

**“The Determinants of the Acceptance of Organizational Change among
University of Botswana Employees: Exploring for Gender
Differences”**

NORTH WEST UNIVERSITY



A33641200165455C

By

610988257

LIBRARY MAFIKENG CAMPUS
Call No.: TH 658.406 2005-04-07.MUL
Acc. No.: 08/0053
NORTH-WEST UNIVERSITY

Munyae Masai Mulinge [PhD]

Dissertation Presented as Partial Fulfilment for the
Degree of Master of Business Administration
in the Graduate School of Business
and Government Leadership
Northwest University

January 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES.....	Page v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
DECLARATION.....	vii
ABSTRACT.....	vii
CHAPTER ONE:	
1.0 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background Information.....	1
1.2 Statement of Study Problem.....	2
1.3 Objectives of the Study	4
1.4 Importance of the Study.....	4
1.5 Organization of the Study	6
CHAPTER TWO:	
2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	7
2.1 Organizational Change: An Overview	7
2.2 Resistance to Organizational Change.....	9
2.3 Acceptance of Organizational Change.....	13
2.3.1 Determinants of Acceptance of Organizational Change....	14
2.4 Organizational Change in Botswana.....	19
2.4.1 The Case of the University of Botswana.....	20
2.5 Theoretical Framework.....	25
CHAPTER THREE:	
3.0 DELINEATION OF STUDY VARIABLES.....	28
3.1 Workplace Features.....	28
3.2 Managerial Features	29
3.3 Employee Personality Traits.....	30
3.4 Employee Affective Responses.....	31
3.5 Control Variables.....	31

3.6	Endogenous Variable.....	31
CHAPTER FOUR:		
4.0	METHODOLOGY	33
4.1	Research Site and Units of Analysis.....	33
4.2	Sample Selection Procedures.....	34
4.3	Methods of Data Collection.....	35
4.4	Response Rate.....	36
4.5	Measurement and Data Analyses Techniques.....	36
4.6	Ethical Considerations	37
CHAPTER FIVE:		
5.0.	FINDINGS.....	38
5.1	Socioeconomic Characteristics of Study Sample.....	38
5.2	Mean Differences in Determinants of Acceptance of Change.....	40
5.3	Gender Differences in Determinants of Acceptance of Change...	41
5.3.1	Workplace Features.....	43
5.3.2	Managerial Features.....	43
5.3.3	Employee Personality Traits.....	45
5.3.4	Employee Affective Responses.....	45
5.4	Effects of the Determinants of Acceptance of Change.....	46
5.4.1	Overall Effects	46
5.4.2	Differential Effects.....	48
CHAPTER SIX:		
6.0	SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION	52
6.1	Summary of Findings	52
6.2	Discussion of Findings	53
6.2.1	Gender Differences in the Acceptance of Change.....	54
6.2.2	Gender Differences in the Determinants of Acceptance of Change.....	55
6.2.3	Effects of the Determinants of Acceptance of Change.....	56
6.3	Conclusions	61
6.4	Policy Recommendations.....	62

6.5	Suggestions for Further Research.....	63
7.0	REFERENCES.....	65
8.0	APPENDIX: RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE.....	73

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Distribution of Respondents by Age Group.....	38
2. Distribution of Respondents by Income Bracket.....	40
3. Mean Scores for Determinants of Acceptance of Change.....	42
4. Mean Differences in the Determinants of Acceptance of Change.....	44
5. Regression Results for Determinants of Acceptance of Change.....	47

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The success of this research would not have been possible without the assistance of many people who gave me encouragement and support during the two years I was enrolled for the MBA degree. While it is not possible to thank everyone, a number of people made contributions that merit a mention here. First, my sincere gratitude goes to my supervisors and fellow academics, Professors H. O. Kaya and L-K Mwansa, for their guidance, encouragement and support. Thank you all for finding the time to read through and comment on my work. I am also indebted to the Northwest University and more specifically to the Graduate School of Business and Government Leadership for giving me the opportunity to pursue the MBA studies and for providing an enabling working studying environment. I wish to thank all the programme administrators including Professor Van Rensburg, G. D. Setsetse, T. Matshego, T. Mpete, B. Mkansi, and the rest of the weekend crew that kept the MBA ship afloat. In addition, special mention should be made of my student colleagues and especially the many friends I made during the two years I was enrolled for the MBA. In particular, I wish to record my gratitude to Assie Mangadi, Bakang Motsisi, Boitumelo Tswetla, Leonard Barakanye, Jeanette Spooner, and Mark Bosch for their encouragement and support.

My gratitude also goes to the University of Botswana and especially the Department of Sociology for granting me the permission to pursue the MBA degree. I would like to acknowledge the support of my colleagues in the department especially Dr. G. N. Lesetedi and Mr. T. Ntsabane who, on several occasions, had to step in to teach my courses so that I could travel to Mafikeng (South Africa) to write examinations. Finally, special and sincere appreciation goes to my spouse and academic colleague Dr Margaret M. Munyai for investing considerable time in editing my research report and to our children - Brian Munyai and Claire Munyai. No amount of words can express my sincere gratitude to you all for your unwavering support and understanding. Your confidence and trust was my consolation during the countless weekends I had to be away attending lectures.

DECLARATION

This research project is my original work. Unless otherwise specifically stated, all the references cited have been consulted. The work of which the dissertation is a record has been done by me and has not been previously accepted for a higher degree or professional qualification at any other higher education institution.

Signed: _____

[Candidate]

This dissertation has been submitted with our approval as University Supervisors and would certify that the requirements for the applicable MBA Programme rules and regulations have been fulfilled.

1. Signed: _____

[Professor H. O. Kaya]

2. Signed: _____

[Professor L-K. Mwansa]

ABSTRACT

This study explores for gender-based differences in the determinants of employee acceptance of organizational change among employees at the University of Botswana. Utilising a sample of 360 respondents drawn from academic and managerial staff the study sought to test for male-female differences in the acceptance of change, explore for male-female differences in the major factors that affect acceptance of change, and to test for male-female differences in the effects of the major determinants of acceptance of organizational change. Self-administered questionnaires were used to collect the data required for the study. The bulk of the data were analysed using SPSS statistical package with the t-test and regression (beta) coefficients as the key test statistics.

The study showed that the overall acceptance of organizational change among employees was moderate with male and female employees being equally likely to accept the changes taking place at the workplace. However, the sexes differed significantly in the levels of 10 of the 20 determinants of acceptance of change analyzed with women, relative to men, being substantially lower in promotional opportunity, work overload, job-skill match, participative management, trust in leadership, receptivity, and in job satisfaction and higher in routinization, enthusiasm, and desire to leave. Results for regression analyses showed that eight (8) of 19 substantive variables were significant determinants of acceptance of change for all employees. However, separate regression models for men and women revealed that 11 of 19 substantive factors were significant determinants of acceptance of change for males compared to two factors for females. Although the level of acceptance of change does not differ by the sex, male and female employees have different orientations to the change processes taking place in the organization and warrant separate treatment by management if organizational change is to be successful and yield the desired results.

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

We explore for gender-based differences in the determinants of employee acceptance of organizational change in Botswana focusing on the University of Botswana. The study acknowledges the significance and inevitability of organizational change within the context of globalization. However, it is argued that for change to bear its desired outcomes, it must be introduced, implemented, and managed in such a way that it is acceptable to all parties involved. This applies to all organizations whether in the public, private or voluntary sectors. In light of this, it is not enough for organizational leaders and managers to have the skills and expertise required for the introduction and management of change; they must also develop an understanding of the major factors that may promote and/or impede change acceptance by employees. Hence, the need to empirically study (identify) the factors that significantly impact on change acceptance among employees who, to say the least, are pertinent to the success of any changes introduced by organizations.

1.1 Background Information

Today the forces of economic globalization affect virtually every country in the world. In particular, economic globalization has caused a universal fragmentation engulfing all aspects of economic life and what happens in the bigger economies spills over to smaller emerging economies (Abedian, 1998). A major outcome of the globalization process during the last twenty years has been the intensification in the scope and pace of organizational change (Pritchett, 1994; Carr, Hard and Trahant, 1996; Bennett, 2000; Hamlin, Keep and Ash, 2001). Globalization has brought about social, economic and political challenges that have a direct impact on the way individuals, organizations, governments, and institutions do their business (Bennett, 2000; Robbins, 2000) the world over. All organizations "whether in the private, public or voluntary sectors have been subjected to enormous environmental pressures and forces of change..." (Hamlin, et al, 2001:13). Change has not only become a central feature of all organizations but is also becoming more complex and less predictable every day. To say the least, organizations everywhere must initiate and manage various types of changes in

response to the dictates of their internal and external environments. They must make significant changes in the way they do business in order to significantly compete in an increasingly challenging environment (Hale and Whitlam, 1997; Robbins, 2000). The other option is for them to ignore change but at their own peril (Shriver, 2002).

Clearly the need for organizational change is apparent and unquestionable. Most organizations appear to recognize the importance of change and organizations often embark on change programs armed with the promise and expectation of better service and rewards (Carnall, 1999). They are engaged in continuous changes in their structure, systems, procedures and personnel in order to respond effectively to changes in their operating environments. Some of these changes could include job enrichment or redesign, introduction of participatory decision making processes, quality control plans, improved pay systems, and the formation of autonomous work groups (Carr, et al, 1996; Smith, 1998; Duck, 1998; Robbins, 2000). However, of paramount importance is the need for planned changes to attract and gain the support of the affected parties. Successful organizational change requires that there must exist a common vision that change is necessary among all the affected parties. For any organizational changes to achieve the desired goals and purpose, the changes must be both viable and acceptable to especially management and employees (Mink, Mink, Downes, and Owen, 1994; Eales-White, 1994; Baron, Haman and Burton, 2001). This calls for an understanding and appreciation of the possible factors that would facilitate or militate against the implementation of organizational change especially on the part of employees. Such an understanding will guarantee that organizations develop effective ways of gaining workers' acceptance of these changes.

