ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5 -20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

Resistance to change during uncertainty-perspective of Covid-19: An empirical investigation into resistance management in the healthcare organizations

Ali Ahmad[1+], Dababrata Chowdhury[2]

[1] Business and Enterprise, University of the West of Scotland, United Kingdom

[2] University of Suffolk, United Kingdom

Abstract: *Resistance to change is widely recognized as the main reason for failure when it comes to any kind of change initiative. Despite its importance, there is still rather limited knowledge concerning the factors that trigger this behavior in the workplace. The primary purpose of this research study is to uncover the reason behind the resistance to change during uncertainty (perspective of covid-19). A mixed methodology approach was used in this research study to identify the factors that facilitate resistance management in healthcare organizations in Bangladesh. Data collection was semi-structured interviews with purposive sampling to select respondents which included top executives, human resource managers, CEOs, and line managers. To create themes and sub-themes computer software NVIVO has been used and 10 total interviews were recorded by the software. Clustered probability sampling method has been carried out for the questionnaire survey and analyzed the data with computer software SPSS. The results show that effective communication reduces the intensity of resistance in healthcare organizations. The study also revealed that resistance to change often helps to explore alternative perspectives.*

Keywords: change, communication, covid-19, healthcare, resistance to change, uncertainty.

JEL Codes: M10

1. Introduction

Resistance to change is one of the most frequently cited causes of change management failure (Erwin and Garman, 2018) and change resistance is the most common reaction of change recipients (Oreg et al, 2016). Many scholars like Lawrence (2009), Maurer (2017), Strebel, (2016), Waddell and Sohal, (2016) highlighted that the reason behind the failure of many change initiatives can be found in the resistance to change. It is often also thought that resistance is the consequence of an employee's reaction to organizational change (Keen, 2011; Folger and Skarlicki, 2011). Haslam et al, (2014) pointed out that the top reason for an organizational change programmed failure is the employee's resistance to change at all levels. Often the negative reactions (cognitive, behavioral, and affective) occurred in response to organizational change, and it is inherently a psychological response to an external event (Erwin and Garman, 2018; Witting, 2013). The reaction of the change recipient is often marked by illogical fear (Goncalves et al, 2012) but often recipients, the fears are real and significant losses are related to the change in the workplace (Mulki et al, 2012). Whether it is real or imagined, the fears and losses result in intellectual, behavioral, and emotional responses that create obstacles to change that many organizations cannot easily overcome (Smollan, 2016).

[1+] Corresponding Author: Dr. Ali Ahmad, Phone no: +4407588599988, *E-mail*: ahmad_rubel@yahoo.com Address: 12 Rothwell Road, Dagenham, United Kingdom.

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5 -20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

Moreover, identifying and managing change resistance begins with defining the phenomenon and the key factors associated with the resistance. Often change resistance is the natural response to an external event (Ford and Ford, 2014) and many researchers have recognized its role in the change management since Lewin's (2001) development of the three-step model. Smollan (2016) stated that change recipients may resist the change by demonstrating a lack of interest, ignoring the change agents, vocally opposing the change initiatives, spreading rumors, boycotting, subverting the leadership, and destroying the leadership.

Additionally, in some modern healthcare organizations, change has occurred rapidly and continuously. As a result, it is very common for the employees to resist change because resistance itself works as a defense mechanism to maintain the status quo. Hultman (2017) highlighted that some employees are predisposed to resist change, even though the change outcome might ultimately be their benefit. Dent and Goldberg (2016) termed that resistance is the conduct adopted by employees to preserve their status quo when they feel insecure in the workplace, or their existing status is threatened by external matter. By doing so, they maintain their status and often engage in behavior that serves to disrupt, confront, and challenge the change authority. Resistance to change in the organization also carries negative behavior like confrontation, symbolizing an undesirable attitude and counter-productive behavior (Waddell and Sohal, 2016).

Furthermore, exploring change resistance, Ford and Ford (2014) identified the importance of change agents, integrity, honesty, authenticity, the ability to communicate, resolve conflicts and realistically appraise limits when addressing the phenomena of change resistance. It is very important to acknowledge, address and use change agents to focus on building relationships with the recipients, rather than avoiding resistance. To develop this focus, it is necessary to engage participatory management, and this is the attribute of an empowered workforce (Kanter, 2013).

Conversely, resistance often is viewed as a positive force for organizational change (Ford and Ford, 2014). Robbins (2016) asserted that resistance can help to test the commitment of those initiating the change, if resistance to change is based on valid viewpoints, then the important truth could be heard, understood, and considered by the change agent to make the change successful. Often resistance can help to weed out a bad idea that might not have been vetted by the change agent at the initial time, or any idea that might create an impulsive reaction by external events. Often resistance can be the outlet for the employee's reaction and energy during times of intense pressure. Resistance to change only becomes negative when it hinders the employee's adaptation to change and organizational progress (Kanter, 2013).

2. Research Elaboration

This research study is based on the private sector healthcare organizations in Bangladesh. The primary purpose of this research is to uncover reasons behind the resistance to change during uncertainty (perspective of covid-19). Besides, some important references have been made and invited key employees to share their views and experience about change resistance during the change management in the healthcare organizations. This research study used a mixed methodology approach to gather a collective voice of employees for the major debate of resistance management within healthcare organizations. As the study followed a mixed methodology approached, the sampling strategy was also a mixed-method sampling approached. Data collection was a semi-structured interview with purposive sampling and computer software NVIVO has been used to create themes and sub-themes. On the other hand, a clustered probability sampling method has been carried out for the questionnaire survey and analyzed collected data with the computer software SPSS.

