head of Group Public Affairs Department (GPAD) who directly reported to the GMD. The subsidiary companies do have their own Managing Directors (MDs), the Nigerian Liquefied Natural Gas Company (NLNGC), and the Pipelines and Products Marking Company (PPPMC). The head of the corporate divisions and subsidiary companies are of equal rank and perform similar functions.

Another division of the NNPC group is the National Petroleum Investment Management Services Division (NAPIMS) which manages the government interest in the upstream, also involves in the corporation’s partnerships with all operators, including NNPC’s dedicated E&P subsidiary Nigeria Petroleum Development Company (NPDC). Regrettably, the corporation hasn’t sustained an adequate leadership behaviour or organisational culture type that may move the corporation to a greater height in order to reduce whatever dilemma related to change implementation (Makeri, 2009). Also, until now average Nigerians feel that the NNPC has not attained the anticipated expectations considering time of establishment and its strategic position in
the economy. Apart from the underscored poor performance in the NNPC stakeholders believe that the NNPC is faced with enormous challenges believed to have contributed to its setback (Okoye, 2010).

However, the NNPC had over the last few years made efforts to implement a change programme but with very limited success. In 1986, the Corporation in partnership with Arthur Anderson initiated the Commercialisation, Re-organisation, and Capitalization Programme (CRCP) which created strategic units and began the process of capitalization of the various subsidiaries. The strategic change effort was followed by a Total Quality Management (TQM) initiative in 1988 in conjunction with Accenture and Shell Global Solutions through Project PACE. This was aimed to emphasize a quality management process and transform the corporation to an effective and efficient organisation (Makeri, 2009; Okoye, 2010).

Irrespective of these efforts, the NNPC consistently lamented its inability to actualize its vision. For instance, while justifying the introduction of the current ongoing change programme, a senior chief executive officer of the NNPC stated that the corporation is in deficit of over three trillion naira (Nigerian currency), that virtually all its sub business units have been operating as cost centres and none have the capacity of meeting the objectives of the corporation. This situation according to the senior executive officer is totally unacceptable (NNPC news letter, 2010). This claim and other limitations recorded make it necessary to undertake this research hence the outcome of the research may help to remedy the current situation.

A study by Makeri (2009) confirmed that various change initiatives embarked upon in the NNPC have not been effective due to inadequate implementation structure which led to poor performance. Equally, Okoye’s (2010) study which looked at the NNPC’s transformation programmes and corporate performance listed three key factors which he believe are responsible for the lack of poor change implementation, they are:

1. Lack of leadership commitment (especially top management level).
2. Staff motivation and reward not tied to the change programme. This indicates a non-existence of a comprehensive inclusive and strategic change framework.
3. Lack of interest and resistance; failure or abandonment of past change programmes coupled with individual’s opinion about the outcome, have imbued a sense of apathy or resistance among staff towards future change programmes. Aligning this evidence with ongoing change initiative suggests that the NNPC management would need to put in place an acceptable integrated management framework that encompasses and subsumes all relevant concepts involved together to help implement change. It is expected that such framework will show various contributing factors that will lead to successful change implementation. The current study is expected to develop a theoretical framework which will be incorporated with dominant leadership style, organisational culture type, relevant managerial skills and increased perception of organisational trust that will increase the understanding of organisational change implementation.

4.17 Summary

This chapter has demonstrated how the instrument for the study was developed and analysed. The chapter also discussed the methods adopted for questionnaire distribution and collection in the various business units of the NNPC. A self administered questionnaire was considered as the best option for distributing and collecting the questionnaires. The chapter also discussed the reliability and validity of the process to ensure consistency and accuracy in the entire process. Recommended statistical tools for data analysis such as correlation, regression, variance etc were equally employed to show levels of relationship among all variables to decide if hypothesis should be accepted or rejected and predict the outcome from the variables. The next chapter presents the findings from the study.
CHAPTER FIVE

Data Analysis and Results

5.1 Introduction

Chapter four discussed the research methodology adopted for this study and justifies the scale measurement process. This chapter presents the data collected from the quantitative questionnaire and provides a detailed analysis. Quantitative data are often analysed in two categories namely, descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. While descriptive statistics are used to explore, explain, summarise and present quantitative data, inferential statistics are used to draw conclusions from the samples of quantitative data (Collis and Hussey, 2009). In this study, the analyses were carried out with the adoption of SPSS Statistics 21. The analysis includes: descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, factor analysis and multiple regressions analysis.

In order to ensure the reliability and validity of response of the questionnaires, a reliability test was conducted to ascertain the reliability and validity of the questionnaires. This chapter starts by presenting the organisational members profile of the NNPC as well as their level of readiness to change. More so, correlations analysis results were presented as well as multiple regression analysis to examine the research hypotheses.

5.2 Response Rate

In this research, 320 questionnaires were distributed to managers in the NNPC and a total of 183 were completed and returned. A coding and cleaning system was used to record the data before the main analysis was conducted and findings ascertained. Among the 183 responses, 6 cases of missing data was recorded which represent 2.84% of the total data collected and gives a total of 177 valid number of questionnaires returned for analysis. In other words, the value of missing data is less than 5% which is unlikely to cause any problem or difference to the outcome of the analysis (Saunders et al., 2009). This shows that 65.94% is the overall response rate and 64.1% able response rate; see Table 5.1 below.
Table 5.1: The Questionnaire Response Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Questionnaire Distribution</th>
<th>No of Quest</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Total number of questionnaires distributed</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Total number of questionnaires returned</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>65.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Number of invalid questionnaires</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Number of valid questionnaires</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 5.1, a total of three hundred and twenty questionnaires were distributed and a total of one hundred and eighty three returned. Out of this number, six questionnaires were invalid given a valid number of one hundred and seventy seven questionnaires. This shows that one hundred and thirty seven questionnaires were not returned. The reason for non-return of the questionnaire could not be different from related studies which often account for inability of respondents to take part of survey due to their engrained secretive nature, or could not have the time to participate. More so, those that participated in the survey participated voluntary which in other word reduces sampling bias.

5.3 Reliability and Validity of Questionnaire

5.3.1 Validity of the Questionnaire

In order to ensure the validity of the questionnaire, the research checked the content, construct and validity of the questionnaire.

According to Saunders et al. (2009 p 373) content validity refers to the extent to which the questionnaire for a study actually provides adequate coverage for the investigated questions. Hence, this research checked content validity to determine firstly the variables which have been defined and utilised in the existing literature. In this study, the dimensions of variables were identified from the following literatures, change management, leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills organisational trust and other contextual factors that affect organisational change implementation, implying that all the items considered in this research were obtained from preceding literature with a view to contribute to the general knowledge of organisational change management.
Secondly, the content validity of the questionnaire was checked with 5 academic experts from the University of South Wales to ensure that the questionnaire is in conformity with the aim of the study. The experts concluded that the questionnaire was appropriate and can achieve the aim of the study with a little editing. It was also suggested that some of the questions needed to be amended because they felt they were too long and difficult to understand. This was all taken into consideration as the final questionnaire was then amended in line with the feedback.

A pilot study was conducted with a group of managers within to the targeted sample for the study. The pilot study was in line with the targeted population. During the process of the pilot study, it was ensured that the questions measured the construct and that they were interpreted in the same way by all participants. The questionnaire completion time was estimated, accuracy of language was ensured and ambiguity was checked. In order to ensure the questionnaire were clearer, all amendments were made appropriately.

The validity of the construct was measured using Principal Component Factor Analysis (Field, 2013). According to Saunders et al. (2009) a construct is valid if the measurement questions actually measure the theoretical construct the researcher intends to measure. Similarly, Marczyk et al. (2010) viewed that construct validity should be able to ask the question of whether the theory supported by the findings provides the best available explanation of the results.

Therefore, factor analysis enables the researcher to check the validity of the factor structure of the instrument, in the same vein, factor loading shows the strength of the association between the item and the latent construct (Hair et al., 2006; Cohen et al., 2013). Nunnally (1978) posits that factor item loadings which are higher than 0.05 on one factor can be retained for further analysis; however Abdul-Halim and Che-Ha (2009) viewed that where the item loadings are 0.4 they should be retained for further analysis. In another development, Field (2013) considered the research sample size for determining the most appropriate loading value for factor analysis. He viewed that a study with a sample size up to 50 needs variable loading of 0.77 and should be considered a significant variable, also a sample size of 100 needs a factor loading of 0.5 or more. But for a sample size of 200 the loading needs to be 0.364 or more, whereas a sample size of 300 needs a loading of 0.228. Hair et al.’s (2010) guideline suggests that
for a sample above 120 the factor loading should be 0.50 while a sample below 100 must be 0.55 and above.

Following Hair et al.’s (2010) and other recommendations, guideline the current study sets its lowest factor as 0.50 (Abdul-Halim and Che-Ha, 2009; Field, 2013), with a sample size of 177, the accepted loading value for consideration of factors was therefore set at 0.40 and above (Hair, et al., 2010; Field, 2013). This implies that items with loadings of less than 0.40 may be subject to being dropped from the analysis. Consequently, items which have a loading of less than 0.40 will be considered inconsistent and would not be required for subsequent analysis. This is to ensure that the current study is consistent with the criteria of conducting business and management research and can be considered as reliably valid.

The results presented in Table 5.2 show that, for each construct (factor), the individual items were well loaded, exceeding 0.40 on their respective construct. All items related robustly to their respective factor. The percentage of total variance explained by all items under each construct factor was above 40%. Therefore, this study concludes that all measures exhibited construct validity and had a unifactorial nature (Hair et al., 2010). Similar to the theoretical categorisation, each measure formed a ‘solid’ single construct and exhibited strong unidimensionality from a statistical perspective.

For example, the loading values for the items selected to measure change implementation were all high ranging, from 0.783 – 0.890, and they can collectively explain 69.373% of the variance. The findings suggest that organisational change implementation shows a strong convergence as measured by its five practices, meaning that organisation change can be implemented with an integrated approach.
### Table 5.2: Individual Items and Factor Loadings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Name of Factor</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>% of Variance explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organisational Change Implementation (OCI)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.783 – 0.890</td>
<td>69.373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Individual Readiness for Change (IRFC)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.793 – 0.865</td>
<td>69.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership (TFL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.656 – 0.839</td>
<td>61.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Transactional Leadership (TSL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.726 – 0.919</td>
<td>75.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Democratic Leadership (DL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.633 – 0.899</td>
<td>67.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Autocratic Leadership (AL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.699 – 0.816</td>
<td>59.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Laissez-faire Leadership (LFL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.561 – 0.737</td>
<td>47.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Group Culture (GC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.654 – 0.784</td>
<td>51.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Developmental Culture (DC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.450 – 0.759</td>
<td>41.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rational Culture (RC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.798 – 0.843</td>
<td>70.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hierarchy Culture (HC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.579 – 0.736</td>
<td>47.468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Technical Skills (TS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.770 – 0.908</td>
<td>70.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Conceptual Skills (CS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.712 – 0.849</td>
<td>64.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skills (IS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.759 – 0.845</td>
<td>65.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Interpersonal Trust (IT)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.813 – 0.858</td>
<td>69.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Institutional Trust (ITT)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.728 – 0.825</td>
<td>61.911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Social Norms (SN)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.760 – 0.815</td>
<td>62.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Unit/dept. Characteristic (UDC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.725 – 0.926</td>
<td>70.655</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.3.2 Questionnaire Reliability

The literature strongly affirmed that Cronbach’s coefficient alpha is one of the most frequently used measures of internal consistency of instruments (Bryman and Bell, 2011, Saunders et al., 2009). The majority of authors consider that Cronbach’s alpha should not drop below 0.7, and that an alpha value of 0.7 or more signifies reliable measures (de Vaus, 2002; Pallant, 2010). In this study Cronbach’s coefficient alpha measure was used to estimate the degree of the internal consistency of each construct as demonstrated in Table 5.3.
The results of the analysis in Table 5.3 show that all the scales have a high reliability, and the values of Cronbach’s alpha derived for the constructs range from 0.706 to 0.949. Therefore, the instrument developed for measuring organisational change implementation was considered to be reliable. Overall, the scales used in this study were found to have adequate reliability and validity, and were consequently employed in the hypotheses testing however there was one deletion in factor 16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Items for deletion</th>
<th>Value of Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Effective Organisational Change Implementation (EOCI)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Individual Readiness for Change (IRFC)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transformational Leadership (TFL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Transactional Leadership (TSL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Democratic Leadership (DL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Autocratic Leadership (AL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Laissez-faire Leadership (LFL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Group Culture (GC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Developmental Culture (DC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rational Culture (RC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Hierarchy Culture (HC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Technical Skills (TS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Conceptual Skills (CS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Interpersonal Skills (IS)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Interpersonal Trust (IT)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Institutional Trust (ITT)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Social Norms (SN)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Unit/dept Characteristic (UDC)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4 Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Characteristics

This section presents a descriptive analysis of employee characteristics. It aims, therefore, are to present the analysis of employee characteristics and how they impact on organisational change implementation. In addition, the analysis provides some background information of the individual respondents who filled in the questionnaires about their job function, units and departments, qualification, sex, age and level of work experience they have in the organisation (see Table 5.4). Studies shows that the personal information (demographic) of organisational members is also contributing factors for change implementation, they are: job function, level of education, years of experience, age and gender (Alas and Vadi, 2006; Shah and Shah, 2010; Gillespie et al., 2011). As indicated earlier, the personnel responsible for change implementation in the NNPC are ranked between managers and deputy managers (middle managers). The table below presents further descriptive analysis of demographic data of the respondents.

Table 5.4: Profile of Respondents and Organisation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Job Title/Function</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Deputy Manager</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Departments/Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Corporate Services (C&amp;S)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exploration and production (E&amp;P)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Refineries and Petrochemicals (R&amp;P)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Finance and Account (F&amp;A)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Commercial and Investment (C&amp;I)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Engineering and Technology (E&amp;T)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Special Services (S&amp;S)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Gap and Power (G&amp;P)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nationality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nigerian</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>94.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non Nigerian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>HND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>BSc</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>MSc</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>MPhil</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Professional Qualification</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Respondents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Under 25 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>25 – 29 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>30 – 39 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>40 – 49 years</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>50 – 59 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>60 years and over</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents’ Years of Work Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0 – 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 – 10 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11 – 15 years</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16 – 20 years</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>20 years and above</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.1 Profile of Respondents

This section presents charts representing the characteristics of the respondents as shown in Table 5.4. With regard to the respondents’ job title and functions, 44.6% of the respondents were managers and 55.4% respondents were deputy managers. This shows that the participants were between the positions of managers and deputy managers as represented in Chart 5.1.

Chart 5.1: Job Title/Functions of Respondents

Table 5.4 presents departments/units of the organisation as represented by the participants. With regards to this representation, 8.5% respondents were from the Corporate Services (C&S), 16.9% represents Exploration and Production (E&P), 13.6% represents Refineries and Petrochemicals (R&P), 15.3% represents Finance and Account (F&A), 10.7% represents Commercial and Investment (C&I), 14.7% represents Engineering and Technology (E&T), 11.9% represents Special Services (S&S) and 8.5% represents Gas and Power. This shows that all the participants were represented from all the departments/units of the organisation under study and were represented in the analysis as shown in Chart 5.2.
Chart 5.2: Departments/Units of the Organisation

As shown in Table 5.4, participants were drawn from a ranged of qualifications, hence Chart 5.3 presents the educational level of respondents as being classified into categories: 59.4% Bachelor’s degree, 33.9% Master’s degree, 2.3% Masters of philosophy, 2.8% Doctorate degree, 1.1% Professional qualification. This implies that the participants had bachelor’s degree and higher degrees, which therefore supports that credibility of the data.

Chart 5.3: Qualifications of Respondents
In relation to gender of respondents as presented in Table 5.4, it implies that 61.4% of the respondents were male while 38.6% respondents were female indicating that both male and female managers participated in the study.

**Chart 5.4: Gender of Respondents**

Table 5.4 and Chart 5.5 show that the ages of the respondents were categorised as follows: between 25 and 29 years old were 1.3%, between 30 and 39 years old were 21.6%, between 40 and 49 years old were 45.1%, between 50 and 59 years old were 26.8% and 60 years old and over were 5.2%. This shows that the ages of the respondents support the credibility of the data collected.

**Chart 5.5: Ages of Respondents**
Table 5.4 shows that the respondents had more than 5 years’ work experience with 6 – 10 years 16.5%, 11 – 15 years 39.6%, 16 – 20 years 22.6% and 20 years and above 21.3%. This means that work experience of the respondents supports the reliability of the data collected.

**Chart 5.6: Respondents’ Work Experience**

![Chart 5.6: Respondents’ Work Experience](chart)

### 5.5 The Level of Organisational Change Implementation

Studies confirmed that the overall level of organisational change implementation is drawn from the average scores for the constructs in the measurement instrument in order to help develop a framework for change implementation (Oakland and Tanner, 2007; Walker, 2007; Shah and Shah, 2010, Shah, 2011). In relation to the level of organisational change implementation in the NNPC, Table 5.5 illustrates the mean score and standard deviation of each variable measuring the average practice for change implementation. It shows that the seven variables measuring the impact of organisational change implementation have a mean score range from 3.67 – 4.28 on a 6 point Likert scale, with managerial skills being the lowest. Contextual factors gave the highest mean rating of 4.28 on the 1-6 scale. More so, all other factors scored higher than managerial skills to show the level of organisational change implementation. This shows that the variables for increasing the level of change implementation are between the averages of 3.67 to 4.28.
Table 5.5: Level of Organisational Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>Organisational change implementation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Organisational Change Implementation</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Individual readiness for change</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Organisational Culture</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Managerial Skills</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Organisational Trust</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Contextual Factors</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, in order to determine the relationship among variables and their impact on change implementation, the use of the Bivariate (Spearman rho) correlation coefficient was necessary to establish if there is a relationship between variables.

5.6 Correlation Analysis

Correlation analysis is considered in this study to help to describing the strength and direction of the relationship between variables. More so, it helps to provide an initial evaluation to see if the variables are related to one another (Pallant, 2010; Field, 2013). By using bivariate correlation analysis of Spearman rho, the analysis shows that there is a relationship between leadership and individual readiness for change (IFRC) and organisational change implementation (OCI). The correlation coefficients shows that transformational leadership style (TFL) \( r = 0.750 \) is strongly related with individual readiness for change and with organisational change implementation \( r = 0.701 \). More so, the analysis shows a positive relationship between democratic leadership styles (DL) \( r = 0.802 \) with individual readiness for change, and with organisational change implementation \( r = 0.743 \).

The correlation analysis also indicates a positive relationship between transactional leadership style (TSL) \( r = 0.827 \) with individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation \( r = 0.726 \). Laissez-faire leadership style (LFL) \( r = 0.512 \) was found positive with individual readiness for change, and organisational change implementation \( r = 0.512 \). This result indicates a positive relationship between leadership and individual readiness for change as well as organisational change.
implementation in this study. However, autocratic leadership styles (AL) \( r = -0.635 \) was found to have a negative correlation with individual readiness for change and \( r = -0.635 \) with organisational change implementation (see appendix 4a). This result shows that at the level of correlation coefficient analysis, transformational, transactional, democratic and Laissez-faire leadership styles were better relating with individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation in this study.

The correlation coefficient for organisational culture indicates that group culture (GC) \( r = 0.330 \) is positively associating with individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation \( r = 0.352 \). The analysis further shows a positive relationship between rational culture (RC) \( r = 0.387 \) with individual readiness for change and with organisational change implementation \( r = 0.424 \). A positive relationship was equally found between hierarchy culture (HC) \( r = 0.584 \) and individual readiness for change and with organisational change implementation \( r = 0.561 \), however a negative correlation was recorded with developmental culture (DC), individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation (appendix 4b). This shows that at the level of correlation coefficient group, rational and hierarchy culture types were better associating with readiness for change and organisational change implementation in this study.

The correlation coefficient result shows a positive relationship between managerial skills and organisational change implementation. As indicated, technical skills (TS) \( r = 0.720 \) shows positive relationship with individual readiness for change and with organisational change implementation \( r = 0.702 \). Conceptual skills (CS) \( r = 0.731 \) shows a positive correlation coefficient with individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation \( r = 0.968 \). There was a negative correlation between interpersonal skills \( r = -0.723 \) and individual readiness for change and \( r = -0.676 \) with organisational change implementation. The correlation coefficient between organisational trust and organisational change implementation is positive. The result indicated that interpersonal trust (IT) \( r = 0.750 \) has a positive correlation coefficient with individual readiness for change and with organisational change implementation \( r = 0.658 \). A positive correlation coefficient was found with institutional trust (ITT) \( r = 0.750 \) with individual readiness for change and \( r = 0.671 \) with organisational change implementation.
The correlation coefficient shows a positive relationship between the contextual factors and the leadership styles considered in this study. As indicated, the correlation coefficient of TFL and SN is \( r = 0.680 \), and the correlation coefficient of the relationship between TFL and units/departments (UDC) is \( r = 0.538 \). The correlation coefficient result shows positive correlation between SN and TSL is \( r = 0.705 \) with TSL and UDC is \( r = 0.620 \). The correlation coefficient between DL and SN is \( r = 0.757 \), and DL with UDC is \( r = 0.648 \). More so, a positive correlation coefficient was found between LFL and social norms \( r = 0.621 \) and with UDC \( r = 0.518 \).

On the aspect of organisational culture, the contextual factors shows there is a positive correlation coefficient between GC and SN, \( r = 0.355 \) and UDC, \( r = 0.3.26 \). The correlation coefficient of the relationship between RC and SN is, \( r = 0.477 \) and UDC is, \( r = 0.301 \). The correlation coefficient for HC and SN is, \( r = 0.634 \), and UDC is, \( r = 0.557 \). The correlation shows negative relationship between DC and SN \( r = -0.066 \) and a negative relationship between DC and UDC \( r = -0.011 \) indicating that group culture, rational culture and hierarchy culture shows positive relationship between the contextual factors while developmental culture show a negative relationship.

The correlation coefficient shows a positive relationship between the contextual factors and managerial skills, SN and TS, \( r = 0.760 \), and UDC and TS \( r = 0.628 \). The relationship between SN and CS \( r = 0.776 \) and UDC with CS shows \( r = 0.653 \). But there is a negative correlation coefficient between the relationship between IS and the contextual factors. These results show that technical and conceptual skills were best relating with contextual factors. On the aspect organisational trust, the correlation coefficient indicates that there is a relationship between SN and IT \( r = 0.790 \) and UDC with IT \( r = 0.727 \). The correlation coefficient also indicates a positive relationship between SN and ITT \( r = 0.784 \) and UDC with ITT \( r = 0.734 \), indicating that organisational trust have a positive correlation coefficient with the contextual factors.

As indicated earlier, the correlation coefficient analysis was applied to establish if there is a positive or negative relationship between variables. As evident in the results presentation above, some leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills and organisational trust shown a positive relationship with individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. Also, the contextual factors show a positive relationship with some independent and dependent variables. As stated
earlier, the correlation coefficient was adopted to show relationships of variables and not necessarily to make conclusions from the study. In order to determine the extent and impact of each variable measuring organisational change implementation a regression analysis becomes necessary as it will lead to study to more logical and coherent conclusion.

5.7 Multiple Regressions Analysis

Structural equation models (SEM) is a dominant research paradigm in the field of management research, and can be understood as theoretical empiricism because it integrates theory with method and observations (Bagozzi, 1994). Hair et al. (2010) have recommended the use of SEM because SEM examines the structure of interrelationships expressed in a series of equations. These interrelationships depict all of the causality among constructs, the exogenous as well as endogenous variables, which are used in the analysis (Hair et al., 2010). Whilst SEM might be an effective method for analyzing multivariate data, the current study used multiple regressions for hypotheses testing. This is because, SEM requires a large sample technique which requires (usually N > 200; preferably no less than 400) to benefit from its advantages (Kline, 2005). More so, the respondent participants’ usable returns questionnaire for the current study is not large enough to warrant the effective use of SEM. Hence, multiple regression was preferably adopted in this study.