1.2 Statement of Study Problem

In Botswana change has been part and parcel of public, parastatal and private sector organizations since independence. In the public sector for example, the government, in keeping with the social, economic and political trends and driven by a desire to improve performance and productivity and to make the sector more reputable (Mmusi, 1985; Mogae,

1995; Republic of Botswana, 1985, 1997), has continuously sought to restructure its size, structure and operations. It has taken upon itself to continuously make adjustments “in the portfolios of various ministries to accommodate shifts in policy and improve co-ordination” (Republic of Botswana, 1968:67). In addition, employees are constantly being urged to embrace the changes in their organizations to ensure better service delivery and responsiveness to the needs of their customers (Republic of Botswana, 1993). By constantly restructuring the public sector, the government has sought to rationalize its objectives, functions and structures; simplify its work systems and methods; and to establish sound management services (Republic of Botswana, 1985). The situation is not much different in the private and semi-autonomous (parastatal) sectors. In the private sector in particular, change is viewed as a necessary survival ingredient in an increasingly competitive globalized business world.

Despite the recognition of the centrality of organizational change in all sectors in Botswana not much substantive research focusing on this subject among employees has been carried out. Yet there are indications that the implementation of such changes has not been accompanied by the desired outcomes such as performance improvements (see e.g., Republic of Botswana, 1993; Mogae, 1995). More specifically, there exists no research that we are aware of focusing on the determinants of employee acceptance of change in general or on gender differences in the effects of these. Furthermore, with the exception of a study conducted by Monyatsi (2004) focusing on the level of acceptance of organizational change among employees in the public service of Botswana, most previous works about organizational change in the country (see e.g. Asafo-Adjei, 1999; Nyamunga, 1999; Raditlhokwa, 1999) are mere commentaries about the subject matter. Even the limited discussion of organizational change that has occurred in the print media (e.g., The Botswana Guardian, 2001; Information Review, 2001; Mmegi Newspaper, 2001) has not focused on the subject of acceptance of organizational change. This study is designed to contribute towards filling the knowledge gap in acceptance of organizational change in Botswana by exploring for gender differences in the determinants of acceptance of change among employees. It

focuses on the case of the University of Botswana where two major changes – administrative/management restructuring and a shift from a year long to a semesterized academic programme were introduced in during the late 1990s and early 2000s, respectively.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The broad purpose of this study is to assess for gender based differences in the major factors that impact on the acceptance of organizational change among employees in the work settings in Botswana utilizing the case of the University of Botswana. More specifically the study aims to:

- Test for male-female differences in the acceptance of change among employees at the University of Botswana.
- Explore male-female differences in the major factors – namely, workplace features workplace, managerial features, employee personality traits, and employee affective responses - that affect acceptance of organizational change.
- Test for female-male differences in the effects of the major factors that impact on the acceptance of organizational change among employees at the University of Botswana

By focusing on these objectives the study hopes to answer the following questions:

- Are men and women employees at the University equally receptive to organizational change?
- Do male and female employees differ significantly in the factors that influence the acceptance of organizational change at the University of Botswana?
- Do the same factors produce acceptance of organizational change among both male and female employees at the University of Botswana?

1.4 The Importance of the Study

Conducting this study is important for three reasons. First is the contribution the study is expected to make to the stock of existing theoretical knowledge about organizational change in Botswana. The study will contribute invaluable information in an area where empirical knowledge is generally scanty if not totally lacking. As pointed out earlier, there exists no research that we are aware of focusing on the determinants of employee acceptance of change in general or on gender differences in the effects of these. Most previous writings (see e.g.

Asafo-Adjei, 1999; Nyamunga, 1999; Raditlhokwa, 1999) have mainly taken the form of commentaries about the subject matter or have simply not focused on the subject of acceptance of organizational change. The absence of such knowledge continues to act as an impediment to the successful introduction and implementation of organizational change in public, private, or voluntary sector organizations in the country. Through the proposed study, the body of knowledge about the acceptance of organizational change in general and the specific factors that promote and/or militate against that acceptance will be increased. It is hoped that by adding a more academic dimension to the ongoing debate about organizational change in Botswana, this study will stimulate further interest and research in the subject matter of acceptance of organizational change.

Second, is the study's implication for the development of policy to guide employment relations in work organizations in general and in the University of Botswana in particular. The study will contribute significant knowledge (ideas or information) that could constitute a basis for the formulation and, above all, the effective implementation of policy in the management of change in Botswana. By identifying the major factors that impact on employee acceptance of change in general and along gender lines in particular, the study will create knowledge that could form a milestone in the management of change among employees. As emphasized in the literature, change agents or managers who want their organizations to survive in today's turbulent world of business must have a clear understanding of the factors that foster the acceptance of organizational changes among employees and must also have the necessary skills in facilitating the acceptance of the desired changes (Carnall, 1999; Baron, et al, 2001). For Botswana such knowledge could guide change agents in developing policies and initiating changes that would facilitate greater acceptance of change among employees.

Finally, the change process itself is central in the attainment of organizational goals and/ or effective delivery of service. Existing evidence shows that organizational changes often have huge implications for the work environment (The Botswana Guardian, 2001; Mmegi

Newspaper, 2001; Pritchett, 1994). For instance, where change is being resisted, it can disrupt the work environment (Strebel, 1998; Kirpatrick, 1985; Aaron, 1985) and possibly lower the level and rate of productivity (Morgan, 1988; Pritchett, 1994; Triolo, Allgeier and Schwartz, 1995). On the other hand, the acceptance of organizational change ensures that the employees become motivated as well as creates team spirit in the organization (Kessler, Duckworth and Shapiro, 1997), which are very vital in a competitive environment (Hampden-Turner, 1990; Bennett, 2000). This, in turn leads to increased efficiency and sustainability of the organization and hence the attainment of organizational goals (Iverson, 1996; Kessler, et al, 1997; Baron et al, 2001). As such, understanding the factors that facilitate the acceptance of organizational change among employees as a whole and the differential effects of these factors among male and female employees cannot be overemphasized.

1.5 Organization of the Study

The study is organized into six chapters. Chapter one is the introduction and presents the backgrounds to the study, the problem of study, the study objectives and the justification for the study. The second chapter synthesizes the existing theoretical and empirical literature. This is grouped under five subheadings including an overview of organizational change, the resistance of organizational change, acceptance of organizational change, organizational change in Botswana, and the theoretical framework for guiding the study. The identification and definitions of the various factors analyzed by the study as the determinants of acceptance of organizational change is presented in chapter three. In the fourth Chapter we profile the methodology utilized by the study including the site description and units of analysis, the study sample and selection procedures, the methods of data collection, and the techniques of data analysis. The fifth and sixth chapters present the findings of the study and the discussion of those findings, respectively.

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

In this Chapter, we review some of the empirical and theoretical literature pertaining to organizational change in general and to the acceptance of organizational change in particular. The chapter is organized into four sections. While section one presents an overview of the process of organizational change, section two focuses on the subject of resistance of organizational change. In the third section we discuss the acceptance of organizational change among employees including the factors that have been shown to affect it. The last two sections, respectively, examine the process of organizational change in Botswana with an emphasis on the University of Botswana and the theoretical framework utilized to guide the study.

2.1 Organizational Change: An Overview

The term organizational change refers to "a difference in form, quality, or state over time in an organizational entity" (Nicholson, 1995:366). Very often organizational change is a planned, purposeful and goal oriented activity aimed at improving an organization's ability to survive in its environment (Robbins, 2000) and to model employee behavior to achieve desired ends. Change has become a permanent feature of all organizations today and its need is felt almost everywhere. It has become a permanent feature or part of their very existence either as a way of development or adaptation to the ever-changing environment. As Hale and Whitlam (1997:7) put it, change "has become a fact of life for anyone in an organization and especially for managers". Organizations must constantly make necessary adjustments in their structures, methods and practices in order to remain effective and competitive and to effectively deal with the challenges in their environment (Guest, Hersey and Blanchard, 1986; Carnall, 1999). Organizational change cuts across all organizations whether public, private, or voluntary. For instance, with the current drive towards privatization around the world, public organizations, particularly in the developing world, are currently engaged in rationalizing and streamlining their operations (Pritchett, 1994).

The importance of change to the organization cannot be overemphasized. More often than not, change often has huge implications for the work environment (The Botswana Guardian, 2001; Mmegi Newspaper, 2001; Pritchett, 1994). To illustrate, organizational changes can disrupt the work environment especially where it meets resistance (Aaron, 1985; Kirkpatrick, 1985; Strebel, 1998). This could lead to lowered levels and rates of productivity in the organization (Levin, and Fox, 1985; Morgan, 1988; Pritchett, 1994; Triolo, et al, 1995). Levin and Fox (1985) and Morgan (1988), for example, argued that employees who perceive job loss as a result of organizational change are likely to spend the rest of their time using organizational resources to find new jobs at the expense of productivity in the organization. Consistent with this view, Triolo et al (1995) observed that job insecurity has the effect of lowering productivity especially in the face of organizational change. On the contrary, where organizational change can boost the morale of staff and lead to increased productivity in the organization (Iverson, 1996). However, even in cases where employees have been properly consulted and have accepted the need for change the level of productivity may still be affected adversely as employees lose momentum while trying to adjust to their new situations (Kirkpatrick, 1985; Aaron, 1985). In this case productivity could decrease due to stay-aways, or as a result the man hours devoted to negotiations between employers and employees, consultations, and organizing between employees seeking clarification (Eccles, 1984; Hamlin et al, 2001).