Further, resistance to change is well thought out and one of the basic, fundamental causes of change failure (Lawrence, 2009; Maurer 2016; Strebel, 2014; Waddell and Sohal, 2016) and the major reason why change does not get implemented. Resistance can be defined as an expression of reservation that usually arises in reaction to change (Block, 2016). In addition, to make change successful, a lot of work needs to be done by different authors and researchers to find the major causes of employee resistance, and which properly deals with the symptoms of resistance. This will lead the organization to solve the problem which is causing the challenge to the change.

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5 -20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

The result of the member's defiance to change is very necessary to mention, to reveal the miseries of resistance for the organization and the change programmed. The consequence of resistance is a slowdown in the change process and thereby an increase in the cost (Bryant, 2016), causing less productivity, high employee turnover, disturbance, and trouble with the change programmed. In an extreme situation, resistance can lead to organization weakening and breakdown (Coetsee, 2011; Coch and French, 2008).

Additionally, resistance to change cannot be denied, but constructively handled it can facilitate the change process and can be used to gather more ideas from the employees (Dent and Goldberg, 2016). It may help by improving the change process by utilizing objections rather than just overcoming them (Waddell and Sohal, 2016). The causes, natures, and factors of resistance to change, have been discussed by many authors and researchers. This has led to the causes being divided into different categories, based on the nature of resistance to change. There are four categories identified as different causes of resistance which are:

a) Psychological-Employee's negative perception, frustration, anxiety, preference for status quo, cognitive comfort, fear, past failure, cynicism, and mistrust (Kreitner, 2015; Dubrin and Ireland, 2013).

b) Materialistic-Loss of payment, comfort, status quo, and threat to job security (Dent and Goldberg, 2016).

c) Employee's Constant Capabilities-Employee's knowledge and expertise become obsolete, existing skills, capabilities gap, and embedded routine (Lawrence, 2009).

d) Employee's Concern for Firm- Weakness and fault of the change programmed, poor change communication, and conflict of perception about change (Dubrin and Ireland, 2013).

In fact, it is a very common saying that employees don't just defy all the changes, they merely resist changes that they cannot comprehend, or find psychosomatically intimidating (Baired et al, 2010; Hayes, 2010). To understand the resistance to change, Hayes (2010) pointed out that it is very necessary to identify factors associated with such resistance. Hayes (2010) identified these key factors as parochial self-interest, panic for failure, group-pressurized, and sluggishness. Another empirical research study reviewed by Piderit (2017) identified that there are three different underlines put on the conceptualization of change resistance as a cognitive state, an emotional state, and a behavior state.

This construct might be comprehended by the different sources of change resistance, and which can be at the individual or organization level (Strebel. 2016; Hellriegel et al, 2011; Dent et al, 2016). In fact, resistance to change is an action taken by an individual or group of people that is often perceived as a threat. Often resistance is the behavioral phenomenon that appears as a form of rejection or sometimes it is called negative action towards a change or adaptation to new methods (Franklin and Aguenza, 2016). Though plenty of reasons have been discussed for resistance to change, the Kotter and Schlesinger article entitled "Choosing Strategies for Change" is one of the widely known and most acceptable models as to why people resist change. This article was published in 1979 and recently re-edited and published in the "Harvard Business Review" in 2018. Kotter and Schlesinger (2018) identified four common reasons why people resist changes, and these are parochial self-interest, low tolerance for change, misunderstanding, and lack of trust, and difficult assessment.

This is the time when people think that they will lose something valuable because of the change. In this situation, people just think about their interests, not for their organization or other people. This often results in toxic political activities being revealed. Lack of trust and misunderstanding are the major reasons for change failure and severe resistance in the workplace. Frequently people perceive the opposite to what the change result will look like. Different assessments reveal that people often judge the change matter negatively. It is often considered that change might cost them without a valid reason, and the last one is low tolerance for change. These are psychological matters because people often fear that they will not be able to develop new skills to cope with the change.

2.1 Factors influencing resistance to change:

Resistance to change is an action taken by an individual or group that perceives change as a threat. Most of the time employees have a high inclination to change when the environmental factor presents no other options except change (Franklin and Aguenza, 2016). Therefore, there are so many factors influencing the resistance to change. These factors are either related to the organizational environment or the perception of the

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5-20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

employees for their own job. Kanter's (2013) and Traders (2012) identified some factors that influence the employee's resistance to change. There are some other factors also found by Davis et al, (2017). Davis (2011) pointed out that Trader's (2012) factors influence resistance are not practical and often these factors are not aligned with the organizational change implementation process. The factors influencing the resistance to change from Kanter's (2013) perspective are more practical, than those of Trader (2012) and Davis et al (2017). From both Trader (2012) and Davis et al, (2017) the perspective of their factor is more general than specific. For example, Trader (2012) has divided his factors affecting resistance into four general categories: personal interest, psychological effects, tradition and custom, and redistribution factor so that each of the categories can be considered in Kanter's perspective. Such psychological effects mentioned in Trader (2012) can be found in Kanter's model as a lack of confidence or showing tenacity in Kanter's perspective.