With the SPSS spread sheet, a sequence of regression analyses were carried out in order to investigate the proposed relationships among leadership styles, organisational culture types, the dimension of managerial skills, the dimensions of organisational trust and the contextual factors with individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. In this order, this section presents the results of the regression analysis of this study. The regression model tested met the requirement of validity and no problem was detected (Pallant, 2010). Importantly, the model derived from the sample can be accurately applied to the population of interest (Pallant, 2010; Field, 2013). Concerning multicollinearity statistics, the variance inflation factor (VIF) values of the independent variables for all models was less than the maximum level of 10, while the Tolerance (TOL) value in the respective models was higher than the minimum level of 0.2 (Pallant, 2010). Consequently, the statistics indicated that there was no multicollinearity problem among the independent variables in all respective models.
Also important to note was the requirement and procedure to ensure that the linearity of the regression models was met (Baron and Kenny, 1986; Pallant, 2010). This is to present the degree of the relationship between the dependent and independent variables to which the change of dependent variable is associated with the independent variable (Field, 2013). Hence, the findings show that all the dependent variables significantly correlated with the independent variables, more so, all the variables were linear with each other. Therefore, the test of linearity supported the appropriateness of the regression models. Bryman and Cramer (2011) posit a ratio of a minimum level of 5 to 1 and a desired level of 20 to 1 in order to achieve an appropriate and suitable generalisation of findings. Consequently, the maximum number of variables used in the models of the current study was 10 with a sample size of 177 respondents, thus the ratio is above the minimum level of 5 to 1 and the desired level of 20 to 1. The overall models tested were statistically significant (F-value significant on a 1% level) demonstrating that the entire model reported was reliable (Baron and Kenny, 1986; Pallant, 2010); therefore, an acceptable prediction of the dependent variable was provided with the regression analysis. This study follows Baron and Kenny (1986) condition for mediation analysis which states that to test for mediation, one should estimate the three following regression equation: first regressing the mediator on the independent variable, second regressing the dependent variables on the independent variables; and third, regressing the dependent variable on both the independent and mediator variables. Therefore, to establish mediation the following condition must hold: first, the independent variable must affect the mediating variable in the first equation; second, independent variable must be shown to affect the dependent variable in the second equation; and third, the mediator must affect the dependent variable in the third equation.

5.7.1 The Influence of Leadership Styles on Change Implementation

This study proposed six major hypotheses to assess the impact of leadership styles, organisational trust, managerial skills, organisational trust on organisational change implementation, as well as the mediating role of individual readiness for change. The contextual factors considered were hypothesised to access the moderating impact of the contextual factors between the variables. Tables 5.6 to 8 present the regression analysis
for the relationship between leadership styles, organisational change implementation and individual readiness for change. The proposed hypotheses are:

**H1:** There is a relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation.

**H1a:** Transformational leadership style will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

**H1b:** Transactional leadership style will have a lesser impact on organisational change implementation than transformational leadership style.

**H1c:** Democratic leadership style will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

**H1d:** Autocratic leadership style will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.

**H1e:** Laissez-faire leadership style will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.

Multiple regression analysis was applied to test the direct effects of leadership styles on organisational change implementation. As indicated in Model 1 of Table 5.6, transformational leadership style ($\beta = 0.353, p < 0.001$), democratic leadership style ($\beta = 0.338, p < 0.001$) were found to make the highest positive and significant effect on organisational change implementation. On the other hand, transactional and were found to make the lowest contribution on organisational change implementation. However, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles were found to have a negative contribution on organisational change implementation. This finding indicates that transformational and democratic leadership styles were the most influential leadership styles as they made the most important contribution to organisational change implementation in the current study.
Table 5.6: Regression Result for Leadership and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>T- test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>3.875</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSL</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.430</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>3.485</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>-.103</td>
<td>-1.503</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFL</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.749</td>
<td>.651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary of the result in model 2 shows the regression analysis between leadership styles and individual readiness for change. As indicated, democratic leadership style ($\beta = 0.373, p < 0.001$), transactional leadership style ($\beta = 0.219, p < 0.001$), and transformational leadership style ($\beta = 0.240, p < 0.001$) were found to have the highest positive and significant effect on individual readiness for change. The result shows that democratic and transformational leadership styles were making the highest contributions to individual readiness for change, whereas transactional leadership style was found to make a lesser impact with individual readiness for change. More so, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles were either not making a significant contribution or were making a negative influence on individual readiness for change. The positive influence of transactional leadership style shows that there is high level of concentration of transactional leadership style at the level of individual readiness for change in the NNPC than at the level of change implementation. This could be a reason for the low level of change implementation in the NNPC.

Table 5.7: Regression Result for Leadership and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>T- test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>.249</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>3.203</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSL</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>2.953</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>4.557</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>-4.12</td>
<td>.681</td>
<td>.507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFL</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>.670</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.659</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sig of F = .000
Adjusted $R^2 = .763$
The regression result in (Model 3) shows an inclusion of individual readiness for change (the mediator variable) in order to assess the mediating role of individual readiness for change between the leadership styles and organisational change implementation. As indicated in Table 5.8, transactional leadership shows a negative influence on readiness for change and organisational change implementation ($\beta = -0.117, p < 0.079$). But, transformational leadership ($\beta = 0.210, p = 0.018$) with a reduction from ($\beta = 0.240, p < 0.001$) shows a positive impact when individual readiness for change was added into the analysis. It equally shows that democratic leadership style ($\beta = 0.176, p = 0.079$) with a reduction from ($\beta = 0.373, p < 0.001$) is positively influencing organisational change implementation through individual readiness for change. This is a mere reduction and not necessarily elimination when the mediator was included in the model. Also, it shows that, Baron and Kenny’s (1986) condition for examining the mediating role of individual readiness for change was met.

The result of the adjusted R-square (0.700) was higher than (0.648) in Model 1 which further indicates that transformational and democratic leadership styles are better the impacting on organisational change implementation through individual readiness for change in this study. This result is consistent with H1, H1a, and H1c, while H1b, H1d and H1e were not supported. A detailed discussion on the impact of transformational leadership style and democratic leadership style on individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation is presented in chapter six below.

Table 5.8: Regression Result for Change Readiness, Leadership and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>T- test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>2.401</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSL</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-1.017</td>
<td>.311</td>
<td>.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.767</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFL</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRFC</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>5.838</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sig of F = .000

Adjusted $R^2 = .700$
Table 5.9 represents the regression analysis for the relationship between organisational culture types and organisational change implementation. The research hypotheses for this section are:

**H2**: There is a positive relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation.

**H2a**: Group culture type will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

**H2b**: Developmental culture type will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

**H2c**: Rational culture type will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.

**H2d**: Hierarchical culture type will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.

The regression analysis result in this section as indicated in Table 5.9 (Model 1) shows that Group culture style ($\beta = 0.174$, $p = 0.019$) have a positive relationship on organisational change implementation. Rational culture type ($\beta = 0.155$, $p = 0.047$) was also found to have a positive impact with organisational change implementation. The result further indicated that hierarchy culture was found to have the highest positive impact on organisational change implementation ($\beta = 0.424$, $p < 0.001$), and developmental culture type with ($\beta = -0.12$ $p = 0.864$) shows a negative impact on organisational change implementation. The result shows that, at the level of organisational change implementation hierarchy culture was making the highest impact, where developmental culture was making the lowest impact. This result is consistent with correlation analysis result found in the correlation coefficient analysis (appendix 4b) which shows a positive relationship between hierarchy culture and rational culture types with readiness for change and organisational change implementation. The high level of hierarchy culture could be responsible for the low level of change implementation in the NNPC, which mean, the NNPC might be emphasising more of hierarchy culture type instead of focusing more of developmental and group culture types.
Table 5.9: Regression Result for Organisational Culture and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>T-test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>.265</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td><strong>.174</strong></td>
<td>2.368</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td>.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td><strong>.155</strong></td>
<td>2.002</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>.425</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td><strong>.424</strong></td>
<td>5.433</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sig of F = .000
Adjusted R² = .334

Table 5.10: Regression Result for Organisational Culture and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>T-test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td><strong>.118</strong></td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>-.125</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.128</td>
<td>-1.902</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>1.339</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td><strong>.501</strong></td>
<td>6.596</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sig of F = .000
Adjusted R² = .369

Table 5.11 shows an inclusion of individual readiness for change (the mediator) in order to assess the mediating role of individual readiness for change in the relationship between organisational culture types and organisational change implementation. As indicated that in Model 3, developmental culture (β = 0.087, p < 0.053) and group
culture ($\beta = 0.082$, $p < 0.069$) were found to have the highest impact on organisational change implementation through individual readiness for change ($\beta = 0.772$, $p < 0.001$), therefore supported H2, H2a and H2b. This is consistent with Baron and Kenny’s (1986) condition for mediation, indicating that developmental and group culture types were better increasing the level of readiness for change in order to increase the impact of change implementation in the NNPC. The adjusted R-square for Model 3 (0.708) is higher than that of Model 1 (0.334) further indicates a significant influence of developmental and group culture types on organisational change implementation via individual readiness for change. On the other hand, hierarchy culture with ($\beta = 0.037$, 0.351) and rational culture with ($\beta = 0.077$, 0.137) indicating a lesser impact with readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

Table 5.11: Regression Result for Change Readiness, Organisational Culture and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 3 Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>T- test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOCI</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig of F = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>1.678</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>1.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>1.874</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.956</td>
<td>1.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>1.494</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.785</td>
<td>1.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.531</td>
<td>.586</td>
<td>1.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRFC</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>13.327</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>1.632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression analysis for the relationship between managerial skills and organisational change implementation is presented in Table 5.12. The research hypotheses for this section include:

H3: There is a positive relationship between managerial skills and organisational change implementation.

This main hypothesis is divided in three sub-hypotheses, which are:

H3a: An emphasis on technical skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.

H3b: An emphasis on conceptual skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.
H3c: An emphasis on interpersonal skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.

As indicated in (Model 1), conceptual skills were found to have the highest positive significant effect on organisational change implementation ($\beta = 0.263, p = 0.010$), followed with technical skills ($\beta = 0.245, p = 0.017$). However, interpersonal skills were found to have a negative effect on organisational change implementation ($\beta = -0.287, p < 0.001$). This result is consistent with the correlation analysis (appendix 4c) which also shows a negative correlation. The low influence of interpersonal skills indicated that interpersonal skills are possibly less emphasized in the NNPC, consequently causing a low level of change implementation.

Table 5.12: Regression Result for Managerial Skills and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>T-test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.245</td>
<td>2.422</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td>2.591</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>-.288</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>-.287</td>
<td>-3.025</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.13 shows the summary result of the regression analysis of managerial skills and individual readiness for change. As indicated, conceptual skills ($\beta = 0.260, p < 0.001$) shows a positive impact on individual readiness for change. Technical skills ($\beta = 0234, p = 0.015$) also show a positive impact with individual readiness for change. But, interpersonal skills ($\beta = -0.357, p < 0.001$) further indicates a low level of interpersonal skills in the NNPC as indicated in Model 1.
Table 5.13: Regression Result for Managerial Skills and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 2 Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>T-test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig of F = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRFC</td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>2.471</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>2.722</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>-.350</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.357</td>
<td>-.3995</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression result summary in Model 3 shows an inclusion of individual readiness for change (mediator) in order to assess the mediating role of individual readiness for change in the relationship between technical, conceptual and interpersonal skills with organisational change implementation. As indicated in Table 5.14, conceptual skills (β = .90, p = .299) and technical skills (β = .88, p = .303) shows a better impact with organisational change implementation through individual readiness for change, hence the meditational condition of Baron and Kenny (1986) was met. This result shows that the values of conceptual skills and technical skills were better appreciated in the NNPC than those of interpersonal skills hence H3, H3a and H3b were supported. The negative impact interpersonal skills (β = -0.049, p = 0.551) is a clear indication that the low level of interpersonal skills is militating against change implementation in the NNPC, hence H3c is not support.

Table 5.14: Regression Result for Readiness for Change, Managerial Skills and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 3 Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>T-test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOCI</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig of F = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TS</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>1.034</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IS</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>-.049</td>
<td>-.597</td>
<td>.551</td>
<td>.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IRFC</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.667</td>
<td>9.206</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.373</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.15 presents the regression analysis for the relationship between organisational trust and organisational change implementation for this study, the research hypotheses for this section are:

**H4**: There is a significant positive relationship between organisational trust and organisational change implementation.

**H4a**: Interpersonal trust will positively influence organisational change implementation.

**H4b**: Institutional trust will positively influence organisational change implementation.

As indicated in Model 1, the regression result shows that institutional trust ($\beta = 0.710$, $p = 0.027$) has a significant positive impact on organisational change implementation. On the other hand, interpersonal trust ($\beta = -0.040$, $p = 0.901$) shows a negative impact on organisational change implementation. This result shows that the values of institutional trust are better appreciated at the level of change implementation than the values of interpersonal trust in the NNPC hence the low level of interpersonal trust could be one of the reasons for low level of change implementation in the NNPC.

Table 5.15: Regression Result for Organisational Trust and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>T-test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sig of F = .000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjusted $R^2 = .444$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>$-0.040$</td>
<td>$-0.040$</td>
<td>$-0.124$</td>
<td>$0.901$</td>
<td>$0.034$</td>
<td>$29.847$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT</td>
<td>$.711$</td>
<td>$.319$</td>
<td>$0.710$</td>
<td>$2.231$</td>
<td>$.027$</td>
<td>$.034$</td>
<td>$29.847$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The summary of the regression analysis result shown in Table 5.16 indicated that both institutional trust ($\beta = 0.381$, $p = 0.202$) and interpersonal trust ($\beta = 0.375$, $p = 0.208$) have a significant positive impact with individual readiness for change. This implies that both dimensions of organisational trust are appreciated at the level of individual readiness for change.
Table 5.16: Regression Result for Organisational Trust and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 2 Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>T- test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRFC</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T- test</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.375</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>29.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td>.381</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>29.847</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression result in (Model 3) shows that with the inclusion of individual readiness for change institutional trust (β = 0.419, p < 0.093) was better impacting on organisational change implementation through individual readiness for change. Therefore, the Baron and Kenny’s (1986) condition for mediation was met. As a result H4 and H4b are supported. However, interpersonal trust (β = -0.327, p = 0.189) shows a negative impact on organisational change implementation, hence H4a is could not be supported. This shows that the values of interpersonal trust are low therefore causing low level of organisational change implementation in the NNPC.

Table 5.17: Regression Result for Readiness for Change, Organisational Trust and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 3 Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficient</th>
<th>T- test</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>TOL</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Model Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EOCl</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T- test</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>TOL</td>
<td>VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>-.327</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>-.327</td>
<td>-1.319</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>30.173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>1.692</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>30.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRFC</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>11.161</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>2.308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The regression analysis has helped to explain the predicting relationship between the independent variables, mediator on the dependent variable. For example, the regression analysis indicated in Table 5.16 which revealed that institutional trust has a positive relationship with individual readiness for change in order to predict more of organisational change implementation is consistent with Thanacoody et al.’s (2009)
regression analysis for the mediation analyses on the relationship between work-family conflict and intention to leave work, and Pantouvakis and Bouranta’s (2013) regression analysis of the inter-relationships between organisational learning culture, employee job satisfaction and their impact on customer satisfaction. This means that individual readiness for change as a mediator help to increase the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable.

5.8 The Relationship between Individual Readiness for Change and Organisational Change Implementation

H5: hypothesized that there is a strong relationship between individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. Studies have confirmed that if organisational members are better prepared for change readiness, their level of readiness for change will increase (Senior and Swailes, 2010; Shah, 2011; Goksoy, 2012; Mueller et al. 2012) in order to participate and contribute more towards change success. Consequently, H5 is predicting that an increased level of individual readiness for change will have a significant positive impact on organisational change implementation. Bivariate correlation was used to show the relationship between individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation as indicated in Table 5.18. This shows that a higher level of individual readiness for change will consistently increase the impact of organisational change implementation. Also, previous regression analyses have shown the mediating impact of individual readiness for change in the current study. The analyses indicated that individual readiness for change is mediating the influence of transformational and democratic leadership styles, group and developmental culture types, technical and conceptual skills and institutional trust. See section 6.4 for detailed discussion of the mediating role of individual readiness for change.

Table 5.18: Relationship between Readiness for Change and Organisational Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual Readiness for change</th>
<th>Organisational Change Implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Readiness for change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Change Implementation</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.9 The Moderating Effect of the Contextual Factors

Hypothesis H6 proposes that the application of contextual factors such as social norms (SN) and units/departments characteristics (DUC) will increase the level of organisational change implementation. In other words, the hypothesis predicts that the contextual factors will have a significant influence on the strength of a relationship between the independent variables and dependent variable.

Moderating variables strengthen research findings and advance theoretical sophistication as well as enabling researchers to go beyond the linear relationship of variables, but help the study to show how other variables interact with the independent variables in order to strengthen the relationship between the independent variables and the expected outcome (Field, 2013; Hayes, 2013). Hence, the relationship of the moderation analysis enabled the researcher to test whether the relationship between the predictors and the outcome can change with the additional presence of the moderator (Panari et al., 2010; Hayes, 2013, Field, 2013).

Panari et al. (2010) believe that a moderator variable is a variable that can influence the strength of a relationship between two variables. In another development, Baron and Kenny (1986) posit that a moderator may affect the direction of the relationship between two variables either positively or negatively to ascertain the strength at which it contributes to the relationship. More so, the strength of any relationship between variables falls into one of the following categories: low, mean and high correlation (Field, 2013). Based on this, the moderating effect of the contextual factors (variables) considered in this study were investigated to show the extent they contributed to the relationship between the independent variable, mediating and dependent variable.

A moderation regression analysis named PROCESS procedure written by Andrew F. Hayes (2013) (www.afhayes.com), which is compatible with SPSS, was used to test the impact of the contextual factors on the interaction between the independent variables, mediating variable and dependent variable. The moderation regression model illustrates the conditional and unconditional effect of the concept of moderation; thus the effect of X on Y is moderated by M, if its strength depends on, or can be predicted by M. In this case, M is the moderator on the effect on Y with the equation Y = i + b1X + b2 M +
\[ b_3XM + ey, \] which estimates \( Y \) from two predictors \( X \) and \( M \) (Hayes, 2013). Based on, the next section presents the analysis of the moderation regression results.

Following the above equations, the value represented by \( b_3 \) suggests the degree of interaction between the moderator variables and the predictor variable (Hayes, 2013; Field, 2013). The tables below categorised the process based on the significance of the effect on moderation found in the \( p \) value. Also, the \( R^2 \) (e.g. Table 5.26) representing the predictive validity coefficient observed for the change in beta coefficients based on comparing different variation in beta value (Panari et al., 2010).

Hypotheses H6a proposes that the activities of social norms will moderate the relationship between leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust and individual readiness for change in order to increase the impact organisational change implementation. This means that this hypothesis is predicting that social norms have a significant impact on the strength of the relationship between the independent variables, mediating variable and the dependent variable. In order to interpret the level of interaction, Field (2013) posits that the \( p \)-value should be less than 0.05.

### 5.9.1 Moderating Effect of Social Norms on Leadership Styles

H6a predict that social norms are contingent on the relationship leadership and organisational change implementation.

As indicated in Table 5.19, the interpretation of the moderation impact of social norms on the relationship between transformational leadership style and organisational change implementation can be examined as entered in the table. The \( p \)-value for each predictor and the associated standard errors has been adjusted for heteroscedasticity because it was requested (Field, 2013). Each \( b \) is compared to zero using a \( t \)-test, which is computed from the beta divided by its standard error (Field, 2013). Also, the confidence interval for \( b \) is produced (because it was asked for) and hence moderation is shown up by a significant interaction effect (Field, 2013). The moderation effect on the strength of social norms and transformational leadership in order to predict more of organisational change implementation as shown in Table 6.19 is significant, \( b = 0.110, 95\% \) confident intervals (CI), \( t = 2.735 \ p = 0.006 \), indicating that the relationship
between transformational leadership and organisational change implementation is moderated by social norms.

To interpret the moderation effect of this result, we can examine the simple slopes as indicated in (Appendix 6a), which shows three different regressions: the strength of the predictor to the outcome based on the moderator at either low level, mean or average level and high level (Field, 2013; Hayes, 2013). Therefore, the interpretation of the moderation regression result of social norms on the relationship between transformational leadership and organisational change implementation is thus: when social norms are low, there is a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.505$, 95% CI, $t = 4.51$, $p = .001$. At the mean value of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.621$, 95% CI, $t = 8.14$, $p < 0.001$.

When social norms are increased, there is a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.738$, 95% CI, $t = 14.050$, $p < .001$. These results implied that the relationship between transformational leadership and organisational change increases from a low to a high level of social norms therefore supports H6a.

Table 5.19: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Transformational Leadership and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>8.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>[0.47, 0.77]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.10, 0.12]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL X SN</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>2.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[0.03, 0.18]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.20 shows that the moderation regression of social norms on the relationship between transformational leadership and individual readiness for change is negative. The regression coefficient for transformational leadership and social norms is $b = 0.057$,
95% CI [-0.017, 0.131], t = 1.528, p = 0.129, indicating a negative statistical interaction. Field (2013) noted that for a statistical positive interaction between the predictor and moderator the p value must be less than 0.05. The negative impact of social norms at the level of individual readiness for change implies that the characteristics of transformational leadership are low at the level of individual readiness for change in the NNPC.

Table 5.20: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Transformational Leadership and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>(i_1)</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>0.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.13]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>(b_1)</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>12.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.63, 0.87]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>(b_2)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.10, 0.11]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL X SN</td>
<td>(b_3)</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>1.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.13]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2) = 0.597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated, Table 5.21 the moderation regression analysis of social norms on the relationship between transactional leadership and organisational change implementation is not positive. The regression coefficient for transactional leadership and social norms is \(b = 0.050\), 95% CI [-0.057, 0.157], t = 0.929, p = 0.354, indicating a negative interaction of social norms on the relationship between transactional leadership and organisational change implementation. This result is consistent with the mediation analysis which indicated that transactional leadership style was contributing less compared to transformational and democratic leadership styles.
Table 5.21: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Transactional Leadership and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.12]</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction leadership</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.680</td>
<td>[0.54, 0.81]</td>
<td>0.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.060</td>
<td>[-0.16, 0.04]</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSL X Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.18]</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = 0.56$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The result in Table 5.22 shows a negative moderation regression of social norms on the relationship between transactional leadership and individual readiness for change, $b = 0.031$, 95% CI [-0.095, 0.032], $t = -0.970$, $p = 0.334$, indicating that the social norm does not moderate the relationship between transactional leadership and individual readiness for change, implying that the values of transactional leadership style are not increase organisational member’s readiness for change when engaged in organisational change implementation.

Table 5.22: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Transactional Leadership and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>[-0.05, 0.12]</td>
<td>0.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction leadership (TSL)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>[0.76, 0.96]</td>
<td>0.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>[-0.15, 0.00]</td>
<td>0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms X TSL</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.03]</td>
<td>0.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = 0.707$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.23 shows a positive interaction impact on social norms on the relationship between democratic leadership and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.081$, 95%, CI [-0.000, 0.163], $t = 1.694$, $p = 0.051$, indicating that the relationship between
democratic leadership and organisational change is moderated by the values of social norms.

This result is interpreted as follows, when the values of social norms are low there is a significant relationship between democratic leadership style and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.588$, 95% CI, [0.374, 0.802] $t = 5.423$, $p < .001$. At the average level of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between democratic leadership style and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.668$, 95% CI, [0.519, 0.817] $t = 8.843$, $p = < .001$. At a high level of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between democratic leadership style and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.748$, 95% CI, [0.640, 0.856] $t = 13.699$, $p < .001$, see (Appendix 6b), This result shows that the relationship between democratic leadership and organisational change implementation will increase from low to high as the organisation increases the norms democratic leadership style.

Table 5.23: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Democratic Leadership Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.11]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic leadership</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>8.843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.52, 0.82]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-2.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.03, -0.04]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL X Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>1.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.00, 0.16]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.24, presents the regression coefficient for democratic leadership and individual readiness for change, $b = 0.153$, 95% CI, [0.069, 0.239], $t = 3.582$, $p < .001$, and it is positive, indicating that the relationship between democratic leadership and individual readiness for change is further strengthened by the moderation impact of social norms. To further show the strength of the relationship, the analysis shows that, at a low rate of social norms, $b = 0.585$, 95% CI, [0.438, -0.738] $t = 7.874$, $p < .001$, there is a significant positive relationship between democratic leadership and individual readiness for change. At the mean value of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between democratic leadership style and individual readiness for change, $b$
= 0.728, 95% CI, [0.640, 0.816] t = 16.264, p < .001. When social norms are high, there is a more significant positive relationship between democratic leadership and individual readiness for change, b = 0.870, 95% CI, [0.790, 0.951] t = 21.403, p < .001 (appendix 6c). This result shows that the relationship between democratic leadership style and individual readiness for change increases from a low to a higher level when the organisation increases the values norms democratic leadership style at the level of readiness for change.

**Table 5.24: Moderation Effect Social Norms on Democratic Leadership and Readiness Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>i&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>1.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.04, 0.14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>b&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>-2.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.02, -0.01]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic leadership</td>
<td>b&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>16.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.64, 0.82]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL X Social Norms</td>
<td>b&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>0.135</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>3.582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.07, 0.24]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 5.25 the moderation regression for autocratic leadership and social norms is b = 0.129, 95% CI, [-0.032, 0.290] t = 1.580, p = 0.116, indicating a negative interaction effect. This result tells us that the relationship between autocratic leadership style and organisational change implementation is not moderated by social norms.
Table 5.25: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Autocratic Leadership and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>1.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.05, 0.21]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic leadership (AL)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>-0.578</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>-6.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.76, -0.39]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.16, 0.15]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms X AL</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>1.580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.03, 0.29]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.26 shows a non-significant interaction of social norms on the relationship between autocratic leadership style and individual readiness for change. The regression coefficient for autocratic leadership and social norms is $b = 0.114$, 95% CI, [-0.020, 0.249] $t = 1.686$, $p = 0.094$, indicating that the relationship between autocratic leadership and individual readiness for change is not moderated by social norms.