In addition, organizational change often elicits mixed feelings and reactions from members and stakeholders of the organization (Kirkpatrick, 1985; Cross, 1990; Dessler, 1992; Knox and Irving, 1997). Not everyone would be keen on the changes taking place within their organization. Often by the time changes are introduced some employees would have become accustomed to the organization to an extent that any change in the organization becomes threatening to the status quo and therefore stands to be resisted. In other cases employees may accept the change particularly when there are perceived benefits (Levin and Fox, 1985). These variations in responses are very important in the success of the changes and they must be clearly understood by the organizational leadership. Furthermore, the change itself,

whether radical or incremental, can be a complicated and often painful and difficult process (Blank, 1990) requiring careful handling.

The nature and magnitude of the organizational change has important implications for the organization and all its stakeholders (Hampden-Turner, 1990; Iverson and McLeod, 1996; Strebel, 1998; Hamlin et al, 2001; Baron, et al, 2001). Based on a study conducted by Baron, et al (2001), for example, where an organization changed on all three dimensions of the organizations blueprint, especially those dimensions which workers have become accustomed to, there was a higher rate of employee turnover. Changes affecting the organization's original blueprint resulted in significant disruptions affecting mostly the most senior staff; those who had been with the organization during its formative stages. The study concluded that fundamental organizational changes destabilized organizations by altering their premises, values and organizational routines. Organizational change has also been associated with declining employee commitment to the organization (Pritchett, 1994; Iverson and McLeod, 1996). According to Pritchett changes often have the effect of weakening people's emotional attachment to the organization, thereby lowering their productivity. Focusing on bank employees, Iverson and McLeod (1996) found that change was affecting employees' commitment to organizational ideals at all levels. The study demonstrated that where change was fundamental and affecting the organization's core values, organizational commitment was weakened thereby affecting the acceptance and success of organizational changes. It should be noted that the disruption of the work environment due to organizational changes can result in huge losses for the organization especially where changes are dramatic and employees having not been properly consulted (Kirkpatrick, 1985; Hampden-Turner, 1990; Strebel, 1998; Hamlin et al, 2001).

2.2 Resistance to Organizational Change

The success of any change initiatives requires willingness and commitment from the affected parties to drive the changes to achieve the desired goals coupled with the existence of a common vision that change for the organization is necessary and inevitable. The fact is that

without the employees' buy-in and commitment and dedication, no progress is possible (Scarborough, Swan, and Preston, 1999). Change initiatives often fail because organizations try to implement a number of activities too quickly and without proper co-ordination or thought about the implications for people management. This leads to 'initiative fatigue' where employees become disillusioned and more resistant to change. According to Collins (2001:3) most change programs may fail because "they lack accountability, they fail to achieve credibility and they have no authenticity." Most people often view change positively and embrace it (Carrell, Jennings, and Heavrin, 1997; Cohen, Fink, Gadon, and Willitz, 2001; Bateman and Snell, 2002). However, there are those who will evaluate change negatively and resist it. The negative evaluation of change may occur because the benefits of the proposed change are unclear or because organizational members perceive those benefits to be outweighed by the costs of the change (Carrell, et al, 1997; Cohen, et al, 2001; Bateman and Snell, 2002). In addition, there are cases where organizational members simply prefer (or like) the status quo, do not wish to disturb it, and consider the old ways of doing things to be comfortable and easy. Resistance to change may point to a legitimate concern that the change is not good for the organization and that the proposed change should be rethought. Resistance, it should be noted, does not always show up as direct defiance or refusal to go along (Cohen, et al, 2001). It can be disguised, camouflaged, and passive. In some cases it may even take the form of covert sabotage including defacing of property, destruction of records, or the provision of defective goods/products to customers.

Resistance to change may develop from the individual, the organization itself, or from both (Carrell, et al, 1997; Bateman and Snell, 2002). Those who resist change do so for a reason and it is the manager's task to try and identify those reasons and, where possible, to plan the change in such a way as to reduce, if not eliminate, the negative effects and to correct misperceptions (Cohen, et al, 2001). Based on existing research, the following reasons account for resistance to change by the individual (Nadler, 1983; Stanislaw and Stanislaw, 1983; Carrell, et al, 1997; Bateman and Snell, 2002):

- *Fear of the unknown*: Also referred to as uncertainty, fear of the unknown appears to be the greatest cause of individual resistance to change (Nadler, 1983; Stanislaw and Stanislaw, 1983; Carrell et al, 1997; Cohen, et al, 2001). According to Cohen et al (2001: 354), 'change often involves moving from the known to the unknown, from relative certainty to relative uncertainty, from the familiar to the unfamiliar'. Consequently, individuals may construe change as threatening their job security, or even be concerned about their inability to meet new job requirements consequent from change.
- *Self-interest*: Most individuals care less about the organization's best interest than they do about their own best interest (Nadler, 1983; Stanislaw and Stanislaw, 1983; Carrell, et al, 1997; Cohen, et al, 2001; Bateman and Snell, 2002). As such, they will resist change if they associate it with the loss of something of value such as their job, income, power, influence, status, privileges, conveniences, and friends, among others.
- *Timing*: Poor timing of change can also induce resistance (Bateman and Snell, 2002). For instance, the timing may be wrong for management to introduce change when managers and/or employees are unusually busy or under stress or when the management-employee relations are strained. A key aspect of timing and receptivity is surprise. Where change is sudden, unexpected, or extreme, resistance is a very likely reaction.
- *Habit*: Change requires new ways of accomplishing tasks. Individuals who prefer the old way of doing things are therefore likely to resist it. For them, having to learn the new ways of doing things makes the job more difficult (Stanislaw and Stanislaw, 1983; Carrell, et al, 1997).
- *Peer Pressure*: Sometimes work teams rather than individuals may resist change initiated by management on account of peer pressure (Bateman and Snell, 2002). This is more likely to occur in situations where a group is highly cohesive and has anti-management norms. In such situations, the group may even resist reasonable change.
- *Personality Conflict*: The individual's ability to accept change may also be limited by his/her not getting along with others in the organization (Nadler, 1983; Stanislaw and Stanislaw, 1983; Carrell, et al, 1997).
- *Differing Perceptions*: In some cases, individuals may differ in terms of how change may affect them. While change may be viewed as good for some organizational members, it may be considered bad for others (Nadler, 1983; Stanislaw and Stanislaw, 1983; Carrell, et al, 1997).
- *General Mistrust*: Organizational members may understand the arguments for change but they may resist it because they do not trust the motives of those advocating the change (Stanislaw and Stanislaw, 1983; Carrell, et al, 1997).
- *Social Disruptions*: Organizational members may fear that change will disrupt existing traditions. In addition, those who accept change may be ridiculed by others who resist it (Stanislaw and Stanislaw, 1983; Carrell, et al, 1997; Cohen. et al, 2001).

Researchers (e.g., Lawrence, 1970; Patty, 1974; Katz and Kahn, 1978) have identified seven major organizational sources of resistance to change. However, these are not applicable to every change situation and every organization (Moorhead and Griffin, 1992). The seven sources include (see, Lawrence, 1970; Pettigrew, 1972; Patty, 1974; Katz and Kahn, 1978; Carrell et al, 1997):

- *Structural Inertia*: An organization's structure may be designed to maintain stability. Such a structure provides a resistance for change.
- *Bureaucratic Inertia*: Some organizations rely on inflexible bureaucratic rules, and rigid, standardized procedures to manage employee behavior. Such rules and procedures make it difficult for employee to be innovative, flexible and adaptive.
- *Group Norms*: Group norms refer to shared standards that guide membership behavior and make it understandable. These may prevent individual attempts for change.
- *A Resistant Organizational Culture*: Some organizations have cultures that emphasize stability and tradition. Those who advocate for change in such organizations are considered to be misguided.
- *Threatened Power*: Certain managers may resist change because they fear the loss of their power base.
- *Threatened Expertise*: Individuals and groups within organizations develop certain specialized expertise. Any change that threatens such expertise is likely to be resisted.
- *Threatened Resource Allocation*: Individuals and groups may resist change because they believe that it will threaten future resource allocation.

There are several effective approaches to managing resistance to change and enlisting cooperation. First, resistance to change can be managed through *education* and *communication* (Carrell, et al, 1997; Bateman and Snell, 2002). Managers must educate people about upcoming changes before they are introduced. It should communicate both the nature and logic of the change. This approach works well in situations characterized by a lack of information or inaccurate information and analysis. Second, management can deal with resistance to change through *participation* and *involvement* (Carrell, et al, 1997; Bateman and Snell, 2002). Change agents must not only listen to the people who are to be affected by the change but also involve them in designing and implementing the change. Management should

also use the people's advice as long as it is feasible. The importance of participation and involvement lies with the fact that it leads to commitment to the change on the part of the affected. This approach works well in situations where the change initiators do not have all the information they need to design the change, and where others have considerable power to resist. A third approach for managing resistance to change is facilitation and support (Bateman and Snell, 2002). The approach requires managers to ensure that the change is easy for employees and that they are supportive of their (employees') efforts. This calls for the provision of training and other resources necessary for carrying out change and for task performance under the new circumstances. The approach is particularly suitable in situations where people are resistant on account of adjustment problems.

Managers can also deal with resistance to change through *negotiation and rewards* (Nadler, 1983; Bateman and Snell, 2002). This involves management offering tangible incentives to those who cooperate with the change. Rewards such as bonuses, wages and salaries, recognition, and perks could be considered and possibly restructured to reinforce the direction of change. A fifth approach to resistance to change is through *manipulation and cooptation* (Bateman and Snell, 2002). This method applies where other tactics will not work or are too expensive. It entails the use of more subtle, covert tactics to implement change. Cooptation, a form of manipulation, involves giving a resisting individual a desirable role in the change process. As the person becomes more involved in the change, he/she becomes less resistant to it. Finally, management can use *coercion* to address resistance to change (Bateman and Snell, 2002). This approach is commonly employed where speed is essential and the change initiators possess considerable power. Coercion involves the use of punishment or the threat of punishment to those who resist change. That is, managers use force to make individuals comply with their wishes.