In contrast, Davies et al (2017) have classified factors that are more general and are divided into three categories which are economic, personal, and social factors, and that Kanter's (2013) and Traders, factors also can be considered. For example, fear of losing image or fear of losing competence can be replaced by another. These three factors provided by Kanter, Trader, and Davis et al (2017) are almost similar. But that method of classifying them is very different in terms of the holistic and realistic view. Kanter's (2013) factors influencing resistance to change are fear of the unknown, lack of control, being stubborn, the pressure of the habits, lack of support, and losing competence.

2.2 Overcoming resistance to change:

Resistance to change is the undeniable reaction towards change. Most of the time people naturally attack the change to defend the present situation to keep it intact (Bradutanu, 2015). Especially, when people think that their situation might be harmed by the change implementation in the workplace. But organizational change can master the feeling of uncertainty and severe resistance just by following a few steps. Ford and Ford (2014) proposed five organizational behaviors that help to minimize resistance to change, which boost awareness, return to purpose, building participation, complete the past, and change the change.

Boost awareness means promoting the dialogue between the change agent and change recipient across all levels of the organization. When people are informed about the journey for any change then they will be less resistant to change. The second point is returning to purpose. It means employees need to know the purpose of the change programmed and therefore they will co-operate with the journey. The third factor of change means here promoting discussion about the change and helping people to understand the objective of the change journey (Ford and Ford, 2014). When any change initiative is taken by an organization, it is very necessary to evaluate the past change and its lesson (Ford and Ford, 2014).

Furthermore, many managers and change agents underestimate not only the variety of ways people react to organizational change but also the ways they can positively influence the specific individual and group during the change (Kotter, 2016). Often, due to experience, most managers cannot understand the advantages and disadvantages of the methods with which are very familiar. Kotter and Schlesinger (2018) stated that there is nothing tougher to carry out or initiate than a new order of things. They highlighted some strategies for dealing with the resistance to change and these are education, participation, facilitation, negotiation, and coercion.

3. Results

3.1 Quantitative findings:

The first hypothesis testing 'effective communication has a negative association with the resistance to change' and to discuss it the Chi-square testing is essential. First, the case processing summary is discussing, and it is as follows:

H1. Effective communication has a negative association with resistance to change.

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5-20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

The table-1 described the case processing summary of the hypothesis of effective communication and resistance to change. The table-1 shows that all the datasets are valid and there are no missing values.

Table-1: Case processing summary.

Case processing summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Effective Communication * Resistant to change	300	100.00%	0	0.00%	300	100.00%

The table-1 also described that all the responses are valid and therefore, there is no potential for invalid data in the data sets. The variable effective communication and least resistance to change was selected by all N=300 participants valid its 100%, the missing percentage is 0.00%. Now the next phase of the Chi-square test in cross-tabulation is going to discuss. Generally, cross-tabulation is called the joint distribution of the frequency based on two or more variables. it is usually used in categorical data analysis. The following cross-tabulation represents the two variables where the count indicates the actual frequencies obtained in the research survey. On the other hand, the expected count represents how many we would expect to find in this combination if the null hypothesis was true. The percentage of cross-tabulation provides a better representation of the data because there might some uneven numbers in the categories.

Table-2: Cross-tabulation of selected variables.

Effective communication* Resistant to change cross-tabulation

			Resistance to change					
			1	2	3	4	5	Total
Effective Communication	1	Count	6	2	3	0	2	13
		Expected Count	9.1	1.8	0.9	0.3	1	13
		% Within Resistant to change	2.90%	4.90%	14.30%	0.00%	9.10%	4.30%
	2	Count	202	39	17	5	17	280
		Expected Count	196	38.3	19.6	5.6	20.5	280
		% Within Resistant to change	96.20%	95.10%	81.00%	83.30%	77.30%	93.30%
	3	Count	2	0	1	1	3	7
		Expected Count	4.9	1	0.5	0.1	0.5	7
		% Within Resistant to change	1.00%	0.00%	4.80%	16.70%	13.60%	2.30%
Total		Count	210	41	21	6	22	300
		Expected Count	210	41	21	6	22	300
		% Within Resistant to change	100.00%	100.00%	100.00 %	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

Table-2 cross-tabulation table shows that when communication is effective it means participants agreed that they have effective communication, then resistance to change is also reduced. For example, only 6 participants, the observed value, who stated yes to effective communication participants then strongly agreed to least resistance to change while the expected value is also low at 9.1 participants and number of participants who

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5-20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

stated they are agreed also low at 2 participants only. When on the other hand, communication is not effective and participants stated no to effective communication, then resistance to change is high. It means there is a negative relationship between the two variables. The second row shows those who stated no to communication but indicated resistance to change was recognized at 202 participants, this is the observed count while the expected count is 96. The observed count is a more than expected count here. Overall, only 4.30% of participants stated that communication is effective, and 93.30% of participants stated no to communication and only 2.30% stated they did not know about effective communication.

However, an examination of the Chi-square test enables us to make sure whether the pattern developed in the cross-tabulation table is significant or not. In the following Chi-square test table, it can be noted that the Chi-square test is a non-directional hypothesis and that is indicated by the asymptotic significance (2 sided).

Table-3: Chi-square test**.**

Chi-square test			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	29.041a	8	.000
Likelihood Ratio	19.234	8	0.014
Linear-by-Linear Association	0.834	1	0.361
N of Valid Cases	300		
a 9 cells (60.0%) have an expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is .14.			