Table 5.26: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Autocratic Leadership and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.19]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic leadership (AL)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>-0.643</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>-7.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.82, -0.46]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>-0.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.19, 0.10]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms X AL</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>1.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.25]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The moderation regression analysis in Table 5.27 shows a negative interaction of social norms on the relationship between laissez-faire leadership and organisational change implementation. The regression coefficient for laissez-faire leadership style and social norms is $b = 0.007$, 95% CI, [-0.095, 0.110] $t = 0.151$, $p = 0.880$, indicating that the relationship between laissez-faire leadership and organisational change implementation is not moderated by social norms.
Table 5.27: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Laissez-faire Leadership and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>( \bar{b}_1 )</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>[0.89, 0.13]</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire leadership (LFL)</td>
<td>( \bar{b}_1 )</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>[0.17, 0.07]</td>
<td>0.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>( \bar{b}_2 )</td>
<td>-0.048</td>
<td>[0.60, 0.82]</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms X LFL</td>
<td>( \bar{b}_3 )</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>[-0.95, 0.11]</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.28 shows a negative coefficient for the moderation regression analysis for laissez-faire and social norms, \( \bar{b} = -0.056, 95\% \, CI, [-0.134, 0.021], \) \( t = -1.430, p = 0.154, \) indicating that the relationship between laissez-faire leadership and individual readiness for change is not moderated by social norms.

Table 5.28 Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Laissez-faire Leadership and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>( \bar{b}_1 )</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.13]</td>
<td>0.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez-faire leadership</td>
<td>( \bar{b}_1 )</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.04]</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>( \bar{b}_2 )</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>[0.72, 0.92]</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFL X Social Norms</td>
<td>( \bar{b}_3 )</td>
<td>-0.056</td>
<td>[-0.13, 0.02]</td>
<td>0.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A comparison of the moderation regression results for the impact of social norms and leadership styles suggest that social norms is better impacting on the relationship between transformational/democratic leadership styles and organisational change implementation. As indicated in Table 5.19, the impact of social norms on the relationship between transformational leadership style and organisational change implementation is \( \bar{b} = 0.110, p = 0.006 \). The impact of social norms on democratic leadership style and organisational change implementation shows as \( \bar{b} = 0.018, p = \)
0.005 (Table 5.33), and individual readiness for change $b = 0.135, p < .001$), indicating that the norms of transformational and democratic leadership styles will further increase the level of individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. In reference with the mediating regression result obtained in Table 5.8, the study concludes that the norms of transformational and democratic leadership styles are better increasing the level of readiness for change and organisational change implementation. Therefore, the hypothesis (H6a) that social norms are contingent on the relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation is accepted.

### 5.9.2 Moderating Effect of Social Norms on Organisational Culture Types

This section hypothesised that the relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation is dependent on social norms. Following the PROCESS procedure outlined by Hayes (2013) and Field (2013), a moderation regression analysis was applied to test for the moderation impact of social norms on the relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation.

H6b: predicts that social norms are contingent on the relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation. This means that the interaction effect on social norms will strengthen the relationship between organisational culture types and organisational change implementation. Table 5.29 shows a positive interaction of social norms on group culture and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.546, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.327, 0.766], t = 4.930, p < .001$, indicating that the relationship between group culture and organisational change is moderated by social norms. To interpret the moderation effect we can examine the simple slopes in (Appendix 6d), which shows that at a low level of social norms there is a significant positive relationship between group culture and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.102, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.232, 0.436], t = 0.603, p = 0.547$. At the mean value of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between group culture and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.481, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.244, 0.718], t = 4.016, p < .001$. Where social norms are high, there is a significant positive relationship between group culture and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.860, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.644, 1.076], t = 7.880, p < .001$. These results tell us that the relationship between group culture and organisational change implementation increases as the organisation increases the norms for group culture.
Table 5.29: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Group Culture and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-1.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Culture (GC)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>4.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.257</td>
<td>0.1000</td>
<td>-2.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms X GC</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>4.930</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.307$

Table 5.30 shows a positive interaction of social norms on group culture and individual readiness for change with a higher significant level, $b = 0.666$, 95% CI [0.490, 0.841], $t = 7.512$, $p < .001$, indicating that the relationship between group culture and individual readiness for change will increase as a result of the moderating effect of social norms.

This is further interpreted thus, at a low level of social norms there is a non-significant negative relationship between group culture and individual readiness for change, $b = -0.112$, 95% CI, [-0.359, 0.134] $t = -0.903$, $p = 0.368$. At the mean level of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between group culture and individual readiness for change, $b = 0.346$, 95% CI [0.143, 0.549], $t = 3.368$, $p < .001$. At a high level of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between group culture and individual readiness for change, $b = 0.805$, 95% CI [0.580, 1.030], $t = 7.067$, $p < .001$. This result shows that the relationship between group culture and individual readiness for change emerges in employees from an average to a greater level of social norms. In other words, the moderated impact of social norms on group culture will increase the level of individual readiness for change in order to increase the impact of organisational change implementation.
Table 5.30: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Group Culture and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>-0.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.21, 0.08]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Culture (GC)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.102</td>
<td>3.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.14, 0.55]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.215</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>-2.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.42, -0.01]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC X Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>7.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.49, 0.84]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.31 presents the moderation regression effect of social norms on developmental culture and organisational change implementation and it is statistically positive, $b = 0.255$, 95% CI [0.129, 0.382], $t = 3.995$, $p < .001$, indicating that the relationship between developmental culture and organisational change implementation is moderated by social norms. A further interpretation of this result (Appendix 6e), shows that at a low level of social norms, there is a non-significant negative relationship between developmental culture and organisational change implementation, $b = -0.270$, 95% CI [-0.479, -0.062], $t = -2.557$, $p = 0.011$. At the mean value of social norms, there is a non-significant negative relationship between developmental culture and organisational change implementation, $b = -0.002$, 95% CI [-0.158, 0.154], $t = -0.027$, $p = 0.978$. But, at a high level of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between developmental culture and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.266$, 95% CI [0.056, 0.467], $t = 2.618$, $p = 0.010$. This result indicates that the relationship between developmental culture and organisational change implementation only emerge in employees when the level of social norms are high.
Table 5.31: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Developmental Culture and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.19]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental Culture (DC)</strong></td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.16, 0.15]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Norms</strong></td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>-0.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.25, 0.09]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DC X Social Norms</strong></td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>3.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.13, 0.38]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = 0.191$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.32 shows a significant and positive relationship between developmental culture and individual readiness for change, $b = 0.315$, 95% CI, [0.179, 0.450], $t = 4.599$, $p < .001$. This analysis suggests that, at a low level of social norms, there is a non-significant negative relationship between developmental culture and individual readiness for change, $b = -0.457$, 95% CI [-0.679, -0.235], $t = -4.069$, $p < .001$. At the mean value of social norms, there is a non-significant negative relationship between developmental culture and individual readiness for change, $b = -0.128$, 95% CI [-0.267, 0.010], $t = -1.831$, $p = 0.069$. At a high level of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between developmental culture and individual readiness for change, $b = 0.199$, 95% CI [0.029, 0.370] $t = 2.317$, $p < .001$, indicating that the relationship between developmental culture and individual readiness for change emerges when social norms are high.

Table 5.32: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Developmental Culture and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.08, 0.19]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Developmental Culture (DC)</strong></td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>-0.128</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>-1.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.28, 0.01]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social Norms</strong></td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.18, 0.18]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DC X Social Norms</strong></td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>4.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.18, 0.45]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = 0.303$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.33 shows a significant interaction effect of social norms on the relationship between rational culture and organisational change implementation, \( b = 0.276, 95\% \text{ CI} [0.198, 0.337] \), \( t = 7.597, p < .001 \), indicating that the relationship between rational culture and organisational change implementation is moderated by social norms. A further interpretation of this result shows that at the low level of social norms, there is a non-significant negative relationship between rational culture and organisational change implementation, \( b = -0.066, 95\% \text{ CI} [-0.230, 0.098], t = -0.799, p = 0.425 \). At the mean value of social norms, there is a positive relationship between rational culture and organisational change implementation, \( b = 0.203, 95\% \text{ CI} [0.083, 0.324], t = 3.341, p < .001 \). At a high level of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between rational culture and organisational change implementation, \( b = 0.474, 95\% \text{ CI} [0.364, 0.582], t = 8.559, p < .001 \), (see Appendix 6f). These results tell us that the relationship between rational culture and organisational change emerges in employees with an average and greater level of social norms.

Table 5.33: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Rational Culture and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>( i_1 )</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[(-0.10, 0.18)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Culture (RC)</td>
<td>( b_1 )</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>3.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[(0.08, 0.32)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>( b_2 )</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>1.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[(-0.01, 0.22)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms X RC</td>
<td>( b_3 )</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>7.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[(0.19, 0.34)]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 5.34 the interaction influence of social norms on the strength of rational culture and individual readiness for change is positive, \( b = 0.298, 95\% \text{ CI} [0.218, 0.378], t = 7.353, p < .001 \). The regression analysis suggests that at a low level of social norms, there is a non-significant relationship between rational culture and individual readiness for change, \( b = -0.149, 95\% \text{ CI} [-0.339, 0.041], t = -1.549, p = 0.123 \). At the mean value of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between rational culture and individual readiness for change, \( b = 0.157, 95\% \text{ CI} [0.021, 0.294], t =
When social norms are high, there is a significant positive relationship between rational culture and individual readiness for change, $b = 0.464$, 95% CI [0.342, 0.585], $t = 7.556$, $p < .001$, indicating that the relationship between rational culture and individual readiness for change emerges in employees with an average or greater level of social norms.

**Table 5.34: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Rational Culture and Readiness for Change**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant $i_1$</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>[0.05, 0.18]</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>0.614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rational Culture (RC) $b_1$</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>[0.02, 0.29]</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>2.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms $b_2$</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.23]</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>1.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms X RC $b_3$</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>[0.22, 0.38]</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>7.352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.305$

Table 5.35 indicates that the regression coefficient for hierarchy culture and social norms is positive, $b = 0.125$, 95 CI [0.021, 0.228], $t = 2.388$, $p = 0.018$, indicating a statistically significant interaction. This shows that the strength of social norms has a significant positive impact on the relationship between hierarchy culture and organisational change implementation. The extent of the moderation effect shows that (see Appendix 6g), at a low level of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between hierarchy culture and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.334$, 95% CI [0.128, 0.539], $t = 3.203$, $p < .001$. At the mean value of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between hierarchy culture and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.450$, 95% CI [0.304, 0.596], $t = 6.090$, $p < .001$. When social norms are high, there is a significant positive relationship between hierarchy culture and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.567$, 95% CI [0.429, 0.704], $t = 8.153$, $p < .001$. The moderation regression results indicate that the relationship between hierarchy culture and organisational change implementation emerges in employees with low, average or a greater level of social norms.
Table 5.35: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Hierarchy Culture and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[0.054, 0.18]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.08, 0.18]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Culture</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.450</td>
<td>0.0522</td>
<td>6.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.30, 0.59]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>-1.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.22, 0.07]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC X Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>2.388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.02, 0.22]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.333$

Table 5.36 indicates a significant positive interaction impact of social norms on hierarchy culture and individual readiness for change, $b = 0.145$, 95% CI [0.031, 0.259], $t = 2.532$, $p = 0.012$. The interpretation of this regression analysis shows that at a low level of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between hierarchy culture and individual readiness for change, $b = 0.348$, 95% CI [0.147, 0.550], $t = 3.413$, $p < .001$. At the mean value of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between hierarchy culture and individual readiness for change, $b = 0.485$, 95% CI [0.347, 0.624], $t = 6.924$, $p < .001$. At a high level of social norms, there is a significant positive relationship between hierarchy culture and individual readiness for change, $b = 0.622$, 95% CI [0.479, 0.766], $t = 8.520$, $p < .001$). These results indicate that the relationship between hierarchy culture and individual readiness for change emerges in an employee with low, average and larger level of social norms.

Table 5.36: Moderation Effect of Social Norms Hierarchy Culture and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>1.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[0.068, 0.20]</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.06, 0.20]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchical Culture</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>6.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HC)</td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.35, 0.62]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.102</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-1.294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.26, 0.05]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC X Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>2.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.03, 0.26]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.391$
A comparison of the moderation regression result for the impact of social norms and organisational culture types suggest that social norms is better impacting on group/developmental culture types with organisational change implementation. For example, the impact of social norms on the relationship between group culture and organisational change implementation shows as $b = 0.546$, $p < .001$, (see Table 5.29). The impact of social norms on the relationship between developmental culture and organisational change implementation is $b = 0.255$, $p < .001$, (Table 5.31).

On the other hand the result shows that social norms have less impact between rational culture and organisational change implementation $b = 0.276$, $p < .001$ (Table 5.33). While the impact of social norms on the relationship between hierarchy culture and organisational change implementation is $b = 0.125$, $p < .001$ (Table 5.35). In line with the mediation regression results indicated Table 5.11. This result indicates that in order to increase the level of readiness for change and organisational change implementation the norms of group/developmental culture should be better appreciated. Thus, the hypothesis that social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between organisational culture and effective organisational change implementation is accepted.

5.9.3 Moderating Effect of Social Norms on Managerial Skills

This study hypothesised that the moderation impact of social norms will positively influence the relationship between managerial skills and organisational change implementation. Therefore, H6c predicts that social norms are contingent on the relationship between managerial skills and organisational change implementation.

As indicated in Table 5.37 that there is no moderation on the impact of social norms on technical skills and organisational change implementation, $b = 0.090$, 95% CI [-0.002, 0.183], $t = 1.914$, $p = 0.057$. For a moderation to be significant, the significant level must be less than 0.05 (Field, 2013) therefore, this result suggests that the interaction level of relationship between technical skills and organisational change implementation was not statistically significant in this study and no moderation recorded.
Table 5.37: Moderation Effect of Social Norms, Technical Skills and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.08, 0.14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills (TS)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>9.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.48, 0.75]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>-1.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.18, 0.03]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS X Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>1.914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.00, 0.18]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = 0.521$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The interaction impact of social norms on technical skills and individual readiness for change appears to be less than 0.05 as indicated in Table 5.38. This shows that the interaction effect of social norms on the relationship between technical skills and individual readiness for change negative $b = 0.091$, 95% CI [-0.025, 0.207], $t = 1.545$, $p = 0.125$, implying that social norms is not moderating the relationship between technical skills and readiness for change.

Table 5.38: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Technical Skills and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.17]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>-0.072</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>-1.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.19, 0.05]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills (TS)</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>0.669</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>9.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.52, 0.79]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TS X Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>1.545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.03, 0.21]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = 0.563$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.39 presents the moderation regression analysis for the impact of social norms on the relationship between conceptual skills and organisational change implementation. As indicated, the moderation effect is not significant, $b = 0.072$, 95% CI [-0.026, 0.172], $t = 1.453$, $p = 0.148$. The $p$ value is above 0.05, suggesting a negative moderation.
Table 5.39: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Conceptual Skills and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.13]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Skills (CS)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>8.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.47, 0.76]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.077</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>-1.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.185, 0.030]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS X Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>1.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.02, 0.17]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = 0.514$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.40, shows that the moderation regression analysis for the interaction of social norms on the relationship between conceptual skills and individual readiness for change is not statically significant, $b = 0.053$, 95% CI [-0.048, 0.119], $t = 0.837$, $p = 0.403$, indicating that the relationship between conceptual skills and individual readiness for change is not moderated in this study.

Table 5.40: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Conceptual Skills and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.06, 0.16]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Skills (CS)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.684</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>9.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[0.53, 0.83]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-1.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.17, 0.00]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS X Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.04, 0.11]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = 0.561$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.41 presents the moderation regression result of social norms on interpersonal skills and organisational change implementation. As indicated, this result shows a negative non-significant interaction effect, $b = 0.044$, 95% CI [-0.047, 0.136], $t = 0.957$, $p = 0.340$. Thus, the relationship between interpersonal skills and effective organisational change implementation is not moderated by social norms in this study.
Table 5.41: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Interpersonal Skills and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.15]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skills (IS)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>-0.651</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-7.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.81, -0.48]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.07, 0.13]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS X Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.47, 0.14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.502$

The moderation regression analysis for the moderation impact of social norms on the relationship between interpersonal skills and individual readiness for change shows a non-significant negative interaction. Table 5.42 shows that $b = -0.034$, 95% CI [-0.093, 0.026], $t = -1.123$, $p = 0.263$, indicating that there is moderation relationship between interpersonal skills and individual readiness for change.

Table 5.42: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Interpersonal Skills and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.08, 0.14]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skills (IS)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>-0.817</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>-11.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.96, 0.68]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.05, 0.13]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms X IS</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>-1.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[-0.09, 0.02]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.587$

5.8.4 Moderating Effect of Social Norms on Organisational Trust

This study hypothesised that the moderation impact of social norms on the strength of the dimensions of organisational trust will positively impact on the relationship between organisational trust and organisation change implementation. Therefore, H6d predicts that social norms will moderate the relationship between organisational trust and organisational change implementation.
Table 5.43 shows that the moderation regression analysis of the interaction of social norms on the relationship between interpersonal trust and organisational change implementation $b = 0.024, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.050, 0.100]$, $t = 0.645, p = 0.519$, indicating a non-significant interaction, therefore no moderation recorded.

Table 5.43: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Interpersonal Trust and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust (IT)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.614</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>7.794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.092</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>-1.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms X IT</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = 0.445$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.44 indicates a non-significant negative interaction on the strength of social norms on the relationship between interpersonal trust and individual readiness for change, $b = -0.056, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.010, 0.009]$, $t = -1.652, p = 0.100$. This means that the relationship between interpersonal trust and organisational change implementation is not moderated by social norms.

Table 6.44: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Interpersonal Trust and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust (IT)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>11.641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.094</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-2.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms X IT</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-1.651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2 = 0.577$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.45 shows a non-significant interaction of social norms on the relationship between institutional trust and organisation change implementation, $b = 0.037$, 95% CI [-0.039, 0.114], $t = 0.968$, $p = 0.335$. This implies that the relationship between interpersonal trust and readiness for change is moderated by social norms in this study.

Table 5.45: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Institutional Trust and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.042</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Trust (IT)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.620</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>8.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>-1.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms X IT</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.968</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.571$

Table 5.46 shows a negative interaction of the moderation regression analysis of social norms on the relationship between institutional trust on individual readiness for change, $b = -0.036$, 95% CI [-0.095, 0.022], $t = -1.217$, $p = 0.225$.

Table 5.46: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Institutional Trust and Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Trust (IT)</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.775</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>11.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>-0.084</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-1.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms X IT</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-1.218</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.571$
5.9.5 Moderation Effect of Units/Departments Characteristics (UDC)

H6e: the relationship between individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation is contingent on unit/departments characteristics. This hypothesis is predicting that the relationship between individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation will increase as a result of the strength of size of organisational units or departments. The moderation regression analysis in Table 5.65 shows a significant interaction effect of units/departments characteristics on the relationship between individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation, \( b = 0.088, 95\% \text{ CI } [-0.001, 0.177], t = 1.957, p = 0.052 \), indicating that the relationship between individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation is moderated by units/departments characteristics. The analysis shows that (Appendix 6k), when units/departments characteristics low that there is a significant positive relationship between individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation, \( b = 0.695, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.541, 0.850], t = 8.892, p < .001 \), at the mean value of units/departments characteristics, there is a significant positive relationship between individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation, \( b = 0.772, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.669, 0.875], t = 14.833, p < .001 \). When units/departments characteristics are high, there is a significant positive relationship between individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation, \( b = 0.848, 95\% \text{ CI } [0.752, 0.944], p < .001 \). This indicates that the relationship between individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation emerges when units/departments characteristics are low, average and high. Thus this H6e is accepted.
Table 5.47: Moderation Effect of Units/Dept Characteristics on Change Readiness and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coeff.</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>$i_1$</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>2.178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Readiness for Change</td>
<td>$b_1$</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>14.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units/Dept Characteristics</td>
<td>$b_2$</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units/Dept Characteristics X Individual Readiness for Change</td>
<td>$b_3$</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>1.957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = 0.705$

5.9 Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter has presented the data analysis for this study. The data analyses were conducted in two phases. The first phase presented the mediation regression analysis which involves setting a of variables in one model and comparing results, while the second phase presented moderation regression analysis which allows researchers to test the impact of the moderators on the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables.

The chapter began by presenting the descriptive analysis of respondents’ demographic information and how they affect organisational change implementation. Shah (2011) emphasised the need to consider the factor of demographic information of employees when investigating factors of change implementation. The results in this chapter have revealed that most of the factors considered in this study are capable of increasing the level of individual readiness for change in order to implement organisational change. For instance, it was found that transformational leadership style was dominant at the level of organisational change implementation, while democratic leadership style has the greatest impact on individual readiness for change. This means that, transformational and democratic leadership styles were the prevailing leadership styles for increasing the level of individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation in the NNPC.
On the other hand, the findings indicate that hierarchy and group culture were the dominant organisational culture types in the NNPC. However, the study revealed that group culture and developmental culture types were better for influencing readiness for change and change implementation in the NNPC. The findings equally revealed that technical and conceptual skills were highly related to individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation in the NNPC. Also, institutional trust was found to be strongly related to organisational change implementation, while both interpersonal and institutional trust were found to be related to individual readiness for change in the NNPC. The findings also revealed that the perception of individual readiness for change is high in the NNPC.

The findings for moderation analyses revealed that democratic leadership, individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation were moderated by social norms. The analysis indicates that social norms have a moderation impact on group and developmental culture types on organisational change implementation. Units/departments’ characteristics were found to have a significant positive moderation on the relationship between individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

The scales used in this study were found to have adequate reliability and validity and were consequently employed in the hypotheses testing. The hypotheses testing findings were analysed using a relevant mediation and moderation multiple regression procedure and tools (Baron and Kenny, 1986; Hayes, 2013; Field, 2013). The findings indicated an increasing level of individual readiness for change will have a greater positive impact on the level of organisational change implementation. The next chapter presents a more detailed discussion from the findings.
CHAPTER SIX

Discussion of Findings

6.1 Introduction

The previous chapters presented the aim and objectives of this study. Also, the research questions to help investigate the factors that can help organisational change implementation were equally presented. A conceptual framework for a clear understanding of the variables that underpin the study have been presented and discussed in detail. Also, the research methodology for validating the instruments for data collection has been discussed and justified. This chapter will discuss the results from the data collection in the following order. Firstly, the chapter presents the discussion of the descriptive findings and the level of change implementation in the NNPC. Secondly the relationships of variables will be discussed in-depth, in line with their strength to organisational change implementation. The chapter continues with an in-depth discussion of the hypotheses testing in accordance with the framework presented in Chapter Three of this study. Finally, this chapter presents a results summary of the hypotheses testing and a reflection on the hypotheses in relation to the proposed conceptual framework necessary to guide organisational change implementation in the NNPC and related organisations.

6.2 Discussion of the Descriptive Findings

As indicated in chapter five above (section 5.4), the findings of this study revealed that the average number of managers/deputy managers in a department/unit in the NNPC is between 15 - 30, with a qualification of Bachelor of Science being the lowest level of education and PhD being the highest educational qualification in the population. The findings, in addition show a 61.4 percent of male managers/deputy managers in the NNPC and 38.6 percent of female managers/deputy managers, indicating that both male and female managers/deputy managers are represented in the organisation and are participating in change implementation. The findings support Pathak et al.’s (2013) argument that gender balance in an organisation responding to change could support people participation in implementing organisational change. Concerning employee years of work experience, the finding shows that the least range of number of year
managers/deputy managers spent in the NNPC is between 6 – 10 years. On the other hand, the result shows that 39.6 percent managers/deputy managers spent between 11 – 15 years working in the NNPC, and 21.3 percent shows that managers/deputy managers spent above 20 years working with the organisation. This means that managers and deputy managers in the NNPC have spent a considerable number of years capable of supporting change implementation. These findings are in line with studies (Sullivan et al., 2002; Lamm and Meeks, 2009; Shah and Shah, 2010; Wu et al., 2011) that emphasis on factors such as employees’ level of education, years of working experience will have an impact on organisational members readiness for change and change implementation.

The findings show that the level of organisational change implementation practice in the NNPC is relatively low as all the variables used to measure the level of organisational change implementation in the NNPC fall below average, especially the managerial skills construct (see Table 5.5). As indicated, the employees’ levels of education and years of experience are consistent with organisational requirements for change implementation (Shah and Shah, 2010; Wu et al., 2011). However, comparing this with the low level of practice between the constructs shows that less emphasis or less consideration is given to the variables identified for leading organisational change implementation in the NNPC.