2.3 Acceptance of Organizational Change

As underlined earlier the change process is not only inevitable for organizations today but is also central in the attainment of organizational goals and/or effective delivery of services. For

organizational change to be effectively implemented and bring about the desired outcomes it must not only be viable but also acceptable to all affected parties including management and employees (Mink, et al, 1994). Indeed, most organizational change is doomed to fail if it does not receive employee endorsement and support (Eales-White, 1994; Baron, et al, 2001). The term acceptance of organizational change refers to the *employees' readiness and willingness, support, and commitment* to the organizational ideals during periods of significant internal and external shifts in the organizations structure (Bennett, 2000; Marks, 2000). Defined this way, the concept focuses on the willingness of the affected parties to embrace and function in a newly established order and their commitment to effect and implement the changes.

In implementing any organizational changes, gaining workers' acceptance of the changes must assume as much importance as any other aspect of the change process. Failure to do so can result in failure to achieve goals sought by the change or even the overall goals of the organization (Hampden-Turner, 1990; Eales-White, 1994; Hamlin, et al, 2001). On the contrary, acceptance of organizational change means that organizational goals are achieved resulting in increased efficiency and sustainability of the organization and hence contributing to the development of the nation (Iverson, 1996; Kessler, et al, 1997; Baron, et al, 2001). In addition, the acceptance of organizational change is an indication of employee motivation and could also lead to the creation of team spirit in the organization (Hampden-Turner, 1990; Kessler, et al, 1997; Bennett, 2000). All these are vital targets in a competitive environment.

2.3.1 Determinants of Acceptance of Organizational Change

Organizational leaders and managers wishing to initiate change must not only possess the necessary skills in facilitating the acceptance of the desired changes (Carnall, 1999; Baron, et al, 2001) but must also understand the dynamics of acceptance of organizational change (Hamlin et al, 2001). In particular, an understanding and appreciation of the factors that facilitate or militate against the acceptance of organizational change among employees cannot be overemphasized, especially considering the dynamic and volatile environment within which organizations exist today (Carr et al 1996). Change agents or managers must

have a clear understanding of the factors involved in fostering the acceptance of organizational changes among employees (Baron et al, 2001). This provides the bedrock for grounding management decisions about change and also acts as the guide to management in their efforts to initiate and successfully implement organizational change. By understanding and keying on such factors, change agents can devise effective ways of gaining workers' acceptance of the changes they seek to introduce (Eales-White, 1994; Baron, et al, 2001).

There exist a variety of factors that have been demonstrated to impact on employee acceptance of organizational change (see e.g. Carr, et al, 1996; Iverson, 1996; Smith, 1998; Bennett, 2000; Baron et al, 2001). Broadly defined, these include employee background characteristics (such as age, education and training, and length of service); workplace features (such as job security and communication); managerial features (such as participatory management, quality of management, and employee trust of management); and employee affective responses (such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment. It is to a more detailed profiling of these that we now turn.

Age and Length of Service

Based on existing literature employee age and the length of service are important determinants in the acceptance of organizational change (Triolo et al, 1995; Bennett, 2000; Chou, 2000). With respect to age, Triolo et al found that, unlike their younger counterparts, older nurses tended to respond to change with fear, insecurity, uncertainty, frustration, sadness, depression, guilt, betrayal, mistrust resentment, and anger. Similarly, Chou, who studied the impact of congregational structure on the transformation of Christian worship style, found that younger congregation members were more likely to accept changes in the congregation's style of worship than elderly members. Concerning the length of service, Triolo et al (1995) showed that nurses who had been with the organization for longer periods of time were more negative about change. They were more likely to respond to change with fear, insecurity, uncertainty, frustration, sadness, depression, guilt, betrayal, mistrust resentment and anger. Bennett (2000) also demonstrated that the longer the employee had

been with the organization the more likely he/she was unwilling to accept organizational changes.

Education and Training

Education and training have been featured as important factors in the acceptance of organizational change (see, e.g., Smith, Masi, van de Berg and Smucker, 1997; Strugwig, Smith and Venter, 2000). In their study of training practitioners, for example, Strugwig, et al found that training was an important factor in facilitating change in the organization. These results were consistent with those realized by Smith et al (1997) in their investigation of factors affecting successful organizational change and diffusion of accounting innovation in an accounting firm. Smith et al concluded that education and training reduced resistance and increased acceptance of organizational change.

Job Security

Job security is another important factor which has been shown to affect employee acceptance of organizational change (Smith et al, 1997; Smilonich, 1999). Employees may resist change if they feel insecure and threatened. To address this problem and increase acceptance of organizational changes, managers should use strategies such as involving, educating, communicating and negotiating with employees on planned organizational changes (Altman and Iles, 1998; Blank, 1990; Koeck, 1998). In a comparative study of job security, labor and flexibility among employees in Canada and Sweden, Smith et al (1997) found that limits to wage cuts and increases in their employment security were more likely to induce acceptance of organizational change.

Participation in the Change Process

It has been argued that in order to have successful transition in any organization all the affected parties and stakeholders must be involved in the process (Eccles, 1984; Kirkpatrick, 1985; Cross, 1990; Meyer and Shadle, 1994; Hamlin et al, 2001). The importance of participation in the change process as a determinant of acceptance of organizational change has also been demonstrated empirically (Pritchett, 1994; Kessler et al, 1997; Parker, 1997;

Smilonich, 1999; Bennett, 2000). In a study designed to find out how the Surrey County Council was able to keep a good working relationship with its employees, Kessler et al (1997) found that involvement in the process was an important determinant of employee willingness to accept the change. Similarly Parker (1997) found lack of involvement and poor communication to be significantly related to low acceptance of organizational changes.

Effective Communication

Effective communication also has been found to be a significant determinant of employee acceptance of organizational change (Knox and Irving, 1997; Leiter and Harvie, 1998). It is also important to ensure there is communication at all level by the stakeholders. This will ensure that misunderstandings by clients are removed and hence smooth change. In a study focusing on the perceptions of nurse managers about healthcare executive behaviors during organizational transformations, Knox and Irving found the communication of plans, directions, strategies and goals of organizational transitions to be very important and instrumental factors in leading acceptance of organizational change among workers. Consistent with Knox and Irving (1997), Leiter and Harvie (1998) found effective communication was very instrumental in the understanding of the change process among employees.

Perception of Change and Benefits

Employee perception of the change process and the benefits associated with the change process are significantly related to the acceptance of organizational change (Porter, Steers, and Mowday, 1974; Iverson, 1996; Saradmoni, 1996). Porter et al (1974) in their study of organizational commitment, job satisfaction and staff turnover among psychiatric technicians found that employees were more ready to accept change if they perceived some benefits such as increase in salary or promotion. This position was supported by Iverson (1996:11) who found that the acceptance of organizational change was a function of the "the degree to which employees perceive that organizational changes have resulted in improved workplace, climate and service delivery". Similarly, Saradmoni (1996), in a study focusing on changes in the condition of women in India, found that women accepted change in the matrilineal

system because of the gradual nature of the process and perceived benefits in the change process.

Organizational Leadership Style

The type of leadership in change processes can also influence the acceptance of organizational change by employees (Iverson, 1996; Knox and Irving, 1997; Leifer, 1989; Koeck, 1998; Smith, 1998). In a study focusing on the perceptions of nurse managers about healthcare executive behaviors during organizational transformations, Knox and Irving (1997) found that executive behavior was a major factor in determining the success of organizational changes and ranked most important in promoting the quality of work life during organizational transition. Similarly, O'Neil and Kenski (1977) found that acceptance of change was significantly related to the sponsors of the change. Leiter and Harvie (1998) also found employee confidence on the organizational leadership to be very instrumental in the understanding of the change process among employees.

Organizational Commitment

It may be argued that employees who accept organizational change demonstrate their support of and commitment to the organization. Commitment to an organization means that the employee embraces the organization's mission, goals, values, roles, functions, and context. This kind of employee is likely to exude a sense and feeling of attachment and ownership of the organization. Researchers have found that there is a significant correlation between the level of commitment and the acceptance of organizational change (Blank 1990; Iverson, 1996; Iverson and McLeod, 1996; Bennett, 2000). More specifically, organizational commitment is positively related to acceptance of organizational change such that the acceptance of change is likely to be high among employees who are committed to the organization's ideals, values, goals, mission. Bennett, who distinguished between three levels of commitment, namely continuance, affective, and moral commitment found that changes may threaten all these dimensions of commitment. According to him while continuance commitment is based on social and psychological and other costs of leaving the job, affective commitment is based on the employee's emotional bond to the organization. On the other

hand, moral commitment has to do with the "internalization of norms and identification with organizational authority ...values and mission" (Bennett, 2000:6). Consistent with Bennett, Iverson (1996) and Iverson and McLeod (1996) found that employee commitment to the organization was a significant determinant of acceptance of organizational change.

2.4. Organizational Change in Botswana

As pointed out earlier, like elsewhere in the world, organizational change has become a pertinent feature in the public, parastatal, and private sectors in Botswana. The public sector, for example, has experienced dramatic changes in its structure and size, among others, and there does not appear to be a likely end in sight to these organizational changes. Thus, change has become part and parcel of the public sector. Employees are constantly being urged to embrace the changes in their organizations to ensure improved performance, productivity, better service delivery, and responsiveness to the needs of their customers (Mmusi, 1985; Republic of Botswana, 1993; Mogae, 1995; Republic of Botswana, 1997; Botswana Guardian, 2001). To affirm its commitment to organizational change the government of Botswana established the Botswana National Productivity Center in 1993 through an act of parliament (BNPC Act) with the sole purpose to spearhead productivity improvement in the public and private sectors through, among other things, organizational change/institutional reforms. The Botswana government's support for organizational change is also evident through the introduction of a number of other initiatives particularly the Work Improvement Teams (WITS), the Standing Committee on Project Implementation (SCOPI), and, most recently, the Performance Management System (PMS) (Republic of Botswana, 1985, 1992).