The analysis of the above table-3 output shows that one of the important assumptions of Chi-square test has not been violated, expected cell frequencies should not be less than 5. The important thing in the Chi-square test is the value of Pearson Chi-square 29.04 with the 8 degrees of freedom, which is significant at the p<.001 level. So that it can be like,

$$X^2 = 29.04, df = 8, p = <.001 \text{ are}$$

The Chi-square test is usually used to determine whether the association in the cross-tabulation is a significant one. In the above Chi-square table, the p value is less than p<0.05. However, to be statistically significant, the probability value needs to be 0.05 or less. In this case, it is found that the p value is less than 0.05. So that it can be concluded that there is a significant relationship between the two variables. Hence, the hypothesis better understanding of change management will provide a competitive advantage has a statistically significant association.

Another important thing is Cramer's effect size. The table-4 showed that Cramer's effect size statistics is 0.22 out of the possible maximum value of 1, which represents a weak association between effective communication and resistance to change.

Table-4: Symmetric measures.

Symmetric measure			
		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	0.22	.000
	Cramer's V	0.22	.000
N of Valid Cases		300	

This value is highly significant (p<001), indicating that a value of the test statistics that is at least this big if the null hypothesis were true is unlikely to have happened if there were no association in the population.

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5-20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

These results confirm that the Chi-square test already told us but also give us an estimate of the effect size. The fourth hypothesis is that a high level of resistance will negatively affect the organizational change management process. To discuss the Chi-square test case processing test is essential and these are the following:

H2. High level of resistance will negatively affect the organizational change management process.

The table-5 showed that the case processing summary of the hypothesis resistance to change will negatively affect the organizational change management process. The output shows that all the 300 participants are valid, and no data set is missing.

Table-5: Case processing summary.

Case processing summary

	Cases					
	Valid		Missing		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Resistant to change * Change Implementation process	300	100.00%	0	0.00%	300	100.00%

The table-5 also described that all the responses are valid which means there are no potential invalid data in the data sets. The variable resistance to change and change implementation process was selected by all N=300 participants 100% will no missing values and so the missing percentage is 0.00%. Now the next phase of the Chi-square test, the cross-tabulation will be discussed. Generally, cross-tabulation is called the joint distribution of the frequency based on many two or more variables. it usually used in categorical data analysis. The following cross-tabulation represents the two variables where the count indicates the actual frequencies obtained in the research survey. On the other side, the expected count represents how many we would be expected to find out in this combination if the null hypothesis was true. The percentage of cross-tabulation provides a better representation of the data because there might some uneven numbers in the categories.

Table-6: Cross-tabulation of selected variables.

Change implementation process * Resistance to change cross-tabulation

			Resistance to Change			
			1	2	3	Total
Change Implementation process	1	Count	30	6	0	36
		Expected Count	25.9	9.1	1	36
		% Within Resistance to change	13.90%	7.90%	0.00%	12.00%
		% Of Total	10.00%	2.00%	0.00%	12.00%
	2	Count	182	69	6	257
		Expected Count	185	65.1	6.9	257
		% Within Resistance to change	84.30%	90.80%	75.00%	85.70%
		% Of Total	60.70%	23.00%	2.00%	85.70%
	3	Count	4	1	2	7
		Expected Count	5	1.8	0.2	7

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5 -20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

	% Within Resistance to change	1.90%	1.30%	25.00%	2.30%
	% Of Total	1.30%	0.30%	0.70%	2.30%
Total	Count	216	76	8	300
	Expected Count	216	76	8	300
	% Within Resistance to change	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %	100.00 %
	% Of Total	72.00%	25.30%	2.70%	100.00 %

The cross-tabulation table-6 shows that the change implementation process and resistance to change have a negative association. When participants stated yes to the change implementation process total percentage was 12.00% but also 30 participants responded yes resistance to change and that is the observed count but the expected count at 25.9 is less than the observed count and of 25.9 participants. It means there is a very little positive relationship between the two variables. On the other hand, among all the participants 85.00% believe that the change implementation process was not openly communicated to them when resistance to change is heavily increased by 185 observed counts where the observed count is larger than the expected count and it is 185 participants in total. When the change implementation process is not openly communicated when their resistance to change stated yes by 60.70% and no stated only 23.00% and don't know only 2.00% participants overall. It means resistance to change has a negative relationship with the change implementation process variable.

Therefore, an examination of Chi-square test table-7 will enable us to make sure whether the patterns developed in the cross-tabulation table are significant or not. In the following Chi-square test (table7), it can be noted that the Chi-square test is a non-directional hypothesis and that is indicated by the asymptotic significance (2 sided).

Table-7: Che-square tests.

Chi-square test			
	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	21.226a	4	0.000
Likelihood Ratio	10.628	4	0.031
Linear-by-Linear Association	5.809	1	0.016
N of Valid Cases	300		

a 3 cells (33.3%) have an expected count of less than 5. The minimum expected count is .19.

In analyzing output from the above table (table 7), one of the important assumptions of the Chi-square test has not been violated. That is the expected cell frequencies must not be less than 5. The important thing in the Chi-square test is the value of Pearson Chi-square of 21.226 with the 4 degrees of freedom, which is significant at the p<.001 level. So that it can be like,

$$X^2 = 21.226, df = 4, p = <.001 \text{ are}$$

The Chi-square test is usually used to determine whether the association in the cross-tabulation is a significant one. In the above Chi-square, table the p value is less than p<0.05. However, to be statistically significant the probability value must be 0.05 or smaller. In this case, it is found that the p value is smaller than 0.05. So that it can be concluded that there is a significant relationship between the two variables. Hence, the hypothesis that a high level of resistance to change will affect negative the change implementation process has a statistically significant association.