6.3 Relationship between Hypotheses Testing

The analysis of the Spearman rho correlation coefficients has shown the relationship between the independent, mediating and the dependent variables. For example, the analysis for the relationship between leadership styles shows a positive and significant relationship between democratic, transactional and transformational leadership styles and organisational change implementation. However, democratic leadership style is found as the practical dominant leadership styles in the NNPC. More so, the mediating impact of individual readiness for change has a greater positive impact in the level of organisational change implementation in the NNPC. This result thus, supports H1a, H1b, H1c and H1d. However, autocratic leadership style was found to have a negative correlation with organisational change implementation and individual readiness for change which is in accordance with the H1e hypothesis.
The Spearman rho correlation coefficients for organisational culture types, individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation indicates group and rational culture types have a medium correlation with individual readiness for change. However, there is a large correlation between hierarchical culture type with organisational change implementation and individual readiness for change, therefore supported hypotheses H2a, H2c and H2d. Also, the Spearman rho correlation coefficients for the dimensions of managerial skills found that technical and conceptual skills have a high and significant positive correlation with individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. This supports hypotheses H3a and H3b. However, interpersonal skills have a negative correlation, hence do not support H3c.

The Spearman rho correlation coefficients for organisational trust show that both interpersonal and institutional trust has a high correlation with individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. These results revealed that emphasis on the dimensions of organisational trust will have a greater impact on individual readiness for change, consequently increase the levels of organisational change implementation. This result supported hypotheses H4a and H4b. Finally, the Spearman rho correlation coefficients for the contextual factors show a positive relationship between readiness for change and organisational change implementation, which is in accordance with hypotheses H5 and H6.

The overall results of the Spearman rho correlation coefficient indicates that the relationship between transformational leadership and individual readiness for change is (r = 0.750), and organisational change implementation shows (r = 0.701), indicating a positive correlation. The relationship between transactional leadership and individual readiness for change (r = 0.827), and organisational change implementation (r = 0.726) indicates a positive correlation. Democratic leadership and individual readiness for change (r = 0.820) and organisational change implementation (r = 0.743), showing that democratic leadership style have a positive relationship with organisational change implementation. Laissez-faire leadership and individual readiness for change (r = 0.512) and organisational change implementation (r = 0.512), also indicates a positive correlation. Autocratic leadership shows a negative relationship with individual readiness for change (r = -0.635) and organisational change implementation (r = -0.601), indicating a negative correlation. This result shows that apart from autocratic
leadership style, all other leadership styles considered in this study have a positive relationship with readiness for change and organisational change implementation in the correlation coefficient analysis.

In the same manner, a positive correlation coefficient was found between hierarchy culture and individual readiness for change (r = 0.584), and organisational change implementation (r = 0.561). Rational culture has positively relationship with individual readiness for change (r = 0.37) and organisational change implementation (r = 0.42). Group culture is associating with individual readiness for change (r = 0.33) and organisational change implementation (r = 0.35). Developmental culture shows a negative association with individual readiness for change (r = -0.018) and a negative association with organisational change implementation (r = -0.089). This contrast indicates that developmental culture is relating negatively with individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation at the level of correlation analysis. This indicates that the elements of developmental culture are relatively low in the NNPC or have not been practiced as an organisational culture type strategy necessary for reinforcing the levels of individual readiness for change and change implementation. Quinn and Spreitzer’s (1991) study indicates that the elements of developmental culture type includes: creativity, innovation, flexibility and consistent organisational growth are capable of strengthening the levels of organisational members’ readiness to facilitate change implementation. Cameron and Quinn (1999) further emphasise that the elements of developmental culture type enable participative leaders to be innovative and remain consistent with sustaining an organisational future. With developmental culture type in place, the glue that holds organisations together is a commitment to increase performance and implement change.

Similarly, the positive relationship between hierarchy culture type and individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation in the correlation analysis suggest that the NNPC is valuing more of the elements of hierarchy culture type than those of developmental culture. Studies have evidenced that the values of hierarchy culture types are more of controlling and too much procedure of governing organisational members where the rigors of rules and regulation sometime undermine members contributions to organisational effectiveness, success and change implementation (Vilkinas and Cartan, 2006; Prajogo and McDermott, 2011). Consequently, the NNPC may need to adjust its culture type strategy by consistently
increasing and emphasising more values of developmental culture type but reduce those of hierarchy culture as demonstrated in the discussion that follows Figure 6.2.

Concerning managerial skills, the correlation coefficient result shows a positive between technical skills and individual readiness for change \((r = 0.720)\) and organisational change implementation \((r = 0.702)\). Conceptual skills shows a positive association with individual readiness for change \((r = 0.731)\) and organisational change implementation \((r = 0.968)\). Interpersonal skills shows a negative association with individual readiness for change \((r = -0.723)\) as well as negative relationship with organisational change implementation \((r = -0.676)\), indicating that interpersonal skills is negatively associating with readiness for change and organisational change implementation at the level of correlation.

Also, a strong and positive correlation coefficient was found between interpersonal trust with individual readiness for change \((r = 0.750)\) and with organisational change implementation constructs \((r = 0.658)\). Also institutional trust was found to have a positive relationship with individual readiness for change \((r = 0.750)\) and organisational change implementation \((r = 0.671)\). This means organisational trust has a positive association with individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation in the correlation analysis.

The correlation coefficient result shows that contextual factors have a positive relationship with organisational change implementation and individual readiness for change. The impact of social norms \((SN) (r = 0.811)\) and individual readiness for change is positive \((r = 0.737)\), also the impact of social norms \((r = 0.737)\) with organisational change implementation is positive. Units/departmental characteristics \((UDC) (r = 0.642)\) shows positive with individual readiness for change and \((r = 0.600)\) with organisational change implementation. This indicates that the contextual factors have a strong and significant impact on individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation, hence provide support for H6. For a full detailed discussion of the level of impact of the contextual factors (see section 6.6).

Correlation coefficient analyses only measure the relationship between variables because it tells the predictive power such variables (Pallant, 2010; Field, 2013). The conduct of a more sophisticated and advanced analysis using multiple regressions will overcome perceived weakness (Field, 2013). In line with this, the multiple regressions
carried out has helped to examine a greater depth and impact of leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills, organisational trust and the contextual factors on individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

6.4. Discussion of Hypotheses Testing from the Regression Analysis

6.4.1 The Influence of Leadership on Organisational Change Implementation

This section discussed in detail the empirical findings relating the impact of relationship on organisational change implementation in comparison with the established literature in this research field. The results driven from the analysis shows that leadership have a significant and positive impact on organisational change implementation in the NNPC. Therefore, the following hypothesis is retained:

- **H1**: There is a relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation.

This result from the regression analysis shows that there is significant and positive relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation, indicating that leadership makes a significant contribution to bring about readiness for change and organisational change implementation. This result means that leadership is a critical factor capable of leading a positive change in organisations, especially organisations embarking on organisational transformation or organisational change implementation like the NNPC. Therefore, the findings shows that leadership is critical and needs to be adequately considered in organisational corporate culture as a factor for the purposes of increasing people’s readiness for change and the impact of change implementation because it will help employees play their roles effectively and share perspectives when participating in change implementation. Put differently, the results means that organisations who want to respond to change and effectively implement change would need to considerer leadership as one of the core factors necessary for change implementation.

This indicates that organisations that consider leadership will ultimately pay attention towards positively influencing the behaviours of organisational members towards improving the performance and commitment. This means organisations that appropriately value leadership and pay attention on leadership will better mobilise organisational members for formal organisational intervention for change, maintain
reciprocal interaction between management system as well as managing conflicting interests. Furthermore, the findings indicates that organisations that values leadership will increase the criticalities involved in motivating organisational members with values of reinforcing their inner forces of energy that could initiate, sustain and direct their behaviours and actions towards increasing the levels of organisational change implementation than organisations that ignore these criticalities.

This finding is in line with the positions of Northouse (2010), that leadership increase the process of influencing people in order to bring about behaviours leading to organisational change, and Yukl (2013), that organisational leaders emphasizes the need to influence key determinants of organisational performance in bringing about effective change such as influencing the use of task, workplace relationship to achieve organisational results and create opportunities. The finding also aligns with other studies such as Bratton et al. (2005), Bhat et al. (2012) and Carmichael (2011) confirming that the significance of leadership offers effective interaction amongst employees towards confronting organisational challenges as well as facilitating the use of team processes to enhance change implementation. This further shows that organisations that value importance of leadership are likely to incorporate elements of organisational participation towards accepting change and achieving organisational adjectives. In other words, by adequately value the importance of leadership, the NNPC is more likely to develop a more compelling and jointly organisational member’s interest for accepting change implementation, as well as increasing their capability towards providing sufficient services capable of increasing the level of change implementation. This it will enable organisational leaders provide subordinates with personal guidance and goal-directed development necessary of actualising change implementation.

However, in order to ascertain the style of leadership that is necessary for increasing readiness for change and organisational change implementation the next section presents the results from the regression analysis to show the best contributing leadership style for organisational change implementation. Based on the regression analysis results, transformational and democratic leadership styles appeared to be the most contributing leadership styles and are better increasing organisational change implementation via individual readiness for change in this study hence, the following hypotheses were supported and retained:
**H1a:** Transformational leadership style will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

**H1c:** Democratic leadership style will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

The results obtained from these hypotheses indicate that in comparison with other leadership styles, transformational and democratic leadership styles were the most supportive leadership styles for increasing the levels of organisational change implementation. Therefore, Figure 6.1 presents a validated model for leadership and organisational change implementation as evidenced in the current study. This means that this study found transformational and democratic leadership styles as an associate factor capable for helping organisational change implementation and concluded that in order to portray effective leadership style organisational leaders would need to be conversant with the values of transformational and democratic leadership characteristics.
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**Figure 6.1: Model for Leadership and Organisational Change Implementation**

This indicates that organisations that value transformational and democratic leadership characteristics will attempt to increase employee’s responsibilities towards involving and participating maximally in providing harmonious workplace conditions for change implementation. This shows that by emphasizing on the values of transformational and democratic leadership styles, the organisation will better placed itself towards positive change, because it will enable the organisational leaders portray attitude that are
energetic, enthusiastic and passionate which are characteristics of driving the organisation change process.

The findings further indicate that by emphasising on the values of democratic and transformational leadership styles, organisational leaders would better courage organisational members’ ability to contribute maximally in the workplace as well as accomplish organisational goals. This means a reliance of democratic and transformational leadership styles will improve people’s judgment to making good decision and be creative when faced with change implementation problems. In other words, while democratic leaders enhances higher productivity which enable them to provide solutions based on group participation and contributing to change implementation, transformational leaders on the other hand reduces the tension of one man show but increases organisational members participation by inspiring and motivating them with the sense overcoming organisational challenges when engaged with change implementation process.

With this, the organisational leaders will not only focus on performance in quantitative form, but have a positive impact with respect for subordinates or group participation which better motivate members to be more creative in their effort to support change implementation through inspiration, intellectual stimulate geared toward innovation, creativity, feedback and improve opportunities that are highly related to change implementation. This finding is in line with Mumford et al. (2003) and Carmichael et al. (2011), that today’s contemporary organisations needs to adapt to the values of transformational/democratic leadership styles in order to stimulating subordinates’ creativity and evaluating their creative products.

The findings in this study has empirical shown that transformational and democratic leadership styles are better adopted to cope with organisational turbulent periods, for example, when individuals, or groups as well the organisation as whole faces difficult times, transformational or democratic leadership style can be used to influence and change the situation due to the fact that leaders with such characters are more decisive and can inspire confidence and trust on members when carrying out responsibilities. Unlike other leadership styles, transformational and democratic leaders are more likely to encourage their subordinates by stimulating them to develop creative solutions to problems while opposing to issues relating to resistance to change. This is in alignment
with Bass and Riggio (2006), Arnold and Randall (2010) and Loon et al. (2012) who viewed that leaders with the characteristics of transformational/democratic styles are better with the capacity of managing organisational crises, but providing opportunities for fostering and inspire courage and stimulates enthusiasm for organisational members to see the need to recognise growth and achieve change implementation results.

Therefore, this study has supported the argument that transformational and democratic leadership styles are the best supportive leadership style for increasing people readiness for change as well as increasing the impact of organisational change implementation. This is because both leadership styles better directs organisational members’ attention towards the requirements for change implementation. Also, this study supports that transformational and democratic leadership styles better boosts subordinates involvement in decision that are critical for organisational success and change implementation (Caldwell et al., 2009). The current study further supports the argument that transformational and democratic leadership styles will better support performance feedback and improve opportunities which are major requirements for increase employee’s readiness for change in order to increase the level of organisational change implementation (Herold, et al., 2008; Caldwell et al., 2009; Raoprasert and Islam, 2010; Larsson and Eid, 2012).

In furtherance to this, the current study evidenced that organisational emphasis on transformational and democratic leadership styles will increase subordinate participation especially in times when their organisations are engaged on organisational change implementation. This empirically supported the notion that organisations that increase the values of transformational and democratic leadership styles will better manage teamwork, and employee involvement and engagement when managing organisational change implementation than those that did not (Avery, 2004; Yukongdi, 2004; Grove, 2005; Oshagbemi and Ocholi, 2006; Weyer, 2007; Xirasagar, 2008; Bosiok et al., 2013).

However, the findings in this study failed to support the contributions of transactional leadership style on the level of organisational change implementation hence, support the hypothesis that:

**H1b**: Transactional leadership style will have a lesser impact on organisational change implementation than transformational leadership style.
Based on the fact that this finding is unsuccessful, this hypothesis is not retained and is not added into the model in which this study is proposing for change implementation.

With reference to the regression analysis in Table 5.8 which indicated a negative impact of transactional leadership style ($\beta = -0.117$), shows that transactional leadership style was not supporting individual readiness for change and could contribute to organisational change implementation compared to transformational and democratic leadership styles as illustrated in (Figure 6.1). This means that transactional leadership style is less effective and could not motivate people towards involving or participate adequately in organisational change implementation. Or put differently, the characteristics of transactional leadership styles are not engaging or providing opportunity for organisational members to contribute effectively towards organisational change implementation. This finding is in line with Eid et al.’s (2008), Avery’s (2004) arguments that transactional leadership style only focuses on short time management process, and Doherty and Danylchuk (1996) study which found that the attributes of transactional leadership styles failed to meet with business expectation for business improvement compared to the attributes of transformational leadership style. Also Dai et al. (2013) study which compared different leadership style and evidenced that transactional leadership style was associated negatively to organisational commitment and could not support organisational commitment model. Therefore, based on the findings in the current study and findings from related studies, this study is of the view that transactional style will not contribute to change implementation in the NNPC, hence needs to be ignored. Although, this does mean that transactional leadership style may not work well in other organisations as this study was mainly carried out in the NNPC.

Furthermore, the findings in this study support the argument that laissez-faire and autocratic leadership styles will not contribute to individual change readiness and organisational change implementation. Based on this, the following hypotheses are supported.

- **H1d**: Autocratic leadership style will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.
H1e: Laissez-faire leadership styles will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.

The regression analysis indicates a significant lack of laissez-faire and autocratic leadership styles and could not support readiness for change and organisational change implementation, meaning that laissez-faire and autocratic leadership styles will reduce readiness for change and consequently reduce the levels of organisational change implementation. The findings has shown that the values of laissez-faire which are predominantly associated with high degree of autonomy and individual decision making would not work well in an organisational such the NNPC that needs to stress on collective participation in order to effective implement change. Furthermore, the findings provided support to the fact that Laissez-faire approach which encourages hand-off work situation with relatively little or no form of leadership support will not work well in organisations that are focusing on performance increase and change implementation. Again, if the laissez-faire leadership style is encouraged, decisions will be made without due approval and can result to mistakes. Therefore, the values of laissez-faire must be reduced and discard in the NNPC (Rozin and Royzman, 2001; Pounder, 2003; Walumba et al., 2007).

On the other hand, the finding of this study shows that the values of autocratic leadership style which is associated with low emphasis from consultation with organisational members in reaching unanimous decision will slow down change implementation, because managers with autocratic leadership are likely to make decisions without inputs from subordinates. The finding further indicated that leaders with autocratic leadership style (authoritative) will not provide support for organisational change implementation because they exercise too much of authority when dealing with colleagues and subordinates, which could lead to mistakes towards tasks accomplishment procedures. So, the findings in this study has supported the notion that autocratic leadership behaviour would lead to resentment among organisational members due to factors of dictatorship and too much control of power. This is in line with Bass and Riggio (2006), Weyer, (2007) and Overbey (2013) that in a situation where autocratic leadership style is practice or predominant, employees may consistently discontinues contributing to change implementation processes because they may feel unrecognised and unable to contribute ideas during the change implementation.
process. The findings are consistent with studies that autocratic leadership style often results in a lack of creative solutions to organisational problems, which ultimately hinders group performance (Oshagbemi and Ocholi, 2006; Northouse, 2010; Bosiok, 2013). Therefore, the values of autocratic leadership styles must not be stressed in the NNPC because it is associated with possibilities of change implementation failure.

So, in accordance with the regression analysis conducted in this study which indicated that transactional, laissez-faire and autocratic leadership styles were not contributing to readiness for change and organisational change implementation as presented in (Tables 5.6, 5.7 & 5.8), and in line with findings from related literature, this study concludes that such leadership styles will not play significant role towards increasing the levels readiness for change and organisational change implementation. Therefore, they will not be considered in the model for organisational change implementation as proposed in the current study.

In conclusion, the findings in this study has empirically supports the increasing level of the values of democratic and transformational leadership styles, because democratic leadership encourages more of group participation and is generally more effective change than autocratic leadership style when leading organisational change, indicating that democratic leaders offer guidance to group members and can contribute better quality workforce compared to the autocratic leader. This study has increase the support for the notion that democratic leaders will encourages organisational members to participate in organisational change implementation than the autocratic leaders because, with democratic leadership, organisational members will feel engaged and motivated in the process of change implementation. Also, since organisational members are more encouraged and share their thoughts when engaged in change implementation process with the democratic leadership, it is better than autocratic leadership style as it will lead to idea sharing and creative solutions to change implementation problems.

Also, this study has empirically supported that notion that transformational leaders are better in increasing the readiness to change and organisational change implementation than transactional leadership style. This is because the characteristics of the transformational leaders are able to connect subordinates to the need for change. Unlike the transactional leader, the transformational leader act as a role model, the transformational leaders inspires subordinates, challenges them to take greater full
ownership of tasks in order to optimize performance. Apart from challenging members to take full responsibility of various task, the transformational leader nurture and develop employees who tend to think independently and stimulate them to a better ways of executing organisational tasks.

6.4.2 The Influence of Organisational Culture on Organisational Change Implementation

This section presents a discussion of the empirical findings of the impact of organisational culture on organisational change implementation comparing from the empirical evidence in the established literature review. The regression analysis shows that organisational culture has a significant and positive influence on organisational change implementation in the NNPC. Hence, the following hypothesis is supported and retained:

- **H2**: There is positive relationship between organisational culture and organisational change Implementation.

The finding from this hypothesis shows that organisational culture has a significant positive relationship with organisational change implementation and is contributing significantly to organisational change implementation. This finding is in line with the positions of Hong and Park (2010), that organisational culture helps to motivate organisational members’ attitude towards the need to implement organisational change, and Simon *et al.* (2009), that organisational culture provides of one the largest impact on increasing the awareness required for organisational commitment and performance. Therefore, the findings in this study show that organisational culture helps to sharpen people behaviour towards organisational change organisation.

In order to determine the organisational culture type necessary for increasing readiness for change and organisational change implementation, the next section presents the results from the regression analysis to show the impact of the organisational culture types on change readiness and change implementation. The regression analysis result shows that group culture and developmental culture types are the most contributing organisational culture types towards increasing the level of organisational change implementation in this study, therefore the following hypotheses are retained:
H2a: Group culture type will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

H2b: Developmental culture type will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.

The regression results indicate that assessing other CVF culture types, group culture and developmental culture appeared to have the greater impact on organisational change implementation via the individual readiness for change. This indicates that organisations dominated by group and developmental culture types enable a higher possibility of increasing the levels of individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. Thus, Figure 6.2 presents a model for organisational culture and organisational change implementation for this study. This indicates that organisational culture will form an associated factor for the adoption of a model for managing organisational change implementation as proposed in the current study.

**Figure 6.2: Model for Organisational Culture and Organisational Change Implementation**

The result indicates that organisations that are consistent with the values of group and developmental culture types will improve quality, productivity and innovation. The findings have given a clear view that developmental and group culture types are better associated with higher levels of readiness for change, more favourably associated with teamwork and increased participation and greater commitment with capacity to lead
organisational change implementation. This is a clear indication that organisations dominated with developmental and group culture types enable higher possibilities of increasing the level of change readiness and change implementation. Or, were organisational leaders emphasising more on developmental and group cultures, their organisational values are more likely to encourage employees to increase commitment, innovation and teamwork which are elements necessary for leading organisational change implementation. This finding is consistent with the findings of Valencia et al. (2011) that developmental culture type is strongly associated with organisational innovation compared to rational culture type; Oney-Yazici et al. (2007) that group culture was increasing the ability for teamwork and organisational stability, hence enabling organisational members to easily accomplish tasks; and Valencia et al. (2010) that developmental culture helps organisations to improve inhibiting innovation and foster work flexibility.

Therefore the findings provide support for the notion that organisations that value team builders, human development and high commitment, vision and effectiveness are able to increase the level of individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation than organisations that do not focus on such values (Den Hooff et al., 2004; Jones et al., 2005; Vilkinas and Cartan, 2006; Prajogo and McDermott, 2011; Gimenez-Espin et al., 2012). This is in alignment with the findings of other researchers such as Guidroz et al. (2010), Stock et al. (2007), Roh et al. (2008) Prajogo and McDermott (2011) and Haffar et al, (2013) which found that developmental culture and group culture are better contributing to change implementation compared to rational and hierarchy culture types.

However, the findings show that rational and hierarchy culture types have a lesser impact on organisational change implementation and could not have a major impact on readiness for change and organisational change implementation, therefore the following hypotheses were supported in this study:

- **H2c**: Rational culture type will be negative associated with organisational change implementation.
- **H2d**: Hierarchy culture will be negative associated with organisational change implementation.
This study shows that rational culture has a lesser impact on change readiness hence could not influence organisational change implementation. This tells us that the values of rational culture may not work well compared to group and developmental culture types. On the other hand, the findings indicated that the values of hierarchy culture was not contributing to readiness for change and could impact on organisational change implementation, indicating that hierarchy culture type is contributing very low compared group and developmental culture types. Therefore, the study concludes that one of the major reasons for organisational failure to implement change could result from low level of organisational culture support resulting from consistent emphasis on rational culture or group culture. Thus, organisational change implementation is immensely dependent on the influence of organisational culture types dominated by group and developmental cultures. This study evidence that organisational ability to effectively implement change is contingent upon the presence and support of either one or the two of the organisational culture types identified in this study (group culture and developmental culture). Hence, this study view that the NNPC should consistently increase the values of group and developmental culture types in order to offer a favourable and flexible business atmosphere where effective organisational change will thrive.

The study view that flexibility is extremely focused on by organisations that are dominant with developmental culture. More so, organisations with developmental culture show a sense of dynamic innovation and adaptation that are strongly emphasised to glue the organisation together. Leaders are deemed as entrepreneurs, innovators, or risk takers who are driven by innovation and the discovery of innovative ideas necessary for achieving organisational success. Organisations with developmental culture often search for external support and acquire new resources that are needed to increase performance and change implementation.

Also, the finding from this study shows that group culture emphasizes flexibility and focus on the internal organisational performance. Organisations that associated with the characteristics of group culture are often deemed as personal places. Management activities in organisations dominated with group culture pay more attention to discussion and participation among organisational members. With group culture in place organisational leaders play role as mentors which enhances loyalty and regarded as the main glues that hold the organisation together. An organisation with group
culture will associated with atmosphere of openness and emphasizes the morale of employees where subordinates respond in the way of working hard and show loyalty so as to appreciate the leadership structure of the organisation. Furthermore, this kind of relationship positively improves organisational members’ participation and discussion related work improvement.

Thus, this study postulates that group culture and developmental culture types aligned with the values of transformational and democratic leadership behaviour as identified in this study, indicating that by adopting the group culture type democratic leaders (which have values of group participation) and organisational members would see themselves as an extended family with a friendly atmosphere where the leader is considered as a group mentor. That will lead to a high emphasis of flexible working environment where both leaders and subordinates are able to focus primary on issues that will strengthen their internal and external organisational structure and collaborative working environment with elements of openness.

The findings further indicates that such workplace with values of group culture, leaders will be able to demonstrate a working culture with principles of social equality where employees are able to work with the disposition and respond in a way of putting their best and show loyalty so as to appreciate each other. This is because such working relationship positively improves employees and leaders participation and makes relevant discussion that will lead to change implementation. By so doing, there is high possibility of organisational members to continue to keep good quality relationship and the ethics of wholehearted respect, obedience and support for each other.