Of all the changes initiated in the public sector in Botswana, it is the WITS and the PMS initiatives that have been the most visible. The WITS is a public sector people-centered management approach which seeks to develop public employees into problem-solvers, improvement seekers, and team workers who jointly initiate improvements in their respective areas of responsibility (DPSM, 1997). Its major objectives of WITS include the enhancement of team spirit and improvement of human relations; employee development of a more

positive attitude towards work; creation of a free flow of information between management and employees; provision of quality service, development of problem-solving skills; and inculcation of employee job satisfaction (DPSM, 1994). The approach enhances organizational efficiency and effectiveness as well as improving the quality of service to the public sector. Performance Management System (PMS), on the other hand, is a change and quality management process that facilitates the comprehensive management of performance at all levels in an organization. The strategy was introduced in the public service due to the realization that the public service needed a holistic and sustainable approach to improve productivity, manage performance and achieve set goals and objectives (DPSM, 2002). It was a response to public accusations of “insensitivity” and poor quality of services against the government as a whole. Through it, the government hoped to “leap frog” and forge ahead in its attempts to improve service delivery. The major objectives of PMS are “to improve individual and organizational performance in a systematic and sustainable way; to provide a planning and change management framework which is linked to budgeting and funding process; to enhance government capacity; and to inculcate the culture of performance and accountability to manage at higher levels of productivity so as to provide efficient service delivery” (DPSM, 2002:1).

2.4.1 The Case of the University of Botswana

Since the late 1980s two major forms of change have been initiated at University of Botswana with significant implications for the way the organization operates. The first form of change involved an administrative and management restructuring exercise whose resultant structure was implemented between 1998 and 2000. The second change was the shift from the year long to a semesterized academic programme which occurred in 2002. The new programme constituted a movement away from teaching and learning programmes extending over a one year (two terms) periods punctuated by established calendar holidays running from May to August to an academic year composed of two fifteen (15) semesters. It is the first form of change which is the thrust of this study.

In 1990 the University Council invited an External Review Commission to provide guidance on an array of issues, including “the restructuring of the current administrative, organizational and academic structures with a view to decentralizing and/or consolidating or merging certain functions in order to achieve effective administration in a rapidly expanding institution” (University of Botswana, 1990: 4). Council considered the Review Commission’s report in 1991 and accepted the recommendation to restructure the University. Senate was authorized to form Task Forces to undertake the detailed work regarding the reorganization exercise. In all, seven Task Forces were established. The most important of these was Task Force 1, which was mandated to “address all matters relating to the reorganization of the administration” (VCG.2/98, as cited in University of Botswana, 1993: 2). The Task Force presented its first report to Council in 1992. The report was approved with amendments and Council authorized the restructuring exercise to be completed in accordance with the guidelines set out by Task Force 1. In 1993 Task Force 1 presented its second report to council with a proposed (new) organizational structure for the University whose implementation began in 1998.

A striking feature of the revised organizational structure that was implemented in the period 1998-2000 was the expanded administrative cadre. It incorporated seventeen Directorates (some with Deputy Directors), each with line managers and ancillary staff. Posts had well-defined duties and responsibilities clearly laid out in organograms and flow-charts. Not only was the organizational structure expanded, but new language reflecting managerial tendencies also emerged with the new structure. The nomenclature traditionally associated with the University (e.g., Registrar, Bursar, assistant registrar) disappeared from statutes books as new managerial terms such as director, manager, senior management team, strategic planning, and ‘Chief Executive Officer’ in place of ‘Vice-Chancellor’ took their place. The expanded structure was contrary to the initial goal of the restructuring exercise which was to develop a leaner and streamlined structure. The structure has been a basis for concern even among Task Force 1 members, who argue that what they had proposed was a ‘leaner and meaner’ structure which rather than concentrate power at the centre would have devolved it

to the lower layers of the hierarchy. Indeed, Council at its August 1998 meeting to consider the final draft documents on restructuring questioned the expanded nature of the proposed structure (Tabulawa, 2004). However, the Executive deflected this concern by arguing that it was a futuristic structure. According to Executive Management expanded structure would obviate the need for another restructuring exercise in the foreseeable future occasioned by increases in University enrolment beyond the numbers projected at the conception of the restructuring exercise. Council acceded.

The administration and management restructuring at the University of Botswana was accompanied by the review of University Statutes (such as those on Senate and the Staff Appointments and Promotions Committee) and Committee system. The statutes are more than just rules and regulations guiding operations of an institution. They also embody power and act as the devices for distributing power amongst the various governing bodies of the university (University of Botswana, 1998: 4). A Working Group on the Revision of the University of Botswana Statutes was established in 1995. A draft was submitted to Senate in December 1996. Senate referred the draft to the various structures of the University for comments and in November 1997 and February 1998 a Senate Reference Group considered the draft statutes. Through the review of University Statutes power was re-distributed in favour of Executive Management, leading to a managerial approach to decision-making.

There are three major explanations of the restructuring that occurred at the University of Botswana (Tabulawa, 2004). First, the exercise was part of a broader public sector reform through which the Botswana government hoped to decelerate public spending. By the mid-1980s Botswana was experiencing an economic downswing as revenues from diamond sales fell, resulting in stockpiling of the 'precious stone'. This made it impossible to sustain the government's levels of expenditure (Republic of Botswana, 1991). The situation called for austerity measures to curtail expenditure across the entire public sector. The University of Botswana appears to have taken a cue from the tone set by government and started preparing for a future scenario of reduced funding from government. Guided by a future scenario of

austerity measures the institution began to focus on issues of efficiency and effectiveness and saw the major challenge facing it as that of maintaining and enhancing the quality of its products with a less generous resource base than it had enjoyed during the 1980s. In its contribution to National Development Plan (NDP) VIII the University promised to face this challenge by, among other measures, reducing “the financial burden on Government by restructuring its administrative and organizational framework to achieve greater efficiency and by exploring alternative sources of funding” (Republic of Botswana, 1997: 351).

The second factor occasioning administrative and management restructuring at the university of Botswana was the anticipated increase in the demand for university education emanating from improved access to both primary and secondary education partly due to the implementation of the Basic Education Programme in the early 1980s. The implementation of the programme saw junior secondary schools increasing from 40 in 1983 to 120 by 1989 (Meyer, Nagel and Snyder, 1993). In addition, it was projected that between 1991 and 2001 the number of students enrolled in Form V (the final year of secondary education) would increase from approximately 6 000 to a predicted 20 000 (University of Botswana, 1990: 8). Invariably, the demand for university education would increase in the years to come and the University would have to be prepared for that increase. As with the pressure for public reforms, the University’s chose to respond proactively to the pressure likely to be brought to bear on it by rising enrolments through a restructuring exercise.

The final factor responsible for administrative and management restructuring the University of Botswana was a growing strong perception in the 1980s that the institution’s administrative and management structures had immobilized to a point of near-paralysis and the situation required urgent attention. Some even predicted an imminent collapse of the administrative and management structures of the University. Management as a whole was seen as ineffectual and the Vice-Chancellor, in particular, was viewed as being indecisive (Tabulawa, 2004). As such, some deemed it essential to revamp the University’s structures. The feeling that the Vice-Chancellor was ineffective was echoed in the Task Force I report

referred to earlier. The constraining nature of the collegial system is alluded to also in the Task Force 1 report. It justifies the need for restructuring in terms of the “need to develop a structure that enhances the leadership role of the Vice-Chancellor”, an implicit acknowledgement of the fact that the structure obtaining then constrained the Vice-Chancellor’s action. According to the Review Commission, “the present structure is far too unbalanced and places too heavy a burden and day-to-day responsibility on the Vice-Chancellor” (University of Botswana, 1990: i).

It should be noted that the administrative and management restructuring implemented by the University of Botswana between 1998 and 2000 generated mixed reactions among both administrative and academic staff. Academics felt that the new structure marginalized and alienated them. This sentiment was captured in the *Report of the Task Group on the Review of the University of Botswana Act and Governance Structures* of 2004 (or what is commonly referred to as the Youngman Report) which observed that:

The implementation of the restructuring of the University from 1998 to 2000 and the perceived shift to greater executive power at the expense of collegiality highlight the issue of the role of Executive Management in relation to the governance structures. The decline in the authority and effectiveness of Senate in 1999 can be seen as a symptom of an unclear management/governance relationship (University of Botswana, 2004a: 14).

The general consensus is that the new structure has shifted the balance of power amongst the various administrative structures within the University, with a tilt towards more corporate management practices. This view is consistent with Newson (1992) who opined that one effect of an expanded middle management in universities is the de-professionalization or marginalization of faculty. This is achieved through the proliferation of cross-institutional and non-disciplinary academic support units (Henkel, 1997) which take power away from the academic and specialist base and render decision making subject to institutional rather than academic definitions. In short, the work of academics is redefined with “management [assuming] more organizational space and visibility in running the enterprise” (Gumport, 2000: 78). Given the foregoing, it may be concluded that the changes associated with the

restructuring at the University of Botswana are more likely to be supported by administrative and managerial workers and resisted by academic staff simultaneously.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

The subject of the acceptance of organizational change can be best explained within the context of organizational behavior; a field which seeks to understand how and why people behave in certain ways in an organization (Robbins, 2000). The field of organizational behavior is punctuated by several theories that could be utilized to study and understand human behavior in organizations. These include classical theories such as Fredrick Taylor's Scientific Management (Taylor, 1911; Reece and Brandt, 1987; Robbins, 1990) and the more contemporary Human Relations Approaches such as Douglas McGregor's theory X-theory Y (see e.g., Mayo, 1933; McGregor, 1960; Robbins, 1990). However, for the purpose of this study an extended formulation of Blau's (1964) exchange theory will be utilized. We argue that while classical and contemporary theories collectively may provide a framework for the understanding of organizational behavior in general, exchange theory appears to offer a more sufficient and plausible explanation of the acceptance of organizational change by employees.