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5 -20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

Another important thing is Cramer's effect size. The table-8 showed that Cramer's effect size statistics is 0.18 out of the possible maximum value of 1, which represents the very weak association between the high level of resistance affecting resistance to change and the change implementation process.

Table-8: Symmetric measures.

Symmetric measure			
		Value	Approximate Significance
Nominal by Nominal	Phi	0.188	.000
	Cramer's V	0.188	.000
N of Valid Cases		300	

This value is highly significant (p<001), indicating that a value of the test statistic that is at least a big as this, if the null hypothesis were true is unlikely to have happened if there is no association in the population. It results confirm what the Chi-square test already told, but it also gives us an estimate of the size of the effect.

3.2 Qualitative results - main findings:

Qualitative research is a messy and complex process. Using Nvivo, some visual illustration has been presented in this section of the research. At the end of this chapter, there is a table of themes included with frequencies, meaning, and evidence. Overall, 10 interviews have taken place for this research, and the most used words or most frequencies are presented below:

Table-9: Key themes of qualitative interview data.

Themes / Sub-Themes		**Frequency**	**Meaning**	**Coded evidence**
Key Factors of Resistance	Resistance to Change	4	Resistance is inevitable and part of change management. Understanding the level of resistance participant opinion is important.	1. "Change resistance is ubiquitous and inevitable in the change management implementation process." (Jewel) 2. "Resistance is an integral part of the change management process. One of the important things of resistance is that the resistance can be many forms. It can be a grudge and abnormal behaviour." (Jumel) 3. "One of the most baffling problems I face is employee resistance to change. Such resistance may take a number of forms like persistent reduction in output, increase in the number of quits and requests for transfer, chronic quarrels, sullen hostility, wildcat or slowdown strikes, and, of course, the expression of a lot of pseudo logical reasons why the change will not work." (Nayla) 4. "Resistance to change is the most frequently cited cause of change failure and change resistance is the most common reaction of change recipients." (Asma)
				1. "I think the key reason of change resistance is fear of the unknown, lack of trust among the employee's, loss of job security, bad timing and

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5 -20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

	Factors Associated with Resistance	6	Some factors are vigorous and identifying these participant experiences would be much effective.	individual predisposition towards change." (Asma) 2. "If the manager is new and has not yet earned the trust of their employees, then mistrust can manifest itself into resistance to change." (Jumel) 3. "I think of the biggest reason for workplace resistance is poor communication. Poor communication has many bad effects in the organization in short-run and long-run business benefits." (Monuj) 4. I think the key factor of resistance to change is the environment of mistrust and lack of respect. If the individuals in a department highly respect their manager because the manager has built up trust over a period, the team will be more accepting of any changes." (Nayla) 5. "I think one of the important factors of resistance to change is workplace culture. It is a fact that there is an intimate connection between our beliefs and business organization, our value and workplace relationships." (Rownak) 6. "I think workplace culture is the main source of resistance to change. In a bad culture all types of negative and dysfunctional activities are practice and that creates building blocks to change." (Rownak).
	Steps to Overcome Resistance	6	What might be the steps to overcome the resistance from the participants' perspective is necessary for the effective solution.	1. "My recommendation for overcoming resistance to change is to be trustful and supportive. Managers can deal with potential resistance to change is by being supportive." (Jumel) 2. "My recommendation for overcoming resistance to change is to identify the importance of change agent integrity, ability to communicate, resolve and realistic appraisal of limits for the phenomenon of change resistance." (Asma) 3. "My recommendation for overcoming resistance to change is being more aware of the reasons people resist change will help you implement change with fewer issues. Avoid mistrust and the feeling of loss of control by getting others involved in the changes before they occur and asking them to offer input and feedback." (Nayla) 4. "If you provide the reward for the change process, they will help you rather than resistance. There is a very common saying in the corporate culture and that people don't resist change, but they believe in their best interest." (Rajib) 5. "My recommendation for overcoming the resistance to change due to culture is all about leadership. Leaders must model the new behaviours to provide a good example for employees and to demonstrate that these changes are not temporary." (Rownak) 6. "My recommendation for overcoming resistance to change is many folds. In my opinion one of the

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5 -20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

				important solutions, which has become increasingly popular for dealing with resistance to change is to get the people involved to participate in making the change." (Sadia)
Recommendation for Change Management	Critical Success Factors for Change	6	Participant understanding of success factors could be more effective.	1. "I think critical success factors for organizational change depends on right leaderships." (Foysal) 2. "I think human behaviour is the key for organizational change process success or failure. Modifying the organization's infrastructure to support the change effort is key to sustaining the change." (Jumel) 3. "I think critical success factors for organizational change is effective communication. Using a blend of formal and informal communication allows you to ensure that all employees receive the news about the change in some way or another." (Monuj) 4. "There is a common humanistic theme that needs to be taken into consideration. That theme is fairness, at least the perception of fairness, to all involved and it can affect the outcome of the change process." (Nayla) 5. "I think critical success factors for organizational change is to think bottom-up. Top-down change always generates resistance and cynicism. To win support, change must be constructed collectively using channels that give everyone the opportunity to make suggestions, offer solutions and set priorities." (Rownak) 6. "In my opinion, the critical success factors that determine change management success mostly determine on top executive leadership style." (Sadia)
	Recommendation for Solution	7	Getting participant opinion for the change management complexity and solution would be the nice strategy because the	1. "The change management team must prepare a strategy to equip managers to successfully coach their employees through the change. They will need to provide training and guidance, including how to use individual change management tools with their employees." (Asma) 2. "I can say that the monitoring the implementation process. No matter how good a job one does of initially selecting a change strategy and tactics, something unexpected will eventually occur during implementation." (Foysal) 3. "My overall recommendation for making change management successful is to be participative in the change management process." (Jewel) 4. "Change needs to be dealt with in an effective and responsible manner, and if done correctly, it will seriously benefit the company and make it a smooth transition for further growth." (Monuj) 5. "My key recommendation in my workplace to eliminate the fear of the unknown by letting affected groups know there will be changes coming. Develop a culture of respect and trust