Similarly, organisations dominated with values of developmental culture are likely to associate with transformational leadership behaviour that has values of innovation and elements of increasing people responsiveness towards achieving organisational objectives. This study viewed that developmental culture also enhances a flexible working environment with a sense of dynamic innovation and the drive of discovery of new idea capable of implementing change effectively. With developmental culture in place, transformational leaders will be able to search for external support in order to acquire more resources capable of strengthen the organisation’s change process. This is in line with Prajogo and McDermott (2011), that developmental and group culture types help to increase organisational commitment and long-term benefits of human resource
development and build formidable teamwork of increasing participation and Haffar et al. (2013), that organisational members associated with developmental and group culture types are better motivated and encourages creativity and growth. With this finding the current study has evidenced that organisations that are associated with the values of group and development culture will better increase the impact of organisational change implementation because it will enable such organisations to prepare a workplace environment necessary for engaging organisational members effectively.

6.4.3 The Impact of Managerial Skills on Organisational Change Implementation

This section provides a discussion of the empirical findings relating the impact of managerial skills on organisational change implementation in relation to existing literature. The result driven from the regression analysis indicated that managerial skills has a positive impact on organisational change implementation, therefore, the following hypothesis is supported and retained:

- **H3**: There is a positive relationship between managerial skills and organisational change implementation.

The regression shows that managerial skills are significantly important predictors to organisational change implementation. The results indicated that managerial skills were effective when managing organisational change and change implementation. This means the impact of managerial skills on organisational change implementation increases as a result of the mediating influence of individual readiness for change. This further indicates that managerial skills will help facilitate people knowledge and understanding when engaged with change implementation. This study have offer the support for the argument that managerial skills help organisations with general management capability and technical thinking that will enable them implement change effectively (Barhem et al., 2011; Tonidandel et al., 2012; Yukl 2013). Therefore, the findings shows that managerial skill will offer organisational members the ability to effectively engaged on organisational change implementation.

This means that if organisations thoughtfully emphasize the importance of managerial skills it will help them to sustain the managerial knowledge and skills needed to support change implementation. Since members of the organisation play critical role in the
success of organisational change implementation, this study has supported the argument that it is important organisational members are provided with the opportunities of acquiring the necessary skills needed to contribute immensely to towards change implementation. This is because, organisational leaders needs to prepared their subordinates in order to undertake organisational work responsibilities, with the ability to translate knowledge into practice and increase the capacity for change implementation. Therefore, this study concludes that organisational failure to implement change effectively could result from a lack of managerial skills that could influence change implementation competency and readiness to contribute to the process of organisational change implementation.

In the current study, the regression analysis results show that technical and conceptual skills were the most contributing dimensions of managerial skills towards increasing the level of individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation, therefore, the following hypotheses were supported and retained:

- **H3a**: An emphasis on technical skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.
- **H3b**: An emphasis on conceptual skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.

Hypothesis 3a proposes that an increasing level of technical skills (TS) will increase the participation level of organisational change implementation. In other word, the hypothesis predict that TS has a significant impact on the level of organisational change implementation through individual readiness for change ($\beta = 0.088$). On the other hand, hypothesis 3b proposes that an emphasis of conceptual skills (CS) will influence change implementation ($\beta = 0.090$). This result has empirically shown that both technical skills and conceptual skills are capable to form an associate model to increase the understanding and impact of organisational change implementation.

Based on this empirical position, Figure 6.3 presents an inclusion of TS and CS on the proposed model for change implementation. This means technical and conceptual skills as dimensions of managerial skills are adequately considered in the design of organisational change implementation proposed in the current study since both shows a positive and significant contribution to organisational change implementation through
individual readiness for change. The position is line with Haro and Turgut’s (2012) research conceptualisation of managerial skills as a model for stimulating managers thoughts in order to develop both soft and hard skills needed to improve their managerial capabilities, and Parents et al.’s (2012) study which conceptualized managerial skills as a model to increase managers practical implications for enhancement and improvement of organisational success.

![Figure 6.3: Model for Managerial Skills and Organisational Change Implementation](image)

As indicated in the Figure 6.3, the result shows the significance of technical and conceptual skills as they were found to have the most positive and considerable impact on organisational change implementation. However, the findings shows a negative impact of interpersonal skill on organisational change implementation, hence H3c was not supported:

- **H3c**: An emphasis on interpersonal skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.

The negative impact of interpersonal skills (IS) in this study could be a reflection of different managerial roles undertaken by different personnel or, that the values of interpersonal skills are not emphasised in the NNPC. Gentry *et al.* (2008) and Kraut *et al.* (1989) found that the dimensions of managerial skills are important at each level organisations but the degree of importance may depend on perceptions and levels of importance in line with goals accomplishment. This means managerial skills differs in importance depending on relevance and managerial function. For instance,
administrative ability and capability is of more importance to managers who undertakes administrative role because administrative ability is inherent in the administrative function. More so, information gathering and problem identification is relevant to managers who requires technical ability to function effectively. The finding in the current study indicates that technical and conceptual skills were contributing more on organisational change implementation through their impact on individual readiness for change.

The failure of the findings of interpersonal skills to impact on organisational change implementation in the current seems to be inconsistent with the findings attained in other studies such as Tonidandel et al. (2012) Haro and Turgut (2012) and Yukl (2013) who suggests that interpersonal skills have a significant influence on organisational effectiveness and success. The studies view that interpersonal skills helps organisational members to assess relevant information within them which are critical for organisational effectiveness. Yukl (2013) believes that interpersonal skills include knowledge about human behaviour and group processes, as well as enabling managers with the ability to understand feeling, attitudes, and motives of subordinates. This means, an organisational adherence to interpersonal skills could help to develop leaders’ capacity to influence subordinates with the ability to understand organisational motives, values and emotions as well as developing the necessary behaviour that are acceptable when change programme are introduced for implementation.

Given that the findings in this current indicates that conceptual skills and technical skills are extremely critical for change readiness and organisational change implementation. It provides support for the notion that organisations that value knowledge about techniques for conducting specialised organisational change activities, processes and procedures of using tools in relevant change activities are able to increase people’s readiness for change and effectively implement organisational change than those that did not focus on such values (Parente et al., 2012; Yukl, 2013). More so, the finding further provide support that organisations that value logical thinking, creativity and problem solving, ability to analyse events and perceive trends and the anticipative ability to adapt to effective change practices are better than those that do not emphasize on such values (McKenna, 2004; Self, 2007; Kelley, 2007; Erturk, 2008; Gentry et al., 2008).
This shows that organisations that emphasize more on conceptual and technical skills are more likely to increase a situation where organisational change can be implemented, because conceptual skills increases human resources development, creativity and trigger the spirit of innovation that is able to increase the capacity for efficient participation in change implementation. In other words, by emphasising on conceptual skills, the organisational will improve employee’s readiness in the aspect of improving services and processes that will lead to change implementation. This indicates that the provision for a required services that are needed to effect change implementation are galvanised into adequate emphasis of conceptual skills. More so, conceptual skills offer that ability to think creatively, analyse and understand complicated ideas about how change programmes are implemented. Therefore, the finding view that organisations that want to increase their services in order to improve change implementation must equip their employees with the necessary skills associated with conceptual skills in order to increase knowledge and understand of conceptual skills which are necessary for change implementation.

On the other hand, the finding shows that technical skills have a significant positive effect on employee’s readiness in order to participate in organisational change implementation. This means that organisational values for technical skills are necessary for change implementation. This result is consistent with the findings obtained in previous studies that technical skills offers the technical ability for organisation to respond to effective change (Scullen et al., 2003; Barhem et al., 2011; Tonidandel et al., 2012), suggesting that technical skills offers a conducive setting for increase the level of change implementation. Hence, by emphasising and developing the aspect of technical ability in employees, the organisation is more likely to equip employees with skills required for the accomplishment of specific tasks for specific goals. More so, where organisational members are consistently equip with technical skills, the organisation will be improving and sustaining knowledge and capabilities needed to effectively coordinate concerted efforts that will lead to organisational change implementation. Therefore, the findings provide support for the opinion that organisation that value training for technical support, analysis for problem solving, quality assurance, system modification, database management are better able to have detailed capacity towards effective change implementation than those that do not focus on such values (Carmeli and Tishler, 2006; Erturk, 2008; Barhem et al., 2011; Haro and
Turgut, 2012). The findings in this study has shown that managerial skills are contingent for organisational change implementation, thus NNPC needs to be consistently emphasising the need to maintain the characteristics of the dimension of managerial skills considered in this study in order to offer all round employee skills as well as influencing their capacity to adequately participate in change implementation programmes.

6.4.4 The Influence of Organisational Trust on Organisational Change Implementation

This section empirically presents the discussion of the findings relating to the impact of organisational trust on organisational change implementation in comparison with the established literature in this research area. The results derived from the regression analysis show a positive and significant impact of organisational trust on organisational change implementation in the NNPC, thus hypothesis H4 is supported and retained:

- **H4**: There is a significant positive relationship between organisational trust and organisational change implementation.

Thus, the results indicated that organisational trust plays a significant role in organisational change implementation, indicating that trust in organisations enhances organisational structure, processes and policies which support organisational interaction for innovation and adherence for change implementation. This findings show that organisational trust enhances behavioural and overall organisational invention for change and encourages team building for effectiveness and change implementation. This finding is consistent with the studies of other researchers such as Saunders and Thornhill (2003), Atkinson and Butcher (2003) and Vanhala and Ahteela (2011) who believes that organisational trust increases organisational potential resource to improve on the relativity and willingness to improve and sustain organisational effectiveness. This shows that an emphasis on organisational trust will increase organisational effectiveness and readiness to respond to change and implement change. This is in line with other studies emphasising adherence to organisational trust because of its positive impact on organisational innovativeness (Kanter, 1988; Dougherty and Hardy, 1996). Marttins and Terblance (2003) study add that organisational trust improve behavioural dimension that supports innovativeness, i.e. handling challenges, take risks and encourage change personnel on innovation and creativity.
This indicates that an organisation that maintains the characteristics of organisational trust increases the capabilities, possibilities and influences a supportive business environment for managing and implementing change effectively.

In assessing the dimensions of organisational trust, the regression result shows that institutional trust has a significant influence on organisational change implementation in this study therefore hypothesis 4b was supported and retained:

- **H4b**: Institutional trust will positively influence organisational change implementation.

This hypothesis proposes that institutional trust (ITT) has an influence on the level of organisational change implementation. This means ITT will positively influence the level of organisational change implementation through the impact of individual readiness for change. The regression result indicated that ITT ($\beta = 0.419$) have a significant and positive influence on organisational change implementation through individual readiness for change ($\beta = 0.764$). This result means ITT is capable for consideration as an associate model for the understanding of organisational change implementation as illustrated in Figure 6.4.

![Figure 6.4: Model for Trust and Organisational Change Implementation](image)

This finding indicates that institutional trust is able to set organisation on the pace to building a strong organisational policy that connects people's perceptions to fairness and justice. This means institutional trust will strengthen human resources management HRM practices since organisational policies are tie in the heart of HRM. This finding shows that organisations that build a high level of institutional trust will increase its
efficiency and effectiveness to engage on organisational change implementation. In other word, organisations that increase the level of institutional trust will benefit from organisational members comprehensive understanding for the need to implement change effectively. Therefore, organisations that develop institutional trust will enhance performance through cooperation capable of contributing to knowledge creation and innovation. For example, if organisational members are able to trust organisational policy they are engaged with, their level of interaction and contribution towards change implementation will increase.

This finding is in accordance with other studies which confirmed that institutional trust has a positive influence on organisational change implementation (Levin and Cross, 2004; Faghihi and Allameh, 2012). The findings support the belief that institutional trust increases organisational value for efficiency, fairness of the organisational wide system and organisational policies (Tan and Tan, 2000; Mannion et al., 2005; Ellonen et al., 2008; Neves and Caetano, 2009; Smollan, 2013). Also, the findings provide further support that organisations that value organisational policy that guide people’s inclusive participation, sustainability of the organisations trustworthiness, management of business and people, technological reliability, competitiveness and successful future endeavour tend to have the ability to adapt to change readiness and change implementation more than organisations whose policies do not stress on such values (Clegg et al., 2002; Ben-Gal and Tzafrir, 2011; Faghihi and Allameh, 2012).

Considering the impact of interpersonal trust, the current study shows that interpersonal trust was not contributing to organisational change implementation in this study, thus the following hypothesis is not supported:

- **H4a**: Interpersonal trust will positively influence organisational change implementation.

The findings indicate a lack of significant impact of interpersonal trust (β = -0.327) on change implementation. This could not support the findings of Vanhala and Ahteela (2011) and Ellonen *et al.* (2008) which suggests that interpersonal trust influences employee reliability to participate in organisational change practices. The explanation for the lack of significant influence of interpersonal trust could be that the NNPC value for interpersonal trust is relatively low. This means that the organisation’s practice may
not be consistent with the critical behaviours for influencing interpersonal trust. Prusak’s (2001) work suggests that the workplace trust is critical for group and organisational change, innovation, creativity and the management of issues relating to organisational success. Other studies also supported the need to increase the level of interpersonal trust in organisations (Peterson and Behfar, 2003; Tidd et al., 2004). Ellonen et al. (2008) conclude that interpersonal trust is increased with interaction amongst employees in a particular manner that could lead to organisational change implementation.

This means interpersonal trust could help organisations to increase mutual and psychological agreements among organisational members (Ellonen et al., 2008) to build a sustainable trusting relationship between members so they can cope with uncertainties and make stronger the interconnections among employees as they engage with change implementation strategies (Saunders and Thornhill, 2003). More so, it helps organisations with effective and acceptable feedback, because effective feedback process would requires a high degree of interpersonal trust among organisational members (Tidd et al., 2004). In order for organisational members to accept a feedback they must believe that the information contained in such feedback is accurate which is a key representation of the degree of interpersonal trust in place.

Therefore, interpersonal trust could be useful as management cognitive ability to strengthen organisations dominated by democratic and transformational leadership behaviour and values of group/developmental culture as identified in the current study. This will help to enhance group decision making process and remain committed to plan as well as improving performance. On the other hand, it could enable members of various groups to devote a greater proportion towards working hard to implement change effectively.

The findings from this study have shown that the characteristics of organisational trust plays significant and positive role on organisational change implementation. It therefore evident that the ability of organisations to enforce effective change relies upon the presence or elements of organisational trust which will enable the organisation to institute lay down policies and regulations that will help facilitate change implementation. So, the findings in this study as provide empirical support for the conclusions of studies such as Barney and Hansen (1994) and Vanhala and Ahteela
(2011) who found that organisations that operate well and meet their business objectives are those that adhered to organisational trust which helps to balance work practices, increase collaborative effort needed to boost change implementation. Therefore, organisations should increase the values of dimensions of organisational trust in order to offer a better business atmosphere where both leaders and subordinates can intensify their effort to achieve change implementation.

6.5 The influence of Individual Readiness for Change on Change Implementation

This section presents the empirical findings relating the influence of individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation comparing the findings with relevant literature. This study considers that an increasing level of individual readiness for change will impact on organisational change implementation. The mediating role is measured in the relationship between leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust on organisational change implementation. Based on this, the following hypothesis was supported and retained:

- **H5**: Individual readiness for change will have a positive impact on the level of organisational change implementation.

This hypothesis proposes that individual readiness for change has an impact on organisational change implementation. Also, that individual readiness for change will mediate the relationship between the independent variables in order to predict more of organisational change implementation. The analysis shows that individual readiness for change has a positive and significant relationship with organisational change implementation ($r = 0.807$). The regression analysis indicated that democratic and transformational leadership styles, developmental and group culture, technical and conceptual skills and institutional trust were impacting on organisational change implementation via the influence of individual readiness for change. This means that democratic and transformational leadership styles, developmental and group culture types, technical and conceptual skills and institutional trust employ their influences on organisational change implementation through mediating effective of individual readiness for change, and they impact directly on organisational change implementation.
Individual readiness for change as a mediator enhances the effects of leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust to predict more of organisational change implementation. The data collection and analysis suggest that members of the organisation have a high perception of the level of individual readiness for change as well as a high positive attitude towards organisational change implementation. Therefore, the result found that democratic and transformational leadership styles, developmental and group culture types, technical and conceptual skill and institutional trust are capable of increasing the level of individual readiness for change in order to impact more on organisational change implementation as illustrated in the Figures above.

The analysis carried out in this study has proven that organisational members with low level of readiness for change will not participate actively in organisational change implementation, therefore this study conclusion that a low level of readiness for change will reduce the level of organisational change implementation whereas a high level of individual readiness for change will consistently increase the level of organisational change implementation. This means where the level of readiness for change is high, organisational members will be ready to share and resolve in their minds to increase commitment as well as their collective efficacy to change implementation. Readiness for change functions as how much members of an organisation assess organisational preparedness for change implementation, the following key aspects form the bases for such assessments; task demands, resource availability and situational factors (Weiner, 2009), which are linked to the style of leadership behaviour in place, type of organisational culture adopted, training to acquire relevant skills and trust for organisational policies. Hence, an increasing level of such variables will lead to a high level of readiness for change where organisational members are likely to exercise and exert greater effort or exhibit greater persistence for change implementation. More so, there will be high demand for collective behaviour necessary for increasing the anticipated benefits from the change if eventually implemented. Therefore, organisational members who ranked the variables identified in this study high will likely increase their level of change readiness than those who ranked low. This is in line with researchers such as Jones, et al. (2005) and Haffar et al. (2013) who found that a high level of readiness for change will lead to an increasing level of organisational responsiveness to implement organisational objectives.
So, in order to increase the likelihood of organisational change implementation, the leaders of the NNPC should create readiness for change across the NNPC and develop employee’s positive attitude towards effective change implementation. The NNPC leaders need to do this by adopting democratic or transformational leadership attitude, developmental or group culture values, as well as emphasising on policies that would strengthen training so that employees can acquire the essential training capable of increasing their level of change readiness. More so, they need to increase issues about trustworthiness in order to increase motivation and honest participation with change implementation.

The findings revealed that the NNPC seems to practice a variety of leadership styles, as the study identified that transformational, transactional, democratic and laissez-faire as identified in the correlation analysis section. However, there is a strong indication in the literature that democratic and transformational leadership styles have a strong relationship with change readiness and organisational change implementation (Judge and Piccolo, 2004; Northouse, 2010; Sapru, 2011; Rowold and Borgmann, 2013). The regression analysis in this study shows that democratic and transformational leadership styles contribute more to individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. This supports the arguments of Barling et al. (2000) and Pastor and Mayor (2008) who suggest that organisations are likely to adopt more than one leadership style because they add value for both emotional intelligence and adequately involve organisational members towards developing and improving business processes. But, in terms of achieving a result that is necessary for change, some leadership styles are more dominant than others (Keller and Dansereau, 1995; Avery, 2004; Northouse, 2010; Sapru, 2013; Sheaffer et al., 2011). On the other hand, studies have shown that the relationship between leaders and their subordinates should be democratically oriented because it enhances a better choice of engagement when strategising the need for change and implementation (Mostovicz et al., 2009; Meredith et al., 2010). Equally, this study has shown that, the characteristics of democratic leadership behaviour will add more value if increased at the level of individual readiness for change in the NNPC, since it has a strong relationship with individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

The various analyses that support the hypothesis on the influence of leadership on organisational change implementation have answered the question about the influence
of leadership on organisational change implementation. This is contained in the analysis that confirms that transformational leadership have a positive influence on organisational change implementation through individual readiness for change. Therefore, this study concludes that increasing transformational leadership behaviour in the NNPC will increase leader’s integrity to sustain an environment of creativity and commitment. This will further increase employee’s involvement and participation in the change implementation process or create a mechanism for excellent change implementation process. The work of Bass and Avolio (1993) shows that effective leader should exhibit the transformational leadership behaviour in order for them to effectively contribute in organisational change implementation. This was further evidenced in Vigoda-Gadot’s (2007) study that a low level of organisational performance system can be improved by an increased emphasis on transformational leadership styles. This shows that organisational change implementation is effective when transformational leadership style is adequately encouraged.

As indicated in this study, the analysis shows that democratic leadership style is influencing positively on organisational change implementation through individual readiness for change. This further supports the influencing role of leadership on organisational change implementation. This result is in line with Avery’s (2004) and Sapru’s (2013) views that when organisational leaders considers democratic leadership behaviour their leadership ability to effectively and efficiently engaged employees towards improving performance and fast track change implementation will be high. This result is in consistent with the Keller and Dansereau (1995) argument that democratic leadership behaviour empowers both leaders and their subordinates to increase the willingness to support work commitments. The result in this study has further proven that a consideration of democratic leadership behaviour would enhance harmonious working relationship between organisational leaders and their subordinates in order to increase readiness for change. Furthermore, democratic leadership behaviour will facilitate a positive relationship among subordinates in order for them to easily recognise the need to improve performance and involve in collective decision making strategy instead of individual decision making methods. This allows leaders to set direction with subordinates and also participate to ensuring that tasks are met effectively.
In practice, this means organisational leaders who focus on democratic and transformational leadership styles will be more active when working with their subordinates. They will be more responsive when setting tasks and goals because the process allows inputs from subordinates. More so, organisational leadership who are transformational and democratically oriented will be better aware of the synergistic benefit of working together with subordinates towards achieving a common organisational goal, and on the other hand reducing elements of autocratic behaviours among employees. Both leadership styles behaviour are capable of providing individual support, intellectual stimulation and the required norm and culture type capable of increasing the level of individual readiness for change and positively impact more on organisational change implementation.

The analyses on organisational culture have answered the question about the role of organisation culture on individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. This is confirmed in the various analyse that evidenced that group and developmental culture types were relating with individual readiness for change in order to contributing better on organisational change implementation. Also, the findings in this study have made it clear that a consideration and practice of group and developmental culture which are more flexible with innovative characteristics will better increase the level of individual readiness for change and impact more on organisational change implementation. The finding is in line with Quinn and Rohrbaugh (1983) and Quinn and Kimberly (1984) that while a flexible value profile may encourage empowerment in an organisation embarking on change, a control value profile stresses efficiency, productivity and stability. Also, the literature confirmed that when organisations are advocating for change, development culture and group culture types should be best emphasised and increased because it enhances transformational drive, innovative inputs, vision, constant change and effectiveness (Denison and Spreitzer, 1991; Cameron and Quinn, 2006; Prajogo and McDermott, 2011).

It is important to note that these pattern of cultures are not mutually exclusive, as no one organisation may show only one pattern of culture (Al-Khalifa and Aspinwall, 2001), rather organisations are compared with of a mixed set of cultural values. The varieties of organisational culture types viewed in the NNPC is a clear evidence, however shows the strength and weakness of perceived cultures and need for appropriate emphasis.
As indicated in the review, while hierarchy culture emphasizes on internal control and strict adherence to rule and regulations, rational culture emphasizes on measure of a well defined business processes of achieving productivity against external competition. But, developmental culture on the other hand contrasts this as it underlining principles emphasizes on flexible workplace environment which encourages creativity, innovation and external growth (Denison and Spreitzer, 1991). More so, group culture stresses the internal aspects of an organisation and emphasizes on flexible dimension which enable employees empowerment and encouragement to participate during change implementation periods. So, the NNPC as a public owned organisation coordinating the activities of the Nigerian oil and gas exploration which currently faced with challenges of inability to implement change programmes whereas culture is a major factor would need to acquaint itself with cultural values of group and developmental capable of stirring up creativity, innovation, growth and empower employees and all change implementation officers to adequately participate in change implementation programmes.

In practice, the findings in this study indicates that the NNPC leadership is not focusing on innovation, creativity and effective productivity management system that could encourage effective change implementation which are embedded in developmental culture and group culture (Cameron and Quinn, 2006; Prajogo and McDermott, 2011; Haffar et al., 2013). The perception of hierarchy culture type indentified in this study that shows that the leaders in NNPC pay too much attention to authority and power over their subordinates hence reduces subordinates participation and contribution towards change implementation. The finding ascertained that managers mainly focus on getting the work done and making profit in the shortest time with less concentration on developing human resources capable of driving both short and long term change, so too much concentration was in hierarchy culture type, rather than putting greater emphasis on developmental and group culture types. Therefore, in order to increase the level of individual readiness for change and increase the impact of change implementation in the NNPC, attention needs to focus on group culture and developmental culture types.

The analyses on managerial skills have attempted to answer the research question about the influence of managerial skills on individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. The findings show that organisational change implementation is associated with the dimensions of managerial skills, as technical and conceptual skills
shown to influence individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. This is in line with studies that viewed that in order for organisations there capabilities for change accomplishment, the need to increasing managerial skills should be emphasized (Scullen et al., 2003; Yukl, 2013; Haro and Turgut, 2012; Tonidandel et al., 2012). The findings from the study show that conceptual skills and technical skills were better influencing individual readiness for change and are better impacting on organisational change implementation. The failure of interpersonal skills to impact on individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation could be the organisation is not increasing the element of interpersonal skills which could help to improve knowledge about human behaviour and interpersonal processes (Yukl, 2013). Yukl (2013) confirms that interpersonal skills are skills concerned with the ability to understand the feelings, attitudes and motives of members within an organisational setting. It enhances clear and effective communication to influence persuasiveness, and the ability to establish effective and cooperative relationships among employees such as tact, diplomacy, listening skills, and knowledge about acceptable social behaviour, capable of driving change implementation processes (Yukl, 2013). Therefore, an adherence to the values and characteristics of interpersonal skills will help to further increase the level of individual readiness for change in order to impact more on organisational change implementation.