To apply exchange theory to employee acceptance of organizational change in Botswana we treat the acceptance of change by employees as constituting the development of a form of exchange relationship taking place between the organization and the employees. Based on the exchange perspective, individuals enter social relations in anticipation of rewards or benefits in exchange for their inputs/investments in the relationship. The rewards could be both intrinsic and extrinsic factors while inputs/investments include factors such as effort, status, skill, education, experience, seniority and productivity (Kalleberg, 1977). Exchange theory has its origin in the works of George Homans (1958; 1961) who applied what is now termed exchange theory to social relationships existing within small groups. He argued that interactions between persons are analogous to an exchange of goods that carry with them some value. Individuals exchange aspects of their mutually exclusive benefits between one

another so that each derives some measure of that which he/she seeks, while at the same time each is instrumental in the other achieving some measure of his/her interest.

The exchange theory as formulated by Homans was extended by Blau (1964) to deal with kinds of social activities observable in complex organizations. Blau argued that social behaviors found in both simple and complex groups follow the same general principles as those presented by Homans. As applied to work organizations exchange theory argues that individuals perform for, or make contributions to, an organization in exchange for certain rewards or inducements (Mowday, Porter, and Steer, 1982). Prospective members to an organization bring needs and goals and agree to supply their skills and energies in exchange for organizational resources (such as rewards or payments from the organization) capable of satisfying those needs and goals (Hrebiniak and Alutto, 1972; Farrell and Rusbult, 1981; Mowday, et al, 1982; Angle and Perry, 1983). To the extent that there is a favorable balance or match between what the organization provides and the members' expectations (or between inducements and contributions) the members' satisfaction appears to be maximized and performance is maintained (Kotter, 1973; Scholl, 1981).

Applied to the study of employee acceptance of organizational change, exchange theory suggests that employees will accept organizational change to the extent that they do not perceive the change to be disadvantaging them or undermining (threatening) their status in the organizational. That is, employees are likely to resist any organizational change to the extent that such change creates a sense of insecurity, feelings of being unappreciated and undervalued, and undermines their capacity to satisfy their needs and goals. More specifically, we argue that exchange theory would consider acceptable to employees the kind of organizational changes that enhance the following:

- Intrinsic rewards or benefits inherent to the work itself and fulfill human goals related to the individual workers' internal sense of fulfillment (Kalleberg, 1977). These include but are not limited to the freedom to plan work (or self-direction and responsibility), the chance to learn new skills and abilities, opportunities to use one's skills and abilities (challenging work), being informed about the job, creativity, the ability to do the job well, sufficient feedback regarding the effectiveness of one's effort, being fairly rewarded

for work accomplished, the chance to see the results of work done, and the chance for self expression through work (Mottaz, 1985; Price and Mueller, 1986).

- Extrinsic rewards or benefits that are not inherent to the work itself but instead are the byproduct of doing the work (Kalleberg, 1977). These are provided by the organization for the sake of motivating the workers to perform their tasks and maintain membership in the organization and may include pay, fringe benefits, job security, promotional opportunity, and access to managerial positions.
- Foster employer trust and confidence in the organization's leadership and management.

Underlying this position is an assumption that employees value all attributes of the job and the work organization enumerated here.

CHAPTER THREE

DELINEATION OF STUDY VARIABLES

To present a comprehensive overview of gender based differences in the determinants of organizational change in the University of Botswana, this study focused on a broad range of factors (or variables) that have previously been demonstrated to impact on change acceptance among employees. These were grouped into four major groups, namely, workplace features, managerial features, employee personality traits, and employee affective responses. A fifth category of variables was used by the study as controls. The specific factors that are analyzed under each category are delineated and defined below.

3.1 Workplace Features

For the purpose of this study the following are analyzed as workplace features that impact on employee acceptance of change: Communication, job security, promotional opportunity, work overload, role conflict, resource inadequacy, routinization, and job-skill match. *Communication* refers to the transmission of information up and down the organization's hierarchy (Mulinge and Mueller, 1998). It represents the degree to which employees can transmit with ease their ideas, feelings, and feedback from their jobs to higher level administrators and/or managers. The variable *job security*, on the other hand, refers to the extent to which an employee is guaranteed his/her job as long as he/she is cautious and performs at a minimal level of competence (Leonard, 1977). The existence of job security, guarantees the employees the opportunity to continue applying the knowledge and skills that are associated with the job. This not only enables them to become better workers, but also helps them to further their career ambitions.

The third, fourth and fifth variables analyzed as workplace features are promotional opportunity, work overload, and role conflict. We define *promotional opportunity* as the degree of potential vertical mobility within the organization (Mulinge and Mueller, 1998). *Work overload* refers to the extent to which role expectations perceived by the focal person are in excess of the amount of time and resources available for meeting them (Blunt and

Jones, 1992). The converse of work overload is work underload and exists whenever the role holder considers the demands of the role to fall short of his/her abilities either in size or variety relative to the available time (Blunt and Jones, 1992). *Role conflict* represents the degree to which incompatible demands are made upon an individual by two or more persons whose jobs are functionally interdependent with that of the individual (Blunt and Jones, 1992). It may exist when two or more sets of role expectations, that are contradictory or incompatible, occur simultaneously such that compliance with one makes compliance with the other more difficult or impossible.

Other work place features analyzed as independent variables by our study are resource adequacy, routinization, and job-skill match. Whereas *resource adequacy* refers to the extent of sufficiency in infrastructural and material resources and equipment that are necessary for the employee to execute his/her duties with the minimum of discomfort (La-Anyane, 1985), the construct, *routinization* refers to the degree to which job performance is repetitious/lacks variety (Hackman and Oldham, 1975). The opposite of routinization is task variety and exists when an employee's job involves the performance of diverse activities. Finally, the variable job-skill match is defined as the extent to which the employee's skills and training are appropriate for the job he/she occupies. It represents the degree of fit between the employee's skills and the tasks performed. We argue that where the job-skill match is high, the employee may not be very receptive to change especially where the change may have negative implications for the skills especially required for task performance.

3.2 Managerial Features

The management features analyzed as determinants of acceptance of organizational change among employees included the following: Participative management, supervisory support, quality of leadership, and trust in leadership. *Participative Management* refers to the extent to which the organization's management involves employees in the adoption of major policy decisions that affect the organization and its employees. It represents a movement away from the traditional 'top-down' approach to decision making (Blunt and Jones, 1992; Mulinge and

Mueller, 1998). Employees, for example, can be involved in choosing between alternatives in new production or service delivery techniques, promotional procedures, staff promotions, terms of service for workers, and the hiring and firing of core personnel. *Supervisory support* is the degree to which supervisors are friendly, helpful and supportive to their subordinates (Mottaz, 1985; Mulinge and Mueller, 1998). It can be said to exist in a workplace where human relations characterized by trust, respect, friendship, and a considerable concern for subordinates' needs on the part of supervisors abound or where the supervisor's task oriented behaviour is such that both the roles of the supervisor and the subordinate are clearly defined. Whereas *quality of leadership* refers to the degree of efficiency and effectiveness of the organization's management, *trust in leadership* represents the extent to which the organization's management can be relied on (or counted) by employees to take care of them.

3.3 Employee Personality Traits

Four factors - social boldness, receptivity, endurance, and enthusiasm - are analyzed as important employee personality traits that impact on the acceptance of organizational change. Whereas *social Boldness* refers to the degree to which the employee is a spontaneous risk-taker [<http://www.onlinewbc.gov/docs/manage/traits.html>], receptivity represents the extent to which the employee is willing to listen to and consider others' opinions and ideas even when these are inconsistent with his/her beliefs and values. *Endurance* refers to the extent to which an employee displays a confident calmness when under stress (<http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/leader/leadchr.html>). Employees characterized by endurance are said to be courageous or to have the perseverance to accomplish a goal, regardless of the seemingly insurmountable obstacles. They have the ability to withstand fatigue, stress, and hardship (<http://www.chadduck.com/y Marines/useful/traits.htm>). Finally, *enthusiasm* refers to the extent of an employee's sincere interest and exuberance in the performance of duties (<http://www.chadduck.com/y Marines/useful/traits.htm>). This greatly enhances the likelihood that the task will be successfully completed. We argue that the success in task performance due to the employee's enthusiasm will nurture a positive attitude towards change thus making the employee receptive to change.

3.4 Employee Affective Responses

Three variables are analyzed as employee affective responses to the job and organization. These are job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and desire to leave. *Job satisfaction* refers to the degree to which an employee likes his/her job (Kallerberg, 1977; Mulinge and Mueller, 1998). It exists when the perceived benefits of work exceed the perceived costs deemed by the worker to be adequate under the circumstances (Kallerberg, 1977). For the purpose of this study, we define *organizational commitment* after Mowday, et al (1982) as the employee's identification with, and involvement in, a particular organization. According to them, employees who are committed to their work organization are willing to give something of themselves in order to contribute to the organization's well being. Allen and Meyer (1990:1) referred to this as "affective commitment" and defined it as "the employee's emotional attachment to, identification with, and involvement in the organization." Finally, following Halaby (1986) we define *desire to Leave* as the degree to which the employee wishes to leave or to quit working for the organization if alternative employment is available.