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5 -20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

			participant is the only people who experience the existing change management problem in the organization.	and the feeling of loss of control by getting others involved in the changes before they occur and asking them to offer input and feedback." (Nayla) 6. "Prevent bad timing by providing a clear vision and reason for the changes along with a timetable or schedule of what to expect and when to expect it." (Nayla) 7. "Most important thing I could say that start with the end in mind – make plans according to your overall goals and ensure that all staff is also able to see exactly where an organisation is heading throughout a change process. A solid direction makes employees more likely to accept and embrace changes." (Rownak)

Sources: Nvivo output- key themes of qualitative interview data.

4. Discussions

Resistance to change was found to be one of the most frequently cited causes of the change failure (Erwin and Garman, 2018) and change resistance found one of the common reactions of the change recipient (Oreg et al, 2016). According to Haslem et al (2014) one of the major reasons for organizational change programmed failure is the resistance to change at all levels. Further, identifying and managing change resistance begins with defining the phenomenon and the key factors associated with the resistance. Often change resistance is the natural response to an external event (Ford and Ford, 2014) and many researchers have recognized its role in change management since Lewin's (1970s) development of the three steps model. According to Smollan (2016) change recipients may resist the change by demonstrating a lack of interest, ignoring the change agents, vocally opposing the change initiatives, spreading rumors, boycotting, subverting the leadership, and destroying leadership.

Additionally, in some modern healthcare organizations change occurs rapidly and continuously. As a result, it is very common for the employees to resist change, often resistance works as a mechanism of defense to protect the status quo. Hultman (2017) sometimes some employees are predetermined to resist, even though change ultimately becomes their benefit. Added to this, Kotter's (2016) model of organizational change identified several factors that contribute to change, including complacency, self-interest, misunderstanding, mistrust, and overall low tolerance for change. These factors can be traced back to fears of the unknown, loss, and lack of support (Hede's, 2011). In support of Kotter, Witting (2013) identified that emotion, cognition, communication, and active participation in decision-making can play significant factors contributing to the change resistance or acceptance. In a sole effort to assess the level of change resistance, Oreg (2017) has organized various factors associated with change resistance into six categories. These are fear of losing control, cognitive intransigence, emotional rigidity, avoidance of change inconvenience, preference for predictability, and reliance on habitual behavior.

As the correlation coefficient value (r=0.072) and it is positive and (p=>0.212) it means the probability of getting correlation coefficient at least big a sample of (N=300) people if the null hypothesis were true there was a relationship between these variables were very high. In fact, all the significance values up to the standard criteria of p>0.05 and means a statistically significant relationship is not existent. It means that a high level of resistance to change will negatively affect the change management process is not true.

Another important test has been done to test the hypothesis. The Chi-square test has been used in the research to determine whether there is a difference between the counted and expected frequencies in one or more categorical variables. The output 4 cross-tabulation table shows that the change implementation process and resistance to change have a negative association. Some of the participants stated yes to the change

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5 -20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

implementation process and that percentage was only 12.0%. On the other hand, resistance to change stated yes only 30 participants, which means the expected count is less than the observed count and that is only 25.90 participants. Overall, it means there are very few positive relationships between the two variables.

On the other hand, most of the participants provided an opinion that the change implementation process is not openly communicated to them. As a result, resistance to change is very common and the observed count increased heavily by 185, where the expected count is much less, and participants were 185 in total. Most of the participants stated change implementation process is not openly communicated and strong resistance to change is available stated by 60.70% in total, participants stated no, only 23.00%, and don't know only 2.00%. it is now proved that the resistance to change has a negative relationship with the change implementation process.

The important thing in the Chi-square test is the value of Pearson Chi-square 21.226 with the 4 degrees of freedom, which is significant at the p<.001 level. The Chi-square test is usually used to determine whether the association in the cross-tabulation is a significant one. In the output-4, Chi-square figures the p value is less than p<0.05. However, to be statistically significant the probability value needs to be significant it must be 0.05 or smaller. In this case, we have found that the p value is smaller than 0.05. So that it can be concluded that there is a significant relationship between the two variables.

Hence, the hypothesis that a high level of resistance to change will negatively affect the change implementation process has a statistically significant association. Another important thing is Cramer's effect size. The output 7, showed that Cramer's effect size statistics is 0.18 out of the possible maximum value of 1, which represents the very weak association between how a high level of resistance will affect resistance to change during the change implementation process. Thus, H2: a high level of resistance will negatively affect the organizational change management process Is rejected.