It is important that organisational policy supports the emphasis of technical skills as it encourages knowledge about methods, processes, procedures and techniques for conducting specialised activities that are necessary for implementing change (Scullen et al., 2003). Also, it is important that organisational policies support elements of conceptual skills because they help to improve the general analytical ability for problem solving, and recognise opportunities and potential problems (Yukl, 2013). But, where organisational policy does not support interpersonal skills it will reduce members’ capacities and ability to understand another person’s motives, values, emotions, and other social behaviour and the need to contribute to change implementation. The literature confirmed that interpersonal skills enhance the effectiveness of relationship oriented behaviour between organisational leaders and subordinates in the areas of management behaviour that is primary task oriented such as: creating work assignments or tasks and instructions on how such tasks will be accomplished (Zaccaro et al., 1991; Yukl, 2013).
It is important to note that management methodology is essential in maintaining the effectiveness and appropriateness of change implementation (Senior and Swailes, 2009; Grieves, 2010). Therefore, the three dimensions of managerial skills should be contained (emphasized and increased) especially in times of change implementation processes. The findings in this study have shown that, in order to implement change, organisations need to identify the three dimensions of managerial skills as a resource required for providing all the basic skills needed for change implementation. These skills serve as part of the energy for improvement, commitment and drive for individual readiness for change and change implementation. When people are better prepared with the necessary skills for change implementation, their sense of readiness will increase and in turn overcome chances for resisting change. Therefore, the decreasing level of interpersonal skills in the NNPC is one of the barriers decreasing the possibilities of change readiness and change implementation.

The analyses on organisational trust have attempted to answer the research question about the influence of organisational trust on individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation, as it was found that institutional trust was better related to individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation in the NNPC. While interpersonal trust was found be negatively associating with individual readiness for change and organisational implementation. The negative impact of interpersonal trust could mean that there is less emphasis on values of integrity, fairness, employees’ welfare and knowledge management (Levin and Cross, 2004; Ellonen et al., 2008; Faghihi and Allameh, 2012). On the other hand, the strong relationship of institutional trust with individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation shows that there is a general sense of fulfilment of work agreement between organisational leaders and employees in terms of policy formulation and implementation. However, there is a need to increase both interpersonal and institutional trust across all levels of the organisation especially in times of change implementation, because it will lead to better individual readiness for change and successful change implementation (Ellonen et al., 2008; Neves and Caetano, 2009; Faghihi and Allameh, 2012).

A recent study by Institute of Leadership and Management (ILM) shows that organisational trust underpins effective working relationships amongst organisational members. The more someone trusts a colleague, manager or team member, the greater
the likelihood they will cooperate, share information and work effectively to implement change. Or, by increasing the level of trust levels across their organisations, the organisation can drive significant improvements in performance by motivating staff to commit additional flexible effort necessary for change implementation. It enables organisational leaders to both take and manage risks safely and allows them to try new things that will grow and focus the organisation on the pathway to change implementation.

The ILM (2014) study reveals that the challenge of organisational trust is often high in bigger organisations as employees in the big organisations report the lowest levels of trust, with managers in organisations of over 1,000 staff reporting just 27 percent net high trust. Those working in the smallest organisations of under 50 employees, where managers and senior staff are more likely to be in direct contact, displayed the highest level of trust across the group 58 percent net high trust in their organisation. This clearly underscores the fact that organisational trust is very critical for change readiness and change implementation. Hence, the current study supports the notion that an adherence to organisational trust which is directly leads to greater organisational commitment will increase effective work relationship among members (Atkinson and Butcher, 2003; Smollan, 2013). This study has added that organisational trust impacts upon perceptions, including the perceived accuracy of information and acceptance of organisational decisions.

The study also shows that a lack of organisational trust reduces cooperation and communication among organisational members, thereby impeding individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. The more someone trusts a work partner, the greater the likelihood they will cooperate, share information or take some other form of risk that is known to increase individual performance which leads to change implementation. This study has provided organisational leaders with a clear picture of the characteristics and behaviours drive when the values of organisational trust are adopted and practiced in organisations especially when change is introduced.

Finally, the research question about the mediating role of individual readiness for change play on the increasing level of organisational change implementation is being answered, as the analysis shows that the leadership, organisational culture, managerial
skills and organisational trust impact on organisational change implementation through the mediating role of individual readiness for change.

6.6 Discussion of Findings from the Moderation Regression Analysis

6.6.1 The Impact of Social Norms on Leadership and Organisational Change Implementation

This section presents a discussion of findings relating to the impact of the contextual factors on the relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation in comparison with the established literature. The results derived from the moderation regression analysis show that the contextual factors were increasing the relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation therefore the following hypothesis is supported and restrained:

❖ H6: The contextual factors will increase the level of organisational change implementation.

This shows that the contextual factors considered in this study are further increasing the level of organisational change implementation through their strength on the independent and mediating variables. For instance, the findings indicated that social norms are significantly impacting on the relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation. Thus supporting the hypothesis that:

❖ H6a: Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation.

This hypothesis proposes that social norms (SN) will moderate the relationship between leadership in order to increase the impact of organisational change implementation. The regression result indicated that social norms ($p = 0.006$) is significantly and positively impacting on transformational leadership style ($b = 0.110$) and democratic leadership style ($b = 0.081$), hence increasing more of organisational change implementation as illustrated in Figure 6.5. Based on, social norms is added to the model proposed in this study in order to increase the perception about leadership and impact more on organisational change implementation. This mean that if organisational leaders and change implementation personnel value and sustain the norms of transformational and democratic leadership styles their ability to lead and implement organisational change will be high.
The result shows that the relationship between democratic, transformational leadership styles with organisational change implementation in the NNPC is contingent on social norms. This result further proven that a consistent practice of the norms of democratic, transformational leadership styles will increase the level of organisational change implementation therefore making it more visible for organisations to remain consistent with the norms and values of democratic and transformational leadership styles. This finding is consistent with other contributors which confirmed that social norms contribute to organisational leadership structure (Ouimet, 2010), and increases the capability of organisational effectiveness (Eby et al., 2000; Cunningham et al., 2002). This indicates that organisations that adopt the norms of democratic and transformational leadership styles and continue to value and maintain their characteristics and structures are likely to increase the awareness of people participation towards organisational change implementation. In other words, by consistently emphasising and maintaining the right leadership attitude with the necessary norms for sustainability, organisation will have the likelihood to develop a supportive business environment capable for leading a successful change implementation.

This finding has further provided support for the notion that an organisation’s policy, that encourages norms of democratic and transformational behaviour will be able to contribute to change implementation because such leaders with such behaviours are capable better motivate employees to engage in active change implementation (Alas and Vadi 2006; Martin, 2008; Self and Schraeder, 2009). Therefore, it is very necessary
that the NNPC stick to the norms and practice of democratic and transformational leadership styles in order to achieve a healthy and effective change implementation.

On the other hand, the moderation analysis did not provide support for transactional, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles because their norms do not interact with change implementation and therefore no impact was established. This result supports the conclusion that autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles have elements of reducing change readiness and change implementation (Walumba et al., 2007; Northouse, 2010). This does not mean that the norms and values of transactional, autocratic and laissez-faire leadership will not work well in other organisations or culture, as this study was only centred in the NNPC.

6.6.2 The Impact of Social Norms on Organisational Culture and Organisational Change Implementation

The findings in this section show that social norms are moderating the relationship between group, developmental and rational cultures in order to increase the impact of organisational change implementation. Therefore, the following hypothesis is supported in this study:

❖ **H6b**: Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation.

H6b hypothesized that social norms (SN) will moderate the relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation. The findings from the regression indicated a positive impact of social norms (p < 0.001) on the relationship between group culture ($b = 0.546$) and developmental culture ($b = 0.255$), consequently increasing the impact of organisational change implementation as illustrated in Figure 6.6. This indicates that adherence to the norms of group and developmental culture types will increase the impact of organisational change implementation.
Figure 6.6: The Impact of SN on Culture and OCI

This finding shows that the norms of group/developmental cultures are positively impacting on organisational change and are contribution towards increasing the level of organisational change implementation. This means that the strength of social norms increases the impact of group and developmental culture in order to uplift change readiness from low to high, and consequently increase the intensity of organisational change implementation. This indicates that organisations that emphasize and maintains the norms of developmental and group culture types will consistently increase people’s readiness to contribute to organisational change implementation than organisations that do maintain those norms (Naor et al., 2008; Zu et al., 2010; Saame et al., 2011; Carlstrom and Ekman 2012).

The regression result indicated that social norms impacts on the relationship between rational culture and organisational change implementation. But, earlier mediation analysis suggested that rational culture was contributing less in the NNPC compared to developmental and group culture types with a more positive and significant impact. Based on this, rational culture type is not considered in the model for organisational change implementation in this study.

More so, the regression analysis did not report any significant impact social norms on the relationship between hierarchy culture and organisational change implementation. This suggests that hierarchy culture is not impacting positively on organisational change implementation, hence cannot be considered in the model. This implies that the NNPC must discard the norms of hierarchy/rational culture types, but focus more of group and developmental culture types in order to contribute more on change
implementation. This finding supports that notion that hierarchy culture contributes less to change implementation compared to developmental and group culture types as evidence in Prajogo and McDermott (2011) and Haffar et al. (2013). Therefore, the results in this study have empirically shown that developmental culture and group culture are the most supportive organisational culture types when managing organisational change implementation.

6.6.3 The Impact of Social Norms on Managerial Skills and Change Implementation

The finding shows that social norms have a negative and non-significant impact on the dimensions of managerial skills and cannot contribute to effective organisational change implementation in this study. Therefore, could not support the hypothesis that:

- **H6c**: Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between managerial skills and organisational change implementation.

The moderation analysis shows that social norms are not impacting on the relationship between technical, conceptual and interpersonal skills in the NNPC. This indicates that the construct of social norms were not in alignment with the response to increase managerial skills and therefore could not contribute to effective change in the NNPC. However, recent studies have produced strong proof that managerial skills are extremely critical for increasing change readiness and organisational change implementation (Genry et al., 2008; Leong, 2008; Barhem et al., 2011; Haro and Turgut, 2012; Parente et al., 2012; Tonidandel et al., 2012; Yukl, 2013). This indicates that the NNPC may not value or is not consistent with the norms of continues training of personnel on various skills capable of driving change implementation process. Therefore, the need for the NNPC to acquaint itself with the norms and values of consistent training will help increase its level of change preparedness and implementation.
6.6.4 The Impact of Social Norms on Organisational Trust and Organisational Change Implementation

The findings also indicated a negative interaction of social norms on the relationship between the dimensions of organisational trust on change readiness and consequently could not contribute to effective change implementation. Thus, the following hypothesis is not supported:

- **H6d**: Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between organisational trust and organisational change implementation

This result shows that construct of social norms is negatively influence the relationship between interpersonal trust and institutional trust and could not impact on effective organisational change implementation in the NNPC. This indicates lack of adequate adherence to the values of organisational trust in the organisation. However, aligning the norms of both interpersonal and institutional trust on organisational policy would increase members honest engagement when participating on organisational change implementation (Saunders and Thornhill, 2003; Kelley, 2007; Erturk, 2008; Neves and Caetano, 2009; Ben-Gal and Tzafrir, 2011; Smollan, 2013).

The mediation regression analysis in this study shows that organisational trust has a positive impact on readiness for change and is influencing on organisational change implementation. Therefore, an increase adherence of the norms of the dimensions of organisational trust will further increase the significance impact of organisation trust on individual readiness for and organisational change implementation. Studies have shown that a high level of individual readiness for change will lead to an increasing level of change implementation (Armenakis et al., 2007; Hold et al., 2007; Rusly et al., 2012). Thus, the NNPC should move to increase its capability for trust by appropriately aligning itself to the norms and values of trust in order to offer an encouraging environment that will increase people readiness for change and change implementation.

6.6.5 The Impact of Unit/Dept. Characteristics on Organisational Change Implementation

The moderation regression result shows that departments/units characteristics are impacting positively on the relationship between organisational change implementation through readiness for change in the NNPC. This implies that departments and units are
increasing the level of individual readiness for change hence impacting on organisational change implementation in the NNPC, thus, the following hypothesis was accepted and retained:

- **H6e**: Department/units’ characteristics are contingent on the relationship between readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

This finding indicated a positive impact of units/departments characteristics \( (p = 0.052) \) with readiness for change \( (b = 0.088) \) in order to increase the level of organisational change implementation as illustrated in Figure 6.7. This means, the characteristics of units/departments have a moderating impact on organisational change implementation thus added into the model for change implementation as proposed in this study.
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**Figure 6.7: The Impact of UDC on OCI**

This result has indicated that the characteristics of organisational units or departments such as size, structure, policies and delegation of responsibility are necessary for increasing employee’s willingness to contribute actively in actualizing organisational change implementation. This means, departments/units characteristics are capable of enhancing a working environment where organisational members can make use of their expertise at the same time benefit from various contributions from colleagues. This level of interaction and share of information at the department or unit level will help to promote to intensify generation of more ideas, knowledge and skills which are consistent requirement for change readiness and change implementation. On the other hand, the findings indicates that failure to reinforce such collaboration at the department or unit level might lead to breakdown of departmental relationship and cause work ambiguities, work constraints and resistance to change. This means that the change
implementation process will be hindered if there is less force at the units or departmental level to initiate commitment capable of reinforcing the change implementation plan which comes from top level of the organisation.

Therefore, in order to help facilitate change implementation processes, there is need to strengthen the characteristics of organisational departments or units so that members of such department can increase the behaviour to adapt or fit into the change process and predict more change results. Based in this, the current study concludes that unless the characteristics of units/departments are emphasized at all levels of organisation, change implementation success will move very slowly.

This finding is consistent with the findings of studies that viewed departmental workforce as a determinant for change implementation because it enforces people’s responsibility to implement change (Aspinwall and Elgharib, 2013). Also, appropriate rules and regulations impacts on readiness for change and increase the chances of implementing change programmes. This result supports the conclusion that the characteristics of organisations’ units or departments such as size of the department, adequate delegation and attitude of coordinating departmental activities, policies and rules of engagement are extremely critical for change readiness and increasing change implementation (Rad, 2006; Clorley, 2008; Antony et al., 2012; Pun et al., 2012). Consequently, the analyses on the moderating impact of the contextual factors have attempted to answer the research question about the moderating role of the contextual factors on organisational change implementation.

### 6.7 Summary of Hypotheses Tested

The chapter has presented the discussion of results for this study. The discussions were a clear reflection of the findings from the data collected. The chapter discussed the analysis of results obtained from the regression analysis including other relevant interpretation. Chapter three presented the hypotheses in the relationship between the variables considered in the study as illustrated in the conceptual model shown in Figure 3.13 showing the relationship of variables for organisational change implementation.

The analysis shows that individual readiness for change and the contextual factors were increasing the influence of organisational change implementation via their impact on the independent variables. For instance, individual readiness for change was found to
mediate the relationship between leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust thus increasing more of the impact of organisational change implementation. The results indicates that transformational leadership style and democratic leadership style were better increasing the level of individual readiness for change and are better impacting on organisational change implementation. However, a negative impact between transactional, laissez-faire and autocratic leadership styles and organisational change implementation were found in this study, meaning that their values do not support readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

Furthermore, the results show that group culture and developmental culture types were better influencing individual readiness for change and better impacting on organisational change implementation than rational and hierarchy culture types in this study. Technical skills and conceptual skills were also found to have a positive impact on individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation while interpersonal skills indicated a negative impact, and finally institutional trust was found to have a significant impact on readiness for change and organisational change implementation than interpersonal trust.

On the other hand, the finding shows that social norms are further influencing the relationship between transformational leadership style and democratic leadership style in order to increase the impact of organisational change implementation. Also, it was found that social norms is positively impacting on the relationship between group culture and developmental culture types in order to increase the impact of organisational change implementation. This means that a consistent emphasis on the values of transformational and democratic leadership styles, developmental and group culture types, technical and conceptual skills and institutional trust will consistently increase the impact of individual readiness change and further increase the capacity for organisational change implementation.

This study has shown that in order for organisations to better manage performance and implement change, individual readiness for change must be considered as a powerful indicator of overall performance. By measuring, tracking and seeking to increase the level of individual readiness for change, organisations can achieve substantial and sustainable capability to implement change effectively. Therefore, the current study proof that low levels of readiness for change amongst organisational members should
be a reason for major concern as it is the main mediator for performance and change implementation.

The findings of this study fill the gap in the literature which perceived the lack of empirical investigations, the increasing individual readiness for change in the relationship between leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust, as well as the social norms and departmental characteristics with organisational change implementation when leading better corporate change. Table 6.1 presents a summary of the tested hypotheses and related findings.

Table 6.1: Summary of Hypotheses Tested

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Hypotheses</th>
<th>Hypotheses Effect</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1 There is a relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1a Transformational leadership style will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b Transactional leadership style will have a lesser impact on organisational change implementation than transformational leadership style.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1c Democratic leadership style will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1d Autocratic leadership style will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1e Laissez-faire leadership style will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: There is a positive relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a Group culture type will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b Developmental culture type will be positively associated with organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2c Rational culture type will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2d Hierarchical culture type will be negatively associated with organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: There is a positive relationship between managerial skills and organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a</td>
<td>An emphasis on technical skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3b</td>
<td>An emphasis on conceptual skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3c</td>
<td>An emphasis on interpersonal skills will increase employee’s participation on organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: There is a significant positive relationship between organisational trust and organisational change implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4a</td>
<td>Interpersonal trust will positively influence organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4b</td>
<td>Institutional trust will positively influence organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>Individual readiness for change has a positive influence on the level of organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: The contextual factors will help increase the level of organisational change implementation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accepted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6a</td>
<td>Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between leadership and organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6b</td>
<td>Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between organisational culture and organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6c</td>
<td>Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between managerial skills and organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6d</td>
<td>Social norms have a contingent effect on the relationship between organisational trust and organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6e</td>
<td>Department/units’ characteristics are contingent on the relationship between readiness for change and organisational change implementation.</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The findings in this study have indicated that autocratic leadership style impacts negatively on the relationship between individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. Also, the evidence in the study suggests that transactional and laissez-faire leadership styles were not sufficiently contributing to
readiness for change and could not support organisational change implementation in this study. On the other hand, the findings have empirically indicated that rational and hierarchy culture types were not significantly contributing to individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation in study. In the same vein, interpersonal skills and interpersonal trust were not influencing the impact of change readiness and organisational change implementation. More so, a negative impact of the contextual factors on managerial skills and organisational trust was found in this study. Therefore, a modification of the proposed conceptual framework as illustrated in Figure 3.13 became necessary to empirically show the results of the data analysis and hypotheses testing. Thus, the revised conceptual framework presented in Figure 6.8 shows the empirical evidence of the findings from the study.

The findings of this study have contributed to the existing literature of organisational change management by developing and validating a novel conceptual framework for explaining the relationship among leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills and organisational trust, individual readiness for change and the contextual factors considered in this study to increase the impact of organisational change implementation.
Figure 6.8: Validated Framework for the Study
The validated framework shows the discussion of data analysis and results from the hypothesised direct positive influence of democratic and transformational leadership on organisational change implementation and readiness for change. The hypothesised direct positive impact of the contextual factors on democratic and transformational leadership has also been indicated. The analysis and discussion also show that group culture is directly influencing individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation in the NNPC. On the other hand, developmental culture is directly impacting organisational change implementation, which is further increased by the values of individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. The impact of the contextual factors on this relationship is also positive.

Furthermore, the framework shows the hypothesised direct and positive influence of technical and conceptual skills on individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. The influence of interpersonal and institutional trust on individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation is also indicated in the validated framework. The findings empirically show the direct influence of individual readiness for change on organisational change implementation with an increasing impact of leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust. Hence, the study contributes to the existing literature on change management by providing a more holistic viewpoint and empirical evidence of the underlying variables for leading organisational implementation through the influence of individual readiness for change and the contextual factors.

The study provides support for the argument of authors such as Jones et al. (2005) and Haffar et al. (2013) that individual readiness for change has a mediating impact on change implementation. More so, this study considers additional variables such as: leadership styles, dimensions of managerial skills, dimensions of organisational trust and the contextual factors considered in this study, and argue that their impact will increase more of individual readiness for change in order to impact more of organisational change implementation. This study aligns with the findings of many other studies such as Oakland and Tanner (2007) by attesting leadership as a key factor for increasing change readiness; Prajogo and McDermott (2011) by verifying the impact of the organisational culture types CVF on organisational change;
Tonidandel et al. (2012) by verifying the influence of managerial skills on change readiness and change implementation; Erturk (2008) by showing the link of organisational trust on change management.

The findings of the study have contributed to the literature with a better understanding that an increased level of individual readiness for change is better aligned with leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust, which in turn impact effectively on change implementation. Also, this study has contributed to the existing organisational change management literature that contextual factors such as social norms and department/units characteristics have a moderating impact on individual readiness for change in order to predict more of organisational change implementation. Therefore, the findings of this study have attempts to fill the gap in the literature caused by the lack of empirical investigations of the impact of leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills and organisational trust as an understanding, for increasing the level of individual readiness for change, and the impact of contextual factors on such relationships in order to change implementation. The study empirically highlights that in order to increase the impact of organisational change implementation, the NNPC will need to stick with transformational or democratic leadership styles, increase the values of group culture or developmental culture types and discard the values of hierarchy and rational cultures. Also the NNPC needs to put more emphasis on all the dimensions of managerial skills and organisational trust and align all variables to individual readiness for change so that change implementation can be more visible and acceptable.

6.8 Conclusion

The aim of this study is to find out factors that can help organisational change implementation, in relationship with leading change implementation in the NNPC. The study has presented and analysed factors such as leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills, organisational trust, individual readiness for change and some contextual factors to increase the understanding for organisational change implementation. This chapter has provided a detailed discussion of the findings and the hypotheses testing which shows the relationship of variables. Importantly, the hypotheses were discussed in line with the literature which clearly shows that leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills, organisational trust and the other
factors considered have a strong influence on individual readiness for change in order to impact more on change implementation in the NNPC.

The findings indicate that individual readiness for change is extremely critical in organisations because it mediates between leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills, organisational trust and organisational change implementation. The findings equally show that the contextual factors influence the relationship between leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills, individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

The study has developed and validated an innovative conceptual framework capable of increasing the understanding of factors that can help organisational implementation change effectively. The framework has indicated that leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust increase individual readiness for change which consequently impact on organisational change implementation. More so, the framework shows that social norms and departments/units characteristics are adding to the relationship to increase the impact of change readiness and change implementation. Therefore, the study originally affirms that the above factors are extremely critical for organisational change implementation.

The next chapter presents a summary of the entire thesis, implications and conclusions of the findings. The contributions of the study in theory and practice as well as limitations and possible future studies are also presented in the next chapter.
CHAPTER SEVEN

Contribution, Implications and Conclusion

7.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the conclusion of this study, its implications and possible areas of further research. As stated in chapter one above, the aim of this study is to find out factors that can help implement organisational change. Previous chapters have presented detailed literature that underpinned the research areas, and a conceptual framework was developed to guide the entire study. Also, previous chapters have presented data analysis and a discussion of the findings. This chapter presents a summary of the thesis especially the findings as presented in chapter six above. More so, this chapter summarises the theoretical contribution and innovation of the study particularly by closing the research gaps as identified in the study. The managerial and policy implications of this study are presented and discussed in this chapter, and finally the limitations of the study and suggestions for further study are presented.

7.2 Concluding the Study

This study has examined and considered factors that can help organisations implement change. The factors examined and explored are leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisation trust. Individual readiness for change was also explored to mediate the role of organisational change implementation. More so, the study explored some contextual factors which are social norms and employees and departments/units characteristics to moderate the relationship between leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust and organisational change implementation. The study also investigated the level of the ongoing change implementation in the NNPC in relation to the impact of the factors considered in the study.

A comprehensive literature review was conducted to link all critical areas underpinning the study, which was later integrated into a conceptual framework for the correct linking of all variables as well as guiding and understanding the study. Based on this, 6 major and 19 sub hypotheses were developed to address and examine
the relationship of all the variables in line with the research questions. The proposed conceptual framework showed the direct link of leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust on organisational change implementation. The framework also shows the link between individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. The influence of the relationship between leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust on individual readiness for change, as well as the impact of the contextual factors was demonstrated in the framework. In order to validate the framework, the influence of leadership styles, organisational culture types, dimensions of managerial skills and dimensions of organisational trust on individual readiness for change and on organisational change implementation was investigated. The impact of the contextual factors on organisational change implementation was also investigated in order to ascertain the strength of the relationships.