3.5 Control Variables

The study utilized five variables as controls. These are gender, age, education, category of staff, and tenure. As utilized here, *gender* refers to the sex of the individual whereas *education* refers to the highest level of formal schooling or training an individual has had. The variable age, on the other hand, represents the actual number of years the individual had lived by the time of the study. *Tenure* refers to the individual's length of service in the organization. Finally, *category of staff* represents the type of employee the individual is; administrative, or academic.

3.6 Endogenous Variable

The *acceptance of organizational change* is the outcome variable of our study. It represents the employees' readiness and willingness, support, and commitment to the organizational ideals during periods of significant internal and external shifts in the organizations structure. Implicit in this definition is the support and commitment of employees to the organization which implies an understanding of the organization, its roles and functions and context. This

also implies a sense and feeling of attachment and ownership of the organization by the employees. This definition derives from a rational perspective, which assumes that employees have a vested interest in the organization and its continued existence, hence their support of and commitment to its ideals.

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 METHODOLOGY

This methodology chapter describes the procedures that were utilized to collect the data used by the study to assess for gender differences in the acceptance of organizational change at the University of Botswana. It includes a description of the research site and units of analysis, the study sample and sample selection procedures, the methods of data collection, the response rate, and measurements and the data analysis techniques.

4.1 Research Site and Units of Analysis

The study was conducted at the University of Botswana. This is the only university on the land and is located in Gaborone the seat of government and capital city of the country. The University of Botswana as we know it today was formally established in 1985 after the dissolution of the University of Botswana and Swaziland (UBS). Since then the institution has grown tremendously to incorporate seven (7) faculties – namely Business, Continuing Education, Education, Engineering and Technology, Humanities, Science, and Social Sciences – and a school of Graduate Studies. Administratively, the University is organized into 12 divisions or units as follows: Human Resources, Academic Affairs, Information and Technology, Academic Development, Financial Services, Library Services, Campus Services, Student Welfare, Health Services, and Sports and Culture.

The University of Botswana has a total enrolment of 15 425 students and workforce numbering up to 2 153 employees (University of Botswana, 2004b). The workforce can be categorized into two broad groups: Academic staff and support and industrial employees. The academic staff number 760; only 30 percent of these are females. They include 38 professors, 46 associate professors, 147 senior lectures, 523 lecturers, and 6 staff development fellows (University of Botswana, 2004b). The second category is comprised of 1 393 employees. These can be grouped into executive management [four (4) persons], senior management (36 persons), management (136 individuals), and support and industrial workers (1 217 persons). The senior management of the university is made up of the Vice-Chancellor as the chief

executive, three Deputy-Vice-Chancellors, seven Faculty Deans, and 16 Directors (University of Botswana, 2004b). These constitute the umbrella leadership charged with the responsibility to move the institution forward.

The University of Botswana was considered to be a suitable site for the study because of two major reasons. First, as pointed out earlier, since the late 1980s the institution has implemented two major changes; the administration and management restructuring and the shift from the year long to the semester academic programme. These have set in place processes and employee experiences that are relevant to the analysis of organizational change in general and of the factors that may affect employee acceptance of change in particular. Second, as an academic institution, the University of Botswana is a major agent of change in the country. Through research and teaching the institution acts as a major engine of change by generating and disseminating knowledge that guides other change agents particularly policy makers and decision makers in different environments including business organizations. The specific units for the study were the administrative departments and/or units and the various academic faculties and centers that constitute the University of Botswana. However, it was the individual employees operating within the departments, units, faculties and centers who comprised the study's actual respondents.

4.2 Sample Selection Procedures

The University of Botswana has a combined workforce of 2 153 employees. These include 760 academic staff, 176 administrative/managerial workers, and 1 217 support and industrial workers. This study was confined to the former two categories of employees. Thus, it was the 936 individuals who make up these two categories of employees who constituted the population targeted by the study. These are the cadres of workers who must contend with most changes taking place in the organization; for the most part they must deal with the change process more directly by acting as change initiators, implementers, or both. In addition, relative to the support and industrial workers, these cadres of employees are better

equipped to understand and relate to changes taking place in the organization. As such, they are better placed to provide a more critical and balanced appreciation of that change.

In all 450 employees workers were distributed with questionnaires. These were selected from the 936 workers who comprised the population targeted by the study utilizing the simple random sampling technique. The sampling frame for the study was the 2004 internal directory of all academic and administrative/managerial employees at the University of Botswana. The directory provides an alphabetical listing of all staff in these categories. A number was assigned to each person or sampling unit in the sampling frame. These numbers were then written on pieces of paper, placed in a box, and shuffled before a random drawing of numbers (sampling without replacement) ensued to select the desired sample size of 450 respondents. Of the 450 interviewees sampled, 36 declined to act as a respondents and a second selection wave was conducted to identify substitutes. The sampling process eventually culminated with the selection of 318 academic staff and 132 administrative/managerial staff to act as the respondents for the study.

4.3 Methods of Data Collection

To collect the bulk of the data utilized in this study, the survey method was used. More specifically, the study utilized self-administered questionnaires. The questionnaires gathered information about the structural features of employee's job, his/her affective responses the job, and personal backgrounds. Respondents were allowed time to complete the surveys before handing them over to the researcher or his assistant. To strengthen accuracy, clarity, and ease of completion of the questionnaire by respondents, a pre-test of the research questionnaire was conducted utilizing a group of 20 respondents (10 females and 10 males) drawn from a population which reflected the major characteristics of those to be studied. The pilot study enabled the researcher to assess the relevance, accuracy, and clarity of question items and the ease of respondents' understanding of the question items. The concerns raised during the interviews with the 20 respondents involved in the pre-test were used to guide the adjustments to the research instrument.

The purpose of the study was explained to the respondents before the surveys were distributed to them. Any concerns that the respondents might have had were addressed before their co-operation was enlisted for the study. To guarantee confidentiality, no names were indicated on the surveys and each respondent was provided with an envelope in which to seal the completed questionnaire before turning it to the researcher or his assistant. Where it was not possible for employees to complete the questionnaires immediately, they were allowed two days during which they would complete the questionnaires and send them to the researcher using the university's internal mail services. A follow up was conducted once a week for four weeks with respondents who had not completed the questionnaires distributed to them and returned them to the researcher. Where a respondent indicated that he/she had misplaced the questionnaire a fresh copy was supplied.

4.4 Response Rate

Out of the 450 surveys distributed to respondents, 364 were completed and returned. This represented a response rate of 80.89 percent. However, four (4) questionnaires were judged unusable thus reducing the actual response rate to 80.0 percent. The response rate, however, varied by the categories of employees studied. Of the 318 academic staff distributed with questionnaires, 247 satisfactorily completed and returned them to the researcher. This constituted a response rate of 77.67 percent for this category of respondents. On the other hand, 113 of 132 administrative/managerial staff distributed with questionnaires satisfactorily completed and returned them to the researcher. This represented a response rate of 85.61 percent for this category of respondents.

4.5 Measurement and Data Analysis Techniques

Where possible, the variables analyzed in the study were measured using likert-type scales. Respondents were asked to rate each item on a scale with four response points coded from "strongly agree" [4] to "strongly disagree" [1]. The data realized by the study were analyzed in three stages. Stage one involved a presentation describing the study sample using descriptive statistics such as percentages, means and standard deviations. To test for gender differences in the determinants of the acceptance of change, on the other hand, mean levels in

the various factors analyzed were used. More specifically, the t-test (one-tailed) was utilized to check for the possible existence of significant differences between group means. Finally, regression analysis was used to execute separate causal models for each sex to establish whether the same factors are significant determinants of acceptance of organizational change for male and female employees.

4.6 Ethical Considerations

A major ethical consideration of any research is that the respondents do not come to any harm. By its nature, this study did not in any way expose the respondent to any danger. All respondents were guaranteed anonymity. First, no names or any information that could be used to identify particular respondents was employed in reporting the research findings and all surveys will be destroyed at the end of the study. Second, answers to all questions were kept completely confidential. No responses from a particular respondent were analyzed (used) separately. Instead responses were used only in combination with the responses from other participants. A second ethical consideration is that the respondent's participation is voluntary. This was ensured by informing the respondents of their right to voluntary participation at the beginning of the interview. The respondents were also informed about the objectives of the study and what the information was to be used for.

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 FINDINGS

This chapter presents the results of the study. It is organized into four major sections. The first section focuses on the socio-economic characteristics of the study respondents including their sex, age, marital status and educational attainment. The second and third sections focus on the mean differences in the determinants of acceptance of organizational change and the differential effects of those determinants on employee acceptance of change at the University of Botswana, respectively.

5.1 Socioeconomic Characteristics of Study Sample

The study sought data on the respondents' socio-economic characteristics including sex, marital status, age, citizenship, and educational attainment. Based on the results, those studied included 65.3 percent (235) males and 34.7 percent (125) females. With respect to marital status, 64.2 percent reported that they were married, 24.7 percent were single and never married, 6.4 percent were cohabiting, 1.4 percent were separated, 2.5 percent were divorced, and the remaining 0.8 percent indicated that they were widowed. The respondent included 246 academic staff and 114 administrative/managerial employees. They ranged in age from 21 - 67 years; the mean age was 40.7 years. Table 1 summarizes the respondents by age categories.

Table 1: Distribution of Respondents by Age Group

Age Group	Number	Percentage
Less than 25 years	7	2.0
25 – 29 years	32	9.0
30 - 34 years	75	21.1
35 - 39 years	59	16.6
40 – 44 years	66	18.6
45 - 49 years	43	12.1
50 – 54 years	42	11.8
55 - 59 years	18	5.1
60 + years	13	3.7
Total	356	100.0

Based on the Table, 67.3 percent of those studied were young adults aged 44 and below years. This means that the majority of the respondents were still far from attaining the country's mandatory retirement age of 60 years. Only 8.8 percent of the respondents were aged 55 years.