Factors of resistance to change and how to overcome it:

Resistance to change is a common phenomenon in the change management process. It is inevitable and an integral part of the change management process. Often resistance is considered a common reaction to the change initiatives because people do not accept or trust the change output. However, resistance to change in the context of the healthcare organizations in Bangladesh plays an important role and demands attention from the change agent.

In the literature, resistance to change is one of the most frequently cited causes of change failure (Erwin and Garman, 2018), and change resistance is the most common reaction of change recipients (Oreg et al, 2016). Additionally, some important factors are associated with the resistance to change in healthcare organizations. According to Kotter and Schlesinger (2018), the parochial self-interest and individualistic thinking of the employees for their own best interest instead of the companies or collective interest is a key reason for resistance in the workplace. In this research, it has already been discovered that the culture of the healthcare organizations in Bangladesh is individualistic and driven by a silo-mentality. This is also supported by the interviewees, who stated that they are afraid of losing power due to change in the workplace. Some of the participants in this research shared their views and mentioned important factors relevant to the resistance to change. These participants' names are Nayla and Rownak. Their comments are as follows:

"I think the key factor of resistance to change is the environment of mistrust and lack of respect. If the individuals in a department highly respect their manager because the manager has built up trust over a period, the team will be more accepting of any changes." (Nayla)

"I think one of the important factors of resistance to change is workplace culture. It is an established fact that there is an intimate connection between our beliefs and business organizations, our values and workplace relationships." (Rownak)

However, in the context of this research, participant 'Rownak' is one of the senior executives who stated that the important factor of change resistance is workplace culture. On the other hand, participant 'Nayla' stated that an environment of mistrust and lack of respect are the vital reasons for workplace change resistance. The above views also have a similarity to the previous research which is highlighted by Kotter and Schlesinger's article "Choosing Strategies for Change." It contains some of the most widely known and most acceptable factors identified for resistance to change. This article was published in 1979 and recently re-edited

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5-20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

and published in the "Harvard Business Review" in 2008. Kotter and Schlesinger (2018) identified four common factors of resistance to change which are: parochial self-interest, misunderstanding and lack of trust, difficult assessment, and a low tolerance for change. Among the four factors identified by Kotter and Schlesinger (2018) two are directly mentioned by the participants in the interviews described above.

In fact, the above participants mentioned factors of change to resistance which have an association with the previous research done by Kotter and Schlesinger (2018). But there is also some remedy for overcoming the resistance to change. According to the theoretical models of Hiatt and Creasey (2018), and Kotter and Schlesinger (2018) to overcome the resistance to change in the workplace, education, and communication are necessary to create awareness of the change. Regarding the above literature, some participants of this research provided opinions about how to overcome the resistance to change, which are highlighted in the following:

"My recommendation for overcoming resistance to change is to identify the importance of change agent integrity, ability to communicate, resolve and realistic appraisal of limits for the phenomenon of change resistance." (Asma)

"If you provide the reward for the change process, they will help you rather than resistance. There is a very common saying in the corporate culture and that people don't resist change, but they believe in their best interest." (Rajib)

"My recommendation for overcoming resistance to change is many folds. In my opinion, one of the important solutions, which has become increasingly popular for dealing with resistance to change is to get the people involved to participate in making the change." (Sadia)

However, participants' recommendations for overcoming resistance to change have similarities with the previous research. Important things highlighted by participant Rajib's is that people don't resist change, rather they believe in their best interest, this statement has an affinity with Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) who developed a model of strategies to overcome the change resistance, and these are discussed in detail in the literature review chapter. The components of the model are education, participation, facilitation, negotiation, and coercion. Participant Asma's statements hold a similar view about education, participation, and facilitation. On the other hand, participant Rajib's agrees with the negotiation element for overcoming resistance to change. Participant Sadia's views for overcoming resistance to change are completely agreed about the elements of participation and facilitation. Overall, the participants' views are reflected by Kotter's and Schlesinger's (2018) model that was developed to overcome the resistance to change. Thus, factors associated with resistance to change and overcoming resistance to change have almost similar views within this research and previous research.

5. Conclusions

In summary, the key factors of resistance to change have been identified in the previous research as well as this research. But not all resistance to change is bad (Raza and Standing, 2013) although it is inevitable in nature it is not always a negative predictor of the change outcome. Often resistance offers different sources of alternative ideas that improve change initiatives, but if the resistance remains unresolved then change resistance undermines change implementation (Witting, 2013). According to Ford and Ford (2014) resistance to change often works as a positive force for organizational change. Often resistance can weed out bad ideas that might not be vetted by the change agent at the initial time, or any ideas that might create an impulsive reaction by external events, and often resistance can help to be the outlet for the employees' reaction and energy during the times of intense pressure. Therefore, the above hypothesis has been rejected that the high level of resistance will negatively affect organizational change. Factors that affect resistance to change often can be overcome by communication, collaboration, and cooperation by the change agent.

6. Acknowledgments

I owe a great debt of gratitude, enormous personal thanks, and acknowledgment, which goes to Dr. Dababrata Chowdhury for his dedication, kind support, and research activity jointly.

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5-20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

7. References

[1] Block, P. (2016) *Flawless consulting in McLennan*. (2nd Ed.). Managing Organisational Change, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.

[2] Bradutanu, D. (2015) *Resistance to Change - A New Perspective: A Textbook for Managers Who Plan to Implement a Change*. Lulu Press, Inc.