From the results, it was established that organisational change implementation has a significant association with individual readiness for change. More so, the results from the study show that individual readiness for change mediates leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust with organisational change implementation. In other words, leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills and organisational trust increase the level of individual readiness for change in order to effectively implement organisational change. Studies have found that democratic and transformational leadership styles increase organisational members readiness to participate in organisational change success (Herold, et al., 2008; Caldwell et al., 2009); developmental and group culture types associated with readiness for change (Jones, et al., 2005; Haffar et al., 2013); managerial skills increases the capacity for change readiness (Parente et al., 2012; Yukl, 2013); and organisational trust impact on readiness for change (Ellonen et al., 2008; Neves and Caetano, 2009; Smollan, 2013), and were all contributing factors for organisational change implementation.

These findings were similar to the results found in the NNPC where democratic and transformational, developmental and group culture types, technical and conceptual skills as well as interpersonual trust positively influence individual readiness for change hence increase the impact of organisational change implementation. More so, the results indicated that social norms increase the strength of democratic/transformational
leadership styles in order to increase the influence of individual readiness for change to enable it contribute more to organisational change implementation. Again, social norms increase the strength of developmental and group culture types in order to increase the influence of individual readiness for change to contribute more to organisational change implementation. It was equally found that units/departments characteristics increase the relationship between individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation (Cunningham et al., 2002; Alas and Vadi 2006; Carlstrom and Ekman 2012; Yukl, 2013). On the other hand, transactional leadership, laissez-faire and autocratic leadership styles do not contribute to individual readiness for change and change implementation. Also, rational and hierarchy culture types contribute less to individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. However, there is a relatively low impact of interpersonal skills and interpersonal trust in this study as against the view that interpersonal skills are essential to influencing organisational members readiness for change in order to increase the level of participation in change implementation process (Yukl, 2013), and that interpersonal trust is used to increase employees’ integrity, character, ability to conform to work situation and trustworthiness or responsibility, especially in times of change implementation (Vanhala and Ahteela, 2011).

Therefore, the results found in this study indicate that organisations dominated by democratic and transformational leadership styles, developmental and group culture types, technical and conceptual skills and institutional trust will increase the level of individual readiness for change in order to increase the acceptability and capacity for organisational change implementation. This indicates that organisational members are likely to have a higher level of readiness for change and contribute more to change implementation when they recognise that their organisational leadership structure is predominantly dominated with democratic and transformational leadership values, characterised with developmental and group culture types. Furthermore, organisational members are more likely to have a higher level of readiness for change when they are satisfied that they are better equipped with skills and specialist techniques as well as the general analytical ability for logical thinking that will enable them participate in change implementation programmes. These structures will enable organisational leaders enhance employees’ values for effective change implementation by increased motivation and adequately encourage them either by strengthening their
feelings and belief for driving change. This is in line with the findings of other studies which viewed that an increased capacity of employees with the norms for change readiness will trigger them psychologically to fully drive the change implementation process effectively (Yukongdi, 2004; Hold et al., 2007).

The findings of this study have supported the perception that organisations that value a collaborative work environment, consistency, employee involvement in work situations, creativity, commitment, flexibility, a more democratic work structure with characteristics for constant change plus increased emphasis on the dimensions of managerial skills and organisational trust, are able to effectively implement change than organisations that do not pay attention to these essential values (Agle et al., 2006; Raoprasert and Islam, 2010; Erwin and German, 2010; Shah and Shah, 2010; Prajogo and McDermott, 2011; Rusly et al., 2012; Yukl, 2013). Furthermore, the findings have proven that social norms and units/departments characteristics are necessary for strengthening the relationship between democratic and transformational leadership styles, developmental and group culture types with individual readiness for change in order to contribute more to organisational change implementation.

7.3 Contribution to Knowledge

This study has contributed to the existing knowledge in several ways. In the first instance, the study expanded the existing literature of organisational change management by linking leadership styles, organisational culture type, dimensions of managerial skills and dimensions of organisational trust as a strategy necessary for understanding organisational change implementation. It makes empirical innovation in the field of this research area by bringing leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust into a theory for managing change implementation. Unlike other studies, the study went a step further to examine the mediation role of individual readiness for change as well as the moderating roles of contextual factors (social norms and units/departments characteristics) as measures for increasing the impact of organisational change implementation or aid the understanding of change management.

The study put together an integrated theoretical framework that combines the impact of all the variables that made up the entire study, the framework shows that leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust have an impact on
individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation. Also, individual readiness for change mediates the relationship between leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills, organisational trust and organisational change implementation. The framework equally shows the moderating effect of social norms and units/departments characteristics. This theoretical framework extends the contributions of other authors such as Armenakis and Harris (2002), Oakland and Tanner (2007) and Haffar et al. (2013) in relation to the impact of different leadership styles, organisational culture types and other variables when managing organisational change processes. The new innovative framework developed in this study goes further to add more related variables regarding their direct/indirect influence on change readiness and change implementation, and provides detailed explanations of the mechanism through which leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills and organisational trust influenced organisational change implementation through individual readiness for change.

Another significant innovation of this study is that it brings together mediating variable and moderating variables in one single framework to increase the understanding organisational change management and implementation. By validating the theoretical framework, the study makes a novel contribution to knowledge by giving a refined comprehension of the relationships between the independent variables, mediating variable, moderating variables and the dependent variable (outcome). Therefore, with this improved model for organisational change implementation, organisational leaders and managers can improve their efficacy and efficiently when engaged with change management and change implementation.

At this point, it is pertinent to state that this study is one of the studies that has empirically examined the influence of democratic and transformational leadership styles, developmental and group culture types, technical and conceptual skills and institutional trust on individual readiness for change alongside the impact of social norms and units/departments characteristics to holistically increase the perception for change implementation, rather than focusing on just a few factors when managing change and implementation.

Also, this study has further bridged the gap identified in the Table 2.5 above by using quantitative and statistical methods to provide evidence about factors that can increase
the level of organisational change implementation unlike studies can that mainly concentrate on qualitative method (Greaslet et al., 2009; Self and Schraeder et al., 2009). More so, as indicated in Table 2.5, Mueller et al.’s (2012) study explore methods and individual behaviour and commitment to organisational effectiveness, but could not identified skills that could help to aid such commitment. The current study has added dimensions of managerial skills that are critical for increasing individual commitment so as to increase the level of change implementation. In addition, the current study has identified that factors such as autocratic and laissez-faire leadership behaviour would cause potential change resistance in organisations dominated with group and developmental culture (Carlstrom and Ekman 2012), but established that democratic and transformational leadership behaviours are better aligned to organisations associated with group culture and developmental culture types.

Therefore, the study contributes to the existing literature on change management by providing empirical evidence leading to advancement in the understanding of the relationship between leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills, organisational trust and the contextual factors and their impact on individual readiness for change. This will enable organisations to improve their capacity for increasing the level of individual readiness for change and increasing organisational members’ competencies to drive, and participate adequately towards change implementation processes.

Finally, the study contributes to knowledge in the Nigerian context of organisational change implementation, as it is the first to examine the relationship between leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills and organisational trust as well as the contextual factors with individual readiness for change as factors to help increase the level of organisational change implementation. Thus, this study makes a large impact for understanding the implications of change management and change implementation not only in the NNPC, but in other organisations in the developing nations. So, the study contributes to the literature of organisational change management particularly in the Nigeria oil and gas industry. Importantly, the study has provided the NNPC management board with useful information of better understanding on how to engage organisational members when implementing change programmes.
7.4 Implications of the Study

The results of this study offer several useful implications for researchers and practitioners by highlighting the importance of supportive leadership styles, organisational culture types, managerial skills and organisational trust and the need to increase the level of individual readiness for change in order to implement change effectively.

The findings of the study show that individual readiness for change is directly impacting on organisational change implementation. It shows that members of organisation who felt negative about change implementation reported lower level of organisational change implementation. But, organisational members who have positive concern about change implementation show higher level of participation and are likely to support organisational change implementation.

The results of the study shows that managers who associated with autocratic and laissez-faire leadership styles will reduce organisational member’s readiness for change therefore increase resistance for change implementation. Also, the findings show that leaders with transactional leadership style were not significantly impacting on individual readiness change but they are causing negative effect on change implementation. This findings show that organisational leaders who adopt transactional leadership style will reduce people level of change contribution and participation. Therefore, the presence of transactional leadership style in the NNPC is responsible for the low impact of change implementation as a result it needs to be discouraged.

The findings show that organisational leaders who are associated with the values of democratic and transformational leadership styles are better increasing member’s readiness for change and contributing more towards change implementation. It concludes that the characteristics of democratic and transformational leadership styles are better associated with high level of individual readiness for change and such organisational members are better engaged effectively in change implementation process. This furthermore shows that democratic and transformational leadership styles are better providing organisational members with a friendly environment necessary for increasing the impact of change implementation, because both
leadership styles better inspires, motivates, stimulates and encourage organisational member to actively involve in change implementation.

The findings from the study equally show that the characteristics of hierarchy and rational culture types were linked to low level of individual readiness for change and were contributing less to change implementation in the NNPC, while group and developmental culture types are found to have a significant positive impact on individual readiness for change and are better supporting organisational change implementation. It was found that hierarchy culture type negatively influencing organisational change implementation. However, the study found that the values of hierarchy culture are the dominant organisational type in the NNPC, indicating that hierarchy culture is overemphasised in the NNPC. This further shows that high level of hierarchy culture type in the NNPC is one of the reasons why the level of individual readiness for change is low, consequently causing low level of organisational change implementation. So, the findings showed that the dominant organisational culture type in the NNPC such as hierarchy culture is a major hindrance and reducing change implementation in the NNPC.

The findings indicated that the value of interpersonal skills is low in the NNPC therefore negatively impacting on the level of individual readiness for change, and is not contributing to change implementation in The NNPC. However, technical and conceptual skills were positively influencing the level of individual readiness for change and are impacting on change implementation. It concludes that the low level of interpersonal skills is a major factor causing low level of individual readiness for change in the organisation. This shows that the value and characteristics of interpersonal skills are not emphasised in the NNPC, therefore not impacting on change implementation, compared to the high level of technical skills and conceptual skills.

The findings equally indicated a low level of interpersonal trust in the NNPC which shown to be one of the causes of low level of individual readiness for change and change implementation. However, the findings indicated a positive impact of institutional trust on readiness for change and organisational change implementation. This means that the values and characteristics of interpersonal trust are not regarded
and valued in the NNPC, therefore militating against individual readiness for change and change implementation.

Therefore, this study concludes that members in the NNPC who rate their leaders high in transactional, laissez-faire and autocratic leadership behaviour rather than democratic and transformational leadership are less enthusiastic about change implementation. Similarly, those who rate their organisational culture high in hierarchy and rational culture rather than developmental and group culture types are not keen about the organisational culture type capable of leading change implementation. Also, members of the NNPC who have low capacity of interpersonal skills feel that the NNPC has not pay much attention to the importance and values of interpersonal skills and may not properly engage his/her self in change implementation.

Similarly, members of the NNPC who perceived low level of interpersonal trust will feel that the NNPC policy framework is not supporting such values. In addition, the negative moderation of social norms on interpersonal skills and interpersonal trust in this study further provide more evidence that the norms of interpersonal skills and interpersonal trust are not regarded in the NNPC.

Therefore, in order to increase the level of individual readiness for change and implement change effectively, the values of laissez-faire and autocratic and transactional leadership style as well as hierarchy and rational culture types must not be overemphasised, as is currently being practiced in the NNPC. The executive management board and leaders of the NNPC need to understand that adhering to a transactional style will not make them change, rather it will continue to keep them where they are. A continue adherence to values of hierarchy culture type (more authoritative in nature) and the rational culture type (which focuses more on short-term performance) would not contribute to effective change implementation, but the NNPC leaders must understand that the desire for effective change implementation requires an increasing level of individual readiness for change which requires more presence of transformational and democratic leadership styles, group and developmental culture types, high level of managerial skills and high level of organisational trust.
The findings in this study demonstrate that a higher regard for democratic or transformation styles will better encourage all members of the organisation to involve in change implementation. Also, the study emphasis that a consistent increase of the characteristics of the developmental and group culture types would encourage teamwork, commitment and innovative working environment necessary for increasing the level of change implementation. On the other hand, the values of interpersonal skills and interpersonal trust must be emphasized as well to enable organisational members to play critical roles relating to problem solving and change implementation practices.

Furthermore, leaders in the NNPC need to increase the value of the contextual factors, because they enable members of the organisation to stick to the behaviours and cues for effective change implementation, constantly informing people about common objectives, the need to be innovative, creative and give assistance, all of which are necessary for change implementation. This study believes that if organisational leaders satisfactorily consider all these variables the level of individual readiness for change will increase and consequently lead to effective change implementation. Also, an increase in individual readiness for change will enable organisational members to develop an individual positive attitude towards organisational change implementation. Therefore, increasing the level of individual readiness for change will enable the NNPC to focus on long-term change rather than just short-term change achievement and consistently implement change.

The discussion from the implications and the results contained in the validated conceptual framework in Figure 6.8 suggests possible guidelines for managerial/organisational practice in the sense of effective change implementation. For instance, the outcome of this study has clearly indicated that organisations such as the NNPC must emphasis very strongly on the need to increase the levels of individual readiness for change, and this must be done by adopting and increasing the values of transformational and democratic leadership styles, group and developmental culture, the dimension of managerial skills and the dimensions of organisational trust. Importantly, the police statement of such organisations must ensure that the norms of such factors are adequately increased and practiced. On the other hand, managers and practitioners must ensure that the values of autocratic, laissez-faire and transformational leadership styles as well as the values of hierarchy and rational
culture types must be disregarded in managerial process and when change implementation programmes are introduced. The outcome of this study has clearly shown that the presence of transformational, laissez-faire and autocratic leadership styles as well as hierarchy and rational culture types are the key cause of change implementation failure in the NNPC, hence needs to be strongly ignored.

7.5 Recommendations

The results from this study indicated that the low level of interpersonal skills and interpersonal trust are contributing factors for the low level of change implementation in the NNPC, therefore, the study recommends that in order to stimulate the levels of value of interpersonal skills, the NNPC leadership will need to focus on increasing the elements of interpersonal skills. This must be done by consistent emphasis on training and capacity building to improve employees’ knowledge about accepting social behaviour, so that members of the organisation can actively participate in change implementation effectively. Such training must focus on increasing the characteristics of interpersonal skills such as: problem solving, social awareness, self-management, responsibility and accountability, assertiveness, the ability to handle situations effectively as well as communicating and listening skills.

On the aspect of problem solving, the training should focus on key insights of successful problem solving which are capable of identifying the exact root cause of problems, understanding the problem, examining possible ways of finding solutions and setting up strategic objectives to resolve the problem and putting up effective plans into place to monitor the progress of solving the problem. On social awareness; training should focus on the ability to being in tune to others’ emotions such as being able to identify key attributes of people and explore their opportunities as a strategy to increase their change readiness and overall organisational change implementation.

Experts believe that self-management is a fundamental aspect for leadership success (Haro and Turgut; Yukl, 2013), therefore the training on self-management should focus on the ability for people to control their emotions when they find themselves not in alignment with what would be considered appropriate behaviour in a given situation, such as controlling hanger and frustration but exudes calmness and to remain focused. Training on responsibility and accountability should be in line with the indicators of maturity on the job, either by understanding ways of responding
situations especially when mistakes in the change implementation process are made. People should be helped to understand that it is important for them to stand up in what they believe, defend their opinions and ideas, be confident in their selflessness and instruct other members of the organisation on what is needed to be done. Training for communication skills is very necessary as will it enable change implementation personnel to effect communication with clarity and speak effectively. There is a need to be thoughtful when engaged in conversations that involve change implementation processes. More so, body language and expressions are attitudes that need to be taken into consideration. One of the elements of interpersonal skills is the ability to listen effectively. An increase in this element would enable leaders do more listening rather than doing more talking. The best leaders are proactive and intuitive listeners, they recognised that knowledge is not gained by doing all the talking (Yukl, 2013). Therefore, consistent training on communication and listening skills will help increase interpersonal skills with an element capable of increasing the level of individual readiness and change implementation.

The finding from the study also indicates that a low level of interpersonal trust was responsible for change implementation failure in the NNPC. The results from the finding suggest the values of interpersonal trust in the NNPC are relatively low, hence the study recommends a considerable increase of the key values and characteristics of interpersonal trust such as to ensure integrity, concern for welfare, and fairness in dealing with co-workers and ensuring that key knowledge about the job are emphasised. Doing so will help strengthen the levels of individual readiness for change and change implementation. This study believes that if integrity, fairness and concern for welfare are increased and emphasised it will reinforce the dynamics of the managerial relationship on the basis of enhancing the levels of individual readiness for change and change implementation. The study recommends that a strong adherence to interpersonal trust will determine a good work relationship geared towards achieving the common objective of the organisation as well to strengthen the individual and collective desire to increase performance and accomplish change implementation.

The assurances of all these will lead to a reinforcement of employee’s feelings about their self-effectiveness and courage for readiness for change with the capacity to effectively implement change. Again, this will lead to the employees’ sense of feeling valued in a time of decision making capable of leading to change implementation.
Importantly, leaders in the NNPC must equally continue to motivate employees by providing a fair incentive and reward to those who participate effectively in the change implementation process. This will increase their feeling, personal benefits and belief of fairness as part of their gain in their effort to effectively implement change.

It is extremely important that the NNPC state very clearly the requirements it needs for effective change in its policy statements by employing the issues explored in this study. If this is clearly documented and implemented, employees in the NNPC will be psychologically ready to participate in change implementation processes. More so, the leaders in the organisation need to involve everyone in the change implementation programmes to enable them understand critical process and stages of change implementation. This will, to a large extent, enable the employees to understand the criticalities for change implementation and reduce the likelihood for change resistance.

So, by constant emphasis on the characteristics of democratic and transformational leadership styles, developmental and group culture values, emphasising on managerial skills and organisational trust, the members of the NNPC will likely be psychologically ready and increase the willingness for change implementation. This means that such characteristics and values would create a working environment that will support the improvement of individual employees’ attitudes and efforts towards change implementation. Creating such a supportive environment would minimise the need for change resistance but promote the need for individuals to increase their readiness for change and implement change effectively. If organisational leaders provide an environment that increases subordinates’ readiness for change, their attitude towards effective participation for change implementation will be high.

As stated earlier, the findings and implications in this study are not only narrow to the NNPC or organisations in the Nigerian oil and gas industry, the results could as well be applied to organisations in other sectors such as manufacturing, servicing, banking and health sectors. This study strongly believes that if the findings of this study are considered and carefully thought will help organisations implement change effectively. In line with the endorsement of this study by NNPC management, this recommendation will make a huge impact, as it will form part of the NNPC strategy for effective change implementation.
In summary, this study emphasised that in order to achieve effective organisational change implementation, organisational managers/leaders and practitioners must be consistent with the norms and values of transformational and democratic leadership styles, group and development culture types, be consistent with the dimensions and characteristics of managerial skills and organisational trust as well the characteristics of departmental characteristics as a model for increasing the understanding and levels of individual readiness for change and organisational change implementation.

7.6 Limitations and Further Studies

In common with other studies, this study has also attempted to advance research on the investigation of factors that can help organisational change implementation. However, this current study is faced with some shortcomings which can be avenues for future potential studies. Apart from attempting to identify factors that can help organisations implement change, this study believes that further research is needed into exploring more variables for enhancing organisational change implementation such as; knowledge management, models for communication skills, models for innovation and technology in order to improve and expand the strategy for enabling organisational change implementation, so that organisational leaders would have more understanding of the priorities their organisations needs for implementing change.

As stated in section 5.7 above, this study could not adopt the use of Structural Equation Modelling (SEM), because the sample size was not large enough to warrant the use of SEM. SEM requires a large sample technique which requires usually N > 200; preferable no less than 400 hence, this study recommends that future research adopts SEM with bigger sample size and higher number of responses from the participants. More so, this study is not longitudinal in design because the researcher used a cross-sectional research design, which restricted the researcher’s ability to tackle or refer to the change or development of the phenomenon under study. Hence, this study recommends that future studies use the longitudinal research design in order to be able to study the possible change and development of a phenomenon and the relationship between the variables of this study over a period.
7.7 Conclusion

This study has explored and uncovered substantial factors that can help organisations implement change. The theoretical contribution and practical implications of the study have been highlighted. The study makes a strong case that when organisations are willing to change and remain competitive there is a need to increase the level of individual readiness for change by considering democratic or transformational leadership styles in order to ensure that organisational members play an active role in the change process. More so, the study affirmed that developmental and group culture types are the preferred organisational culture types that will increase the organisational environment for participation. This study equally argued that the dimensions of managerial skills and organisational trust must be adequately considered in order to give people the required skills and capacity, as well as a more friendly business environment for increasing the scope for change implementation. Finally, the study added that, social norms and units/departments’ characteristics are fundamental factors for increasing the responsiveness for effective change. The study also highlighted the limitations of the research as well as the directions for further studies in order to advance the understanding of the relationship of variables for organisational change implementation.

The study was divided into seven chapters which made up the entire thesis. The first chapter introduced the aim and objectives of the study and an overview of the research problem which helped to give the reader an understanding of the purpose of the study. The second chapter provided a comprehensive literature review in the fields of organisational change, individual readiness for change, leadership, organisational culture, managerial skills, organisational trust and contextual factors such as: social norms and units/departments characteristics, their relationship and the research gap in the area of organisational change implementation. The third chapter brought out the understanding of the relationship between variables by presenting a conceptual framework that offered a better explanation of the identified variables in the study.

The fourth chapter identified and justified the research philosophy and research approach that guided the entire study. More so, the method for data collection was clearly stated in the chapter as well as the scale for data collection. Relevant tools for analysing the data for the study were equally justified. The fifth chapter presented a
detailed discussion of the analysis of the data collected. Also, the proposed conceptual framework and hypotheses were tested and the findings reported. The sixth chapter presented more detailed discussion of the results in chapter five in relation to the literature provided and finally chapter seven summarised the entire thesis by stating the contributions to knowledge as well as managerial implications of the study. The researcher is optimistic that this study has attempted to reduce the existing knowledge gap in the management of organisational change implementation.
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Appendices
Appendix 1: An introductory Letter of Research into the NNPC

NNPC

INTERNAL MEMORANDUM

To: MD, PHRC
From: GGM, HR

Ref: GGM/HR/06
Date: 23 October 2012

RESEARCH ON CORPORATE CULTURE – MR LAGUO GILBERT LIVINGSTONE

We are glad to introduce Mr. Laguo Gilbert Livingstone, a PhD student at the Glamorgan University, UK, who is conducting a research titled “Leading Corporate Culture for Better Organizational Performance: A Study of the Transformational Agenda at the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC)".

The research is endorsed by Management and its outcome will form part of corporate resources for the delivery of the Transformation Initiatives across the business.

In this regard, we request that you kindly permit the researcher to conduct his research in your SBU and provide him any assistance he may require to ensure a successful study.

Best regards,

[Signature]

Chris Osarumwense.
Appendix 2: NNPC Structure
Appendix 3: Survey Questionnaire

February,

2014

‘Leading Corporate Culture for better Organisational Performance: a Study of the Organisational Change Agenda at the Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC)’

Dear Sir/Madam,

This questionnaire is part of the primary data collection of my PhD research at the University of South Wales. The study will help collect data from various business units across different sections in your organisation. The aim of this research is to explore how NNPC can increase its capacity to implement the proposed change.

I would be grateful if you would kindly complete the attached questionnaire and return it to the office of the GGM business and development by Monday 21st February 2014. All information provided will be treated in the strictest confidence. In addition, I would like to assure you that completed questionnaires cannot be traced to respondent as responses will be assigned a sequential number and only the aggregated results will be reported for the purpose of this research.

Thank you for taking time to participate in this research.
I look forward to receiving your response.