[3] Bryant, M. (2016) *Talking about change: Understanding employee responses through qualitative research*. Management Decision, 44, 246-258.

[4] Coch, L. and French, J. R. P. (2008) Overcoming Resistance to Change. *Human Relations*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 512-532.

[5] Coetsee, L. (2011) From resistance to commitment. *Public Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 23, pp. 204-22.

[6] Davis, F. D. (1999) Perceived Usefulness, Perceived Ease of Use, and User Acceptance of Information Technology. *MIS Quarterly*, 13(3): 319-340.

[7] Davis, F. D. R. P. Bagozzi and P. R. Warshaw (2017) User Acceptance of Computer Technology: A Comparison of Two Theoretical Models. *Management Science* 35(8): 982-1003.

[8] Dent, E. and Goldberg, S. (2016) Challenging resistance to change. *Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 25-41.

[9] Dubrin, A. J. and Ireland, R. D. (2013) *Management and Organization*. (2nd Ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Southwestern Publishing.

[10] Erwin, D. G. and Garman, A. N. (2018) *Governance and Board Development*. In J. A. Johnson (Ed.), Health Organizations: Theory, Behaviour, and Development: 349-369. Sudbury, MA: Jones and Bartlett.

[11] Folger, R. and Skarlicki, D. (2011) Unfairness and resistance to change: Hardship as mistreatment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 35-50.

[12] Ford, J. D. and Ford, L. W. (2014) Decoding Resistance to Change. *Harvard Business Review*, 87 (4).

[13] Franklin, E. and Aguenza, B. (2016) Obstacles, Resistance, and Impact of Change in Organizations: An Examination of the Saudi Telecommunication Company, *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*. 4, 287-298.

[14] Gonclaves M. F. Pereira J. A. (2012) Abundance and diversity of soil arthropods in the olive grove ecosystem. *Journal of Insect Science*. 2012; 12:1-14.

[15] Haslam, S. A., Jetten, J. O'Brien, A. and Jacobs, E. (2014) *Social identity, social influence, and reactions to potentially stressful tasks: Support for the self-categorization model of stress*. Stress and Health, 20, 3–9.

[16] Hayes, J. (2010) *The theory and practice of change management* (3rd Ed.). London: Palgrave Macmillan.

[17] Hellriegel, D. Jackson, S. E. and Slocum, J. W. (2011) *Management: A competency-based approach*. (9th Ed.). Canada: South-Western.

[18] Hultman, K. E. (2017) *Making Change Irresistible: Overcoming Resistance to Change in Your Organization*. Davies-Black Publishers: Palo Alto, CA.

[19] Kanter, R. M. (2013) *The change masters: Corporate entrepreneurs at work*. London: George Allen and Unwin.

[20] Keen, P. G. W. (2011) Information Systems and Organizational Change. *Communication journal*. ACM 24(1): 24-33.

[21] Kotter, J. P. (2016) Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review*, March- April. 1-20.

ISSN: 2247-6172
Review of Applied Socio-Economic Research
(Volume 22, Issue 2/2021), pp. 5 -20
URL: http://www.reaser.eu
e-mail: editors@reaser.eu

[22] Kotter, J. P. and Schlesinger, L. A. (2018) Choosing Strategies for Change, *Harvard Business Review*, 86 (7–8).
[23] Lawrence, T. B., Dyck, B. Maitlis, S. and Mauws, M. K. (2006) The underlying structure of continuous change. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 47(4), 59-66.
[24] Lewin, K. (2001) *Cultural reconstruction*. In G. W. Lewin (Ed.), Resolving social conflicts (pp. 34–42). New York: Harper & Row.
[25] Lewis, L. K. (2001) Disseminating information and soliciting input during planned organisational change: implementers targets, sources, and channels for communicating. *Management Communication Quarterly*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 43-75.
[26] Maurer, R. (2017) Using resistance to build support for change. *The Journal for Quality and Participation*, 19 (3), pp. 56-66.
[27] Mulki, J. P. Jaramillo, F. Malhotra, S. and Locander, W. B. (2012) Reluctant employees and felt stress: The moderating impact of manager decisiveness. *Journal of Business Research*, 65, 77–83. DOI: 10.1016/j. jbusres.2011.01.019.
[28] Piderit, S. K. (2017) Rethinking resistance and recognising ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitudes toward an organisational change. *Academy of Management Review*, 25(4), 783-794.
[29] Robbins, S. P. (2016) *Organizational Behaviour: Concepts, Controversies, Applications*. (7th Ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
[30] Smollan, R. K. (2016) Minds, hearts, and deeds: Cognitive, affective, and behavioural responses to change. *Journal of Change Management*, 6, 143-158.
[31] Strebel, P. (2016) Why Do Employees Resist Change? *Harvard Business Review*, May-Jun.
[32]Trader-leigh, K. E. (2002) Case study, identifying resistance in managing change. *Journal of Organization Change Management*, Vol.15, Iss.2, p.139.
[33] Waddell, D. and Sohal, A. S. (2016) Resistance: a constructive tool for change management. *Journal of Management Decision*, 36 (8), pp. 543-548.
[34] Witting, C. (2013) *Employees' Reactions to Organizational Change*. OD Practitioner, 44 (2), 23-28.

Manuscript received: 14.05.2021
Manuscript received in revised form: 14 .06.2021
Manuscript accepted: 17.09.2021