Laguo Livingstone Gilbert
Room H327
PhD Research Student
Faculty of Business & Society
University of South Wales
Tel:(01443) 482756
Mobile: +447501070231
Email: laguo.gilbert@southwales.ac.uk
DEMographic Information

Please answer the questions in the space provided

1. Job title/function…………………………………………………………………

2. Department/Units…………………………………………………………………

3. Qualification: HND [ ], BSc [ ], MSc [ ], MPhil [ ] PhD [ ] Professional qualification [ ]

4. Gender: Male [ ] Female [ ]

5. Age: …………………………………………………………………………………

6. Years of experience in the organisation…………………………………………

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please mark [x] in the box that most closely corresponds with how you perceive your organisation.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am optimistic that the current change is being implemented effectively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I feel uncertain that the current change will be effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I believe that everyone is happy with the current change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I am working hard to make sure that the current change is effective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I think the current change does not seem to go well effectively</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I think that the organisation will benefit from the current change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I have the skills that are needed to make the current change effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I do not anticipate any problems adjusting to the work that I have with implementing the change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I believe that the current change matches my priorities in this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Our organisation’s top decision makers have put all their support behind the implementation of the change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I feel that our organisation’s group managing director is committed to the current change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Management made it clear about implementing the current change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I have the necessary training that are needed to implement the current change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I do not feel that the current change has disrupted my personal work-related relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I think that there are legitimate reasons for us to implement the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Our leaders allocate reasonable time and resources for teaching and coaching their subordinates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Our leaders do not see what is good for the future of this organisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Our leaders discuss in specific terms on individual responsibility to achieve objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Our leaders are enthusiastic about what is needed to be accomplished.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Our leaders ensure that standards are met at all time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Our leaders emphasize the importance of collective decision-making for implementing the current change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Our leaders do not support employees to get the best out of them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Our leaders often increase the willingness to try harder towards implementing the current change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Leaders emphasize the importance of having a collective sense of mission.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Leaders express satisfaction when employees meet expectations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Leaders express confident that goals will be achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Subordinates voices are not consider during decision making process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Leader’s decision is always considers as the final decision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Leaders delay responding to urgent questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Leaders dominate team-members unilaterally to achieve singular objective.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Leaders maintain servant-master relationships with subordinates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Leaders wait for things to go wrong before taking action.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Leaders avoid getting involved when important issues arise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Leaders are absent when needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Leaders do not provide assistance when needed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The glue that holds this organisation together can be described as loyalty and commitment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Our organisation is generally considered as result-oriented place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The management approach in our organisation is not result oriented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Our organisation is highly competitive.
8 Our success is defined on the bases of winning in the marketplace.
9 This organisation is perceived as dynamic and entrepreneurial where people are willing to take risks.
10 The leaders in this organisation are not innovative.
11 Success is defined based on interventions and innovativeness.
12 Emphases are placed on acquiring new resources and creating new challenges.
13 This organisation is highly controlled and structured environment.
14 Management style is characterised by security of employment and stability.
15 Members of this organisation seem not to formally adhere to rules and policies.
16 The organisation maintains a high standard of business operation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Management plan in detail on how to accomplish task of the current change.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Inadequate plans to check work progress against the current change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Management organise and co-ordinate work activities to avoid delays and waste resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Management clearly explain expected results from the current change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Management provide encouragement and support when employee have difficult task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Inadequate opportunities to develop subordinates skills towards implementing the current change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Management express confidence on the ability to carry out a difficult task.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Managers do not back team members and support them in difficult situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Management proposes creative ideas for improving services and processes that will lead to implement the current change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>There is generally lack of confident when proposing change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Management describe a clear and appealing vision of what the organisation can accomplish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>There is lack of negotiation with people outside the work unit to get necessary support to implement the current change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Integrity is a key value in the operations among employees in this organisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The employees in this organisation are not concern about my welfare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employees have the required knowledge on what they do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Employees are not fair when dealing with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel fine working in this organisation since it generally fulfils its agreement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I am not aware of the strategy of the current change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Our data systems support our operations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>This organisation seems not to be technologically competent.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>This organisation encourages me to be myself.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I do not understand what I need to do in order to contribute to the current change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The things that are important to this organisation are important to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The current change will not contribute to this organisation’s ultimate purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I have the information I need to do a good job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>It is always difficult to talk with someone at work when I have a work-related problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>This organisation has adequate mechanisms for binding itself together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I understand my boss’s efforts to influence me and members of my team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The size of this department can cope with the current change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>There is lack of delegation and empowerment in our department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>People’s attitude towards the current change is considerably high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>There is lacks of inter and intra departmental coordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please use the space provided below to give any additional information you feel might benefit the conduct of this study.

......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................
......................................................................................................................................................

Thank You
Appendix 4: Results for the Correlation Analysis

A: Correlation between Leadership, Change Readiness and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TFL</th>
<th>TSL</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>LFL</th>
<th>IRFC</th>
<th>OCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSL</td>
<td>.833*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>.733*</td>
<td>.846*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>-.561*</td>
<td>-.671*</td>
<td>-.634*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFL</td>
<td>.506*</td>
<td>.555*</td>
<td>.565*</td>
<td>-.417*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRFC</td>
<td>.750*</td>
<td>.827*</td>
<td>.802*</td>
<td>-.635*</td>
<td>.512*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI</td>
<td>.701*</td>
<td>.726*</td>
<td>.743*</td>
<td>-.601*</td>
<td>.512*</td>
<td>.804*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

B: Correlation between Culture Types, Change Readiness and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>IFRC</th>
<th>OCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.291*</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>.334*</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.491*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td>.330*</td>
<td>-.184*</td>
<td>.387*</td>
<td>.584*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI</td>
<td>.352*</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>.424*</td>
<td>.561*</td>
<td>.807*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).
C: Correlation between Skills, Change Readiness and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Technical Skills</th>
<th>Conceptual Skills</th>
<th>Interpersonal Skills</th>
<th>IFRC</th>
<th>OCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical Skills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual Skills</td>
<td>.823**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Skills</td>
<td>-.802**</td>
<td>-.806**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRFC</td>
<td>.720**</td>
<td>.731**</td>
<td>-.723**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI</td>
<td>.702**</td>
<td>.968**</td>
<td>-.676**</td>
<td>.807**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

D: Correlation between Trust, Change Readiness and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interpersonal Trust</th>
<th>Institutional Trust</th>
<th>IRFC</th>
<th>OCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Trust</td>
<td>.983**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRFC</td>
<td>.750**</td>
<td>.750**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI</td>
<td>.658**</td>
<td>.671**</td>
<td>.834**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

E: Correlation between Contextual Factors, Change Readiness and Change Implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Social Norms</th>
<th>Dept/Units Characteristics</th>
<th>IRFC</th>
<th>OCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Norms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept/Units Characteristics</td>
<td>.725**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRFC</td>
<td>.811**</td>
<td>.642**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCI</td>
<td>.737**</td>
<td>.600**</td>
<td>.807**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).
### F: Correlation between Contextual Factors and Leadership Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TFL</th>
<th>TSL</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>AL</th>
<th>LFL</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>DUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSL</td>
<td>.833**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>.733**</td>
<td>.846**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AL</td>
<td>-.561**</td>
<td>-.671**</td>
<td>-.634**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LFL</td>
<td>.506**</td>
<td>.555**</td>
<td>.565**-</td>
<td>.417**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>.680**</td>
<td>.747**</td>
<td>.757**-</td>
<td>-.596**</td>
<td>-.621**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUC</td>
<td>.538**</td>
<td>.620**</td>
<td>.648**-</td>
<td>-.509**</td>
<td>-.518**</td>
<td>.725**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).**

### G: Correlation between Contextual Factors and Organisational Culture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>UDC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DC</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.291**</td>
<td>-.114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>.334**</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.491**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>.355**</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.477**</td>
<td>.634**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDC</td>
<td>.326**</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.301**</td>
<td>.557**</td>
<td>.725**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).**

### H: Correlation between Contextual Factors and Managerial Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TS</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>IS</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>DUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>.823**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>-.802**</td>
<td>-.806**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>.760**</td>
<td>.776**</td>
<td>-.825**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUC</td>
<td>.628**</td>
<td>.653**</td>
<td>-.704**</td>
<td>.725**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).**
I: Correlation between Contextual and Organisational Trust

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>ITT</th>
<th>SN</th>
<th>DUC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT</td>
<td>.980**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN</td>
<td>.790**</td>
<td>.784**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUC</td>
<td>.727**</td>
<td>.734**</td>
<td>.725**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Appendix 5: Regression Analysis Results for Mediation Analysis

A. Regression Results Showing the Relationship Between Leadership styles, Individual Readiness for Change and Effective Organisational Change Implementation

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.845a</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>.53081304</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), IRFC, Laissez fair, Autocratic, Transformation, Democratic, Transactional

b. Dependent Variable: Effective Organisational Change

**ANOVA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>91.253</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.209</td>
<td>53.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>36.629</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>.282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>127.882</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effective Organisational Change

b. Predictors: (Constant), IRFC, Laissez fair, Autocratic, Transformation, Democratic, Transactional
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.816</td>
<td>.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>2.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional</td>
<td>-.116</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>-1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>1.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>-.051</td>
<td>-.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laissez faire</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRFC</td>
<td>.561</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.574</td>
<td>5.838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effective Organisational Change

B. Regression Results Showing the Relationship between Organisational Culture, Individual Readiness for Change and Effective Organisational Change Implementation.

| Model Summaryb |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
| 1 | .847a | .718 | .708 | .54188959 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), IRFC, Developmental, Group, Rational, Hierarchy
b. Dependent Variable: Effective Organisational Change

| ANOVAa |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Model | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig |
| Regression | 102.399 | 5 | 20.480 | 69.744 | .000 |
| 1 | Residual | 40.229 | 137 | .294 |
| Total | 142.629 | 142 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Hierarchy, Developmental, Group, Rational
b. Dependent Variable: Effective Organisational Change
Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.611</td>
<td>.542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>1.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>1.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>1.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.772</td>
<td>13.327</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effective Organisational Change

C. Regression Results Showing the Relationship between Managerial Skills, Individual Readiness for Change and Effective Organisational Change Implementation.

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.844</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.704</td>
<td>.54483787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), IRFC, Technical Skills, Interpersonal Skills, Conceptual Skills
b. Dependent Variable: Effective Organisational Change

ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>108.032</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27.008</td>
<td>90.982</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.637</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>151.669</td>
<td>151</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Effective Organisational Change
b. Predictors: (Constant), IRFC, Technical Skills, Interpersonal Skills, Conceptual Skills
### D. Regression Results Showing the Relationship between Managerial Skills, Individual Readiness for Change and Effective Organisational Change Implementation.

#### Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.839(^a)</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td>.55138694</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a.** Predictors: (Constant), IRFC, Interpersonal Trust, Institutional Trust

**b.** Dependent Variable: Effective Organisational Change

#### ANOVA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>105.272</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.091</td>
<td>115.419</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>44.388</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>149.660</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a.** Dependent Variable: Effective Organisational Change

**b.** Predictors: (Constant), IRFC, Interpersonal Trust, Institutional Trust

#### Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.608</td>
<td>.544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Trust</td>
<td>-.327</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>-.327</td>
<td>-1.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Trust</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.419</td>
<td>1.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRFC</td>
<td>.782</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td>11.161</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a.** Dependent Variable: Effective Organisational Change
Appendix 6: Moderation Regression Analysis

5a: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Transformational Leadership and Effective Organisational Change Implementation

Run MATRIX procedure:

****************** PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Release 2.11 ******************
Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D.  www.afhayes.com
**************************************************************************
Model = 1
Y = EOCI
X = TFL
M = Social N
Sample size
167

Outcome: EOCI
Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.7335</td>
<td>.5381</td>
<td>100.8467</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>163.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>.0388</td>
<td>.0547</td>
<td>.7091</td>
<td>.4793</td>
<td>- .0692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social N</td>
<td>.0071</td>
<td>.0557</td>
<td>.1280</td>
<td>.8983</td>
<td>-.1028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFL</td>
<td>.6214</td>
<td>.0764</td>
<td>8.1373</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.4706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int_1</td>
<td>.1101</td>
<td>.0403</td>
<td>2.7352</td>
<td>.0069</td>
<td>.0306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interactions:

int_1 TFL X Social N

Conditional effect of X on Y at values of the moderator(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social N</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.0579</td>
<td>.5049</td>
<td>.1119</td>
<td>4.5099</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.2838</td>
<td>.7259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.6214</td>
<td>.0764</td>
<td>8.1373</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.4706</td>
<td>.7721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0579</td>
<td>.7378</td>
<td>.0525</td>
<td>14.0508</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.6341</td>
<td>.8415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values for quantitative moderators are the mean and plus/minus one SD from mean.
Values for dichotomous moderators are the two values of the moderator.

5b: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Democratic Leadership and Effective Organisational Change Implementation

Run MATRIX procedure:

****************** PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Release 2.11 ******************
Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D.  www.afhayes.com
**************************************************************************
Model = 1
Y = EOCI
X = DL
M = Interact
Sample size
169
Outcome: EOCI

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.7534</td>
<td>.5676</td>
<td>79.3747</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>165.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>.0091</td>
<td>.0520</td>
<td>.1741</td>
<td>.8620</td>
<td>-.0936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact</td>
<td>-.1362</td>
<td>.0464</td>
<td>-2.9332</td>
<td>.0038</td>
<td>-.2279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL</td>
<td>.6682</td>
<td>.0756</td>
<td>8.8431</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.5190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int_1</td>
<td>.0814</td>
<td>.0415</td>
<td>1.9639</td>
<td>.0512</td>
<td>-.0004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interactions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>int_1</th>
<th>DL</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Interact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Conditional effect of X on Y at values of the moderator(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interact</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.9831</td>
<td>.5981</td>
<td>.1084</td>
<td>5.4235</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.3740</td>
<td>.8022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.6682</td>
<td>.0756</td>
<td>8.8431</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.5190</td>
<td>.8174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9831</td>
<td>.7483</td>
<td>.0546</td>
<td>13.6989</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.6404</td>
<td>.8561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values for quantitative moderators are the mean and plus/minus one SD from mean.
Values for dichotomous moderators are the two values of the moderator.

5c: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Democratic Leadership and Individual Readiness for Change

Run MATRIX procedure:

******************* PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Release 2.11 *******************

Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D.  www.afhayes.com
Documentation available in Hayes (2013).
www.guilford.com/p/hayes3

*****

Model = 1
Y = IRFC
X = DL
M = Interact

Sample size
153

*****

Outcome: IRFC

Model Summary
Outcome: EOCI

5d: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Group Culture and Effective Organisational Change Implementation
Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Group Culture and Individual Readiness for Change

Run MATRIX procedure:

****************** PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Release 2.11 ********************

Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D.       www.afhayes.com
Documentation available in Hayes (2013).
www.guilford.com/p/hayes3

#########################################################
#
# Outcome: IRFC
#
# Model Summary
#
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.5770</td>
<td>.3329</td>
<td>26.5697</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>135.000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
#
Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.0681</td>
<td>.0744</td>
<td>.9150</td>
<td>.3618</td>
<td>-.2153</td>
<td>.0791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.2150</td>
<td>.1052</td>
<td>-2.0435</td>
<td>.0429</td>
<td>-.4232</td>
<td>-.0069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.3462</td>
<td>.1027</td>
<td>3.3698</td>
<td>.0010</td>
<td>.1430</td>
<td>.5493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6657</td>
<td>.0886</td>
<td>7.5120</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.4905</td>
<td>.8410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interactions:

\[ \text{inter}_1 \quad \text{GC} \quad \text{X} \quad \text{Interact} \]

*****************************************************************************

****

Conditional effect of X on Y at values of the moderator(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interact</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.6895</td>
<td>-.1128</td>
<td>.1249</td>
<td>-.9037</td>
<td>.3678</td>
<td>-.3598</td>
<td>.1341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.3462</td>
<td>.1027</td>
<td>3.3698</td>
<td>.0010</td>
<td>.1430</td>
<td>.5493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.6895</td>
<td>.8052</td>
<td>.1139</td>
<td>7.0669</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.5798</td>
<td>1.0305</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values for quantitative moderators are the mean and plus/minus one SD from mean.
Values for dichotomous moderators are the two values of the moderator.

5e: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Developmental Culture and Effective Organisational Change Implementation

Run MATRIX procedure:

***************  PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Release 2.11
***************

Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D.  www.afhayes.com
Documentation available in Hayes (2013).
www.guilford.com/p/hayes3

*****************************************************************************

****

Model = 1
Y = EOCI
X = DC
M = Interact

Sample size
164

*****************************************************************************

****

Outcome: EOCI

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.4377</td>
<td>.1916</td>
<td>5.4046</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>160.0000</td>
<td>.0014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.0478</td>
<td>.0714</td>
<td>.6697</td>
<td>.5040</td>
<td>-.0932</td>
<td>.1889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.0766</td>
<td>.0870</td>
<td>-.8808</td>
<td>.3797</td>
<td>-.2484</td>
<td>.0952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.0022</td>
<td>.0792</td>
<td>-.0272</td>
<td>.9784</td>
<td>-.1585</td>
<td>.1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.2557</td>
<td>.0640</td>
<td>3.9951</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>.1293</td>
<td>.3822</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interactions:

int_1 DC X Interact
Conditional effect of X on Y at values of the moderator(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interact</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.0502</td>
<td>-.2707</td>
<td>.1059</td>
<td>-2.5571</td>
<td>.0115</td>
<td>-.4798</td>
<td>-.0616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.0022</td>
<td>.0792</td>
<td>-0.0272</td>
<td>.9784</td>
<td>-.1585</td>
<td>.1542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0502</td>
<td>.2664</td>
<td>.1018</td>
<td>2.6177</td>
<td>.0097</td>
<td>.0654</td>
<td>.4675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values for quantitative moderators are the mean and plus/minus one SD from mean.
Values for dichotomous moderators are the two values of the moderator.

Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Developmental Culture and Individual Readiness for Change

Run MATRIX procedure:

*************** PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Release 2.11
***************

Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D. www.afhayes.com
Documentation available in Hayes (2013).
www.guilford.com/p/hayes3

Model = 1
Y = IRFC
X = DC
M = Interact

Sample size
148

Outcome: IRFC

Interactions:

Conditional effect of X on Y at values of the moderator(s):
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interact</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.0418</td>
<td>-.4569</td>
<td>.1123</td>
<td>-4.0690</td>
<td>.0001</td>
<td>-.6789</td>
<td>-.2350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>-.1285</td>
<td>.0702</td>
<td>-1.8314</td>
<td>.0691</td>
<td>-.2673</td>
<td>.0102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0418</td>
<td>.1999</td>
<td>.0862</td>
<td>2.3177</td>
<td>.0219</td>
<td>.0294</td>
<td>.3703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values for quantitative moderators are the mean and plus/minus one SD from mean. Values for dichotomous moderators are the two values of the moderator.

**5f: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Rational Culture and Effective Organisational Change Implementation**

Run MATRIX procedure:

```
******************* PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Release 2.11
*******************

Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D.       www.afhayes.com
Documentation available in Hayes (2013).
www.guilford.com/p/hayes3

*******************

Model = 1
Y = EOCI
X = RC
M = Interact

Sample size
155

Outcome: EOCI

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.5264</td>
<td>.2770</td>
<td>39.0637</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>151.0000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>.0324</td>
<td>.0684</td>
<td>.4744</td>
<td>.6359</td>
<td>-.1027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact</td>
<td>.1050</td>
<td>.0594</td>
<td>1.7684</td>
<td>.0790</td>
<td>-.0123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.2036</td>
<td>.0609</td>
<td>3.3415</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.0832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int_1</td>
<td>.2673</td>
<td>.0352</td>
<td>7.5971</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interactions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>int_1</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Interact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Conditional effect of X on Y at values of the moderator(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interact</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.0101</td>
<td>-.0663</td>
<td>.0830</td>
<td>-.7991</td>
<td>.4255</td>
<td>-.2303</td>
<td>.0977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.2036</td>
<td>.0609</td>
<td>3.3415</td>
<td>.0011</td>
<td>.0832</td>
<td>.3240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0101</td>
<td>.4736</td>
<td>.0553</td>
<td>8.5597</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.3642</td>
<td>.5829</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Rational Culture and Individual Readiness for Change

Run MATRIX procedure:

******** PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Release 2.11 **********

Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D.       www.afhayes.com
Documentation available in Hayes (2013).
www.guilford.com/p/hayes3

******************************************************************************

Outcome: IRFC
Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.5525</td>
<td>.3053</td>
<td>34.2845</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>141.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>.0427</td>
<td>.0695</td>
<td>.6143</td>
<td>.5400</td>
<td>-.0947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact</td>
<td>.1089</td>
<td>.0640</td>
<td>1.7029</td>
<td>.0908</td>
<td>-.0175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.1573</td>
<td>.0690</td>
<td>2.2787</td>
<td>.0242</td>
<td>.0208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int_1</td>
<td>.2978</td>
<td>.0405</td>
<td>7.3529</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.2177</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interactions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>int_1</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Interact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Conditional effect of X on Y at values of the moderator(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interact</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1.0283</td>
<td>-.1490</td>
<td>.0961</td>
<td>-1.5497</td>
<td>.1234</td>
<td>-.3390</td>
<td>.0411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.1573</td>
<td>.0690</td>
<td>2.2787</td>
<td>.0242</td>
<td>.0208</td>
<td>.2937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0283</td>
<td>.4635</td>
<td>.0613</td>
<td>7.5588</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.3423</td>
<td>.5848</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values for quantitative moderators are the mean and plus/minus one SD from mean.
Values for dichotomous moderators are the two values of the moderator.
5g: Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Hierarchical Culture and Effective Organisational Change Implementation

Run MATRIX procedure:

********** PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Release 2.11 **********

Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D. www.afhayes.com

Model = 1
Y = EOCI
X = HC
M = Interact

Sample size
155

Outcome: EOCI

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.5773</td>
<td>.3333</td>
<td>22.2044</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>151.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>.0544</td>
<td>.0660</td>
<td>.824</td>
<td>.4111</td>
<td>-.0760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact</td>
<td>-.0769</td>
<td>.0718</td>
<td>-1.0705</td>
<td>.2861</td>
<td>-.2188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>.4503</td>
<td>.0739</td>
<td>6.0902</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.3042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int_1</td>
<td>.1246</td>
<td>.0522</td>
<td>2.3882</td>
<td>.0182</td>
<td>.0215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interactions:

| int_1   | HC    | X     | Interact|

Conditional effect of X on Y at values of the moderator(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interact</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.9349</td>
<td>.3338</td>
<td>.1042</td>
<td>3.2032</td>
<td>.0017</td>
<td>.1279</td>
<td>.5397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.4503</td>
<td>.0739</td>
<td>6.0902</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.3042</td>
<td>.5963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9349</td>
<td>.5667</td>
<td>.0695</td>
<td>8.1537</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.4294</td>
<td>.7041</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values for quantitative moderators are the mean and plus/minus one SD from mean.
Values for dichotomous moderators are the two values of the moderator.
Moderation Effect of Social Norms on Hierarchical Culture and Individual Readiness for Change

Run MATRIX procedure:

************ PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Release 2.11 ************

Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D.       www.afhayes.com
Documentation available in Hayes (2013).
www.guilford.com/p/hayes3

******************************************************************************
Model = 1
Y = IRFC
X = HC
M = Interact

Sample size
141

******************************************************************************

Outcome: IRFC

Model Summary
\[ R = 0.6259, R^2 = 0.3918, F = 25.1807, df1 = 3, df2 = 137, p = 0.0000 \]

Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>coeff</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>.0680</td>
<td>.0673</td>
<td>1.0105</td>
<td>.3140</td>
<td>-.0651</td>
<td>.2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interact</td>
<td>-.1029</td>
<td>.0794</td>
<td>-1.2947</td>
<td>.1976</td>
<td>-.2600</td>
<td>.0542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>.4854</td>
<td>.0701</td>
<td>6.9241</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.3468</td>
<td>.6240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>int_1</td>
<td>.1453</td>
<td>.0574</td>
<td>2.5321</td>
<td>.0125</td>
<td>.0318</td>
<td>.2588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interactions:

| int_1 | HC | X | Interact |

Conditional effect of X on Y at values of the moderator(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interact</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.9424</td>
<td>.3484</td>
<td>.1021</td>
<td>3.4133</td>
<td>.0008</td>
<td>.1466</td>
<td>.5503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.4854</td>
<td>.0701</td>
<td>6.9241</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.3468</td>
<td>.6240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.9424</td>
<td>.6224</td>
<td>.0725</td>
<td>8.5808</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.4790</td>
<td>.7658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values for quantitative moderators are the mean and plus/minus one SD from mean.
Values for dichotomous moderators are the two values of the moderator.
5h: Moderation Effect of Units/Dept Characteristics on and Individual Readiness for Change and Effective Organisational Change Implementation

Run MATRIX procedure:

************* PROCESS Procedure for SPSS Release 2.11 *************

Written by Andrew F. Hayes, Ph.D.       www.afhayes.com
Documentation available in Hayes (2013).
www.guilford.com/p/hayes3

Model = 1
Y = EOCI
X = IRFC
M = UDC_IRFC

Sample size
149

Outcome: EOCI

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R</th>
<th>R-sq</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.8400</td>
<td>.7056</td>
<td>110.6842</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>145.0000</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model coeff se t p  LLCI  ULCI
constant .0971 .0446 2.1783 .0310 .0090 .1852
UDC_IRFC .0379 .0590 .6415 .5222 -.0788 .1545
IRFC    .7719 .0520 14.8328 .0000 .6690 .8747
int_1   .0881 .0450 1.9574 .0522 -.0009 .1771

Interactions:

int_1   IRFC  X  UDC_IRFC

Conditional effect of X on Y at values of the moderator(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UDC_IRFC</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>LLCI</th>
<th>ULCI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.8686</td>
<td>.6953</td>
<td>.0782</td>
<td>8.8920</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.5408</td>
<td>.8499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.7719</td>
<td>.0520</td>
<td>14.8328</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.6690</td>
<td>.8747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.8686</td>
<td>.8484</td>
<td>.0486</td>
<td>17.4607</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.7524</td>
<td>.9445</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Values for quantitative moderators are the mean and plus/minus one SD from mean.
Values for dichotomous moderators are the two values of the moderator.