The results showed that the study sample was made up of highly educated persons. While 37.4 percent of them held doctoral (PhD) degrees, 36.0 percent had Masters degrees, 2.6 percent Postgraduate Diplomas, 9.4 percent Bachelors degrees, and 14.6 percent had Diploma or lower academic qualifications. The respondents' gross monthly earnings ranged from P2 500.00 to P25 000.00¹; with a mean monthly pay of P8 474.14. Table 2 summarizes the distribution of the respondents by income category. Based on the Table, over half (56.1 percent) of the respondents had incomes falling within the P5 001.00 to P10 000.00 income bracket. Only a small minority (2.0 percent) earned monthly incomes in excess of P15 000.00.

Out of the total of 360 respondents analyzed for this study, 68.3 percent (246) were academic staff whose duties mainly involved teaching and research. The remaining 31.7 percent (114) were administration/management staff whose responsibilities mainly included academic support services and administration. Of the academic staff 6.9 percent were Professors, 5.3 percent were Associate Professors, 23.6 percent were Senior Lecturers, 61.8 percent were Lecturers, and 2.4 percent were staff development fellows. These were drawn from all the faculties in the university. On the other hand, the 114 managerial employees interviewed for the study included Directors (4.4 percent), Deputy Directors (4.4 percent), Assistant Directors/Managers/Chief Technicians/Faculty Administrators (16.7 percent), Assistant Managers/Senior Laboratory Technicians (6.1 percent), Technicians/Laboratory Supervisors (30.7 percent), and Office Assistants (37.7 percent). Like the academic staff, managerial respondents were spread across all departments and units of the university. Those interviewed reported having overall work experiences ranging from one (1) year to 41 years;

¹ The Botswana Pula is the currency quoted in the study. The exchange rate currently stands at approximately 1.370 South African Rands and 0.210 US dollars to one (1) Botswana Pula.

Table 2: Distribution of Respondents by Income Bracket

Income Category	Number	Percentage
P5 000 or less	77	22.1
P 5001 – P7 000	55	15.8
P 7 001 – P9 000	85	24.5
P 9001 – P11 000	53	15.2
P 11 001 – P13 000	52	14.9
P 13 001 – P15 000	19	5.5
P 15 001 and above	7	2.0
Total	348	100.0

the mean period they had been working was 14.7 years. While 14.2 percent had been working for 5 years and below, 25.5 percent, 20.0 percent, and 16.7 percent had been in employment for 6 -10 years, 11-15 years, and 16-20 years, respectively. The remainder included 17.8 percent whose service ranged from 21 to 30 years and 5.8 percent who had been working for 31 years and above. The length of time the respondents had been working with the University of Botswana ranged from one (1) year to 30 years; the mean tenure was 7.0 years. Those studied included 54.6 percent who were permanent and pensionable; the rest (43.4 percent) were on contract workers.

5.2 Mean Differences in the Determinants of Acceptance of Change

To set the stage for the analysis of gender differences in the determinants of the acceptance of organizational change we present a brief descriptive overview of the variables analyzed as causal factors of change acceptance. All such variables were measured utilizing a four (4) item Likert-type scale coded 1 to 4. Overall, the results showed that the level of employee acceptance of changes taking place at the University of Botswana was moderate. Out of a total possible score of four (4) points, the mean score for the acceptance of change was 2.67 points with a standard deviation of 0.90 points. With respect to the specific categories of variables analyzed as determinants of the acceptance of organizational change, the results showed that employee ranged from moderate to high in all variables analyzed. As evident

from Table 3, mean scores ranged from 2.28 points (for social boldness) to 3.40 points (for enthusiasm). For variables categorized as workplace features, employee mean scores ranged from 2.36 points (for promotional opportunity) to 3.32 points (for job-skill match). While moderate scores were realized for the variables communication, promotional opportunity, resource adequacy and routinization, high scores were recorded for security, work overload, role conflict, and job-skill match.

For variables grouped under managerial features, mean scores ranged from 2.58 to 2.95 points with employees recording moderate scores in quality of leadership and trust in leadership and high scores in the rest of the variables analyzed. Scores for variables grouped under employee personality traits, on the other hand, ranged from 2.28 to 3.40 points. Employees reported moderate levels of social boldness but were high in receptivity, endurance, and enthusiasm. The final category of variables analyzed was employee affective responses. The results showed that employees were high in job satisfaction and organizational commitment - the mean scores were 3.08 and 3.20 points, respectively - and moderate the desire to leave the organization ($\bar{X} = 2.45$).

5.3 Gender Differences in the Determinants of Acceptance of Change

The first basic question underlying this study is whether male and female employees at the University of Botswana differ significantly in the factors that affect employee acceptance of change. To address this question, the study commences by testing for gender differences in the acceptance of change. As evident from Table 4, both male and female employees displayed moderate receptivity to change. The t-test of mean differences in acceptance of change showed no significant differences between male and female employees. This means that the sexes were equally likely to accept the changes taking place in the workplace. Table 4 also presents the group mean differences in the factors that affect the acceptance of organizational change among employees. Consistent with the specification provided in Chapter three, these are grouped into workplace features, managerial features,

Table 3: Means Scores for Determinants of Acceptance of Change^a

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Std Deviation.</i>	<i>Range</i>
<u>I. Workplace Features:</u>			
Communication	2.68	0.96	1 - 4
Job Security	3.07	1.05	1 - 4
Promotional Opportunity	2.36	0.97	1 - 4
Work Overload	2.78	0.85	1 - 4
Role Conflict	2.83	0.55	1 - 4
Resource Adequacy	2.64	0.79	1 - 4
Routinization	2.40	0.87	1 - 4
Job-Skill Match	3.32	0.84	1 - 4
<u>II. Managerial Features</u>			
Participative Management	2.83	0.92	1 - 4
Autonomy	2.95	0.71	1 - 4
Supervisory Support	2.88	0.61	1 - 4
Quality of Leadership [a]	2.58	0.87	1 - 4
Trust in Leadership	2.68	0.80	1 - 4
<u>III. Employee Personality Traits:</u>			
Social Boldness	2.28	0.96	1 - 4
Receptivity	3.10	8.11	1 - 4
Endurance	3.36	0.61	1 - 4
Enthusiasm	3.40	0.62	1 - 4
<u>IV. Employee Affective Responses:</u>			
Job Satisfaction	3.08	0.78	1 - 4
Organizational Commitment	3.20	0.78	1 - 4
Desire to Leave	2.45	0.96	1 - 4
<u>V. Endogenous Variable:</u>			
Acceptance of Change	2.67	0.90	1 - 4

^a All items were measured using scales of 1.00 – 4.00. The scores are rated as follows:
 1.00 - 1.59 = low, 1.60 - 2.79 = moderate, 2.80 - 4.00 = high.

employee personality traits, and employee affective responses. Presented below is a more detailed discussion of each of these categories of variables starting with workplace features.

5.3.1 Workplace Features

Overall mean scores for workplace features for males and females showed that both sexes perceived moderate levels of communication, promotional opportunity, resource adequacy and routinization and high levels of job security, role conflict and job-skill match. Whereas males perceived high levels of work overload, females were moderate in the same. Results for t-tests for independent sample means showed that, relative to their male counterparts, women were substantially lower promotional opportunity ($p < .05$, 2-tailed test), work overload ($p < .001$, 2-tailed test), and job-skill match ($p < .01$, 2-tailed test). However, they were significantly higher in routinization ($p < .01$, 2-tailed test) compared to male employees. This is consistent with our expectation that women are more likely than men to fill positions that require the performance of highly repetitive (routine) tasks. No significant differences were observed for group means in communication, job security, role conflict, and resource adequacy. Nevertheless, with the exception of job security and role conflict, women's mean scores in these variables were still slightly lower than men's; women scored higher than men and were tied with them in job security and role conflict, respectively.

5.3.2 Managerial Features

Within the context of managerial features, the study focused on four variables, namely participative management, supervisory support, quality of leadership, and trust in leadership. Both males and females reported moderate levels of quality of leadership and high levels of supervisory support. Whereas males reported high levels of participative management and trust in leadership, women were low in the same. The t-test results for mean differences revealed significant gender differences in two of the four variables analyzed. Women were found to be substantially lower than men in participative management ($p < .01$, 2-tailed test), and in trust in leadership ($p < .01$, 2-tailed test). No significant gender differences were observed for supervisory support, and quality of leadership. While the sexes were tied in

Table 4: Mean Differences in the Determinants of Acceptance of Change^a

Variable	Males [N=235]		Females [N=125]		t-value
	Mean	Std. Dev.	Mean	Std. Dev.	
<i>I. Workplace Features:</i>					
Communication	2.69	0.92	2.66	1.02	0.26
Job Security	3.02	1.05	3.16	1.12	- 1.18
Promotional Opportunity	2.42	0.96	2.24*	0.96	1.74
Work Overload	2.87	0.86	2.61***	0.82	2.82
Role Conflict	2.83	0.54	2.83	0.57	0.04
Resource Adequacy	2.68	0.81	2.56	0.74	1.44
Routinization	2.32	0.87	2.56**	0.85	- 2.41
Job-Skill Match	3.40	0.78	3.15**	0.93	2.72
<i>II. Managerial Features:</i>					
Participative Management	2.91	0.90	2.69**	0.96	2.12
Supervisory Support	2.88	0.63	2.88	0.57	0.06
Quality of Leadership	2.57	0.83	2.59	0.93	- 0.23
Trust in Leadership	2.75	0.75	2.56**	0.87	2.14
<i>III. Employee Personality Traits:</i>					
Social Boldness	2.27	0.93	2.29	1.02	- 0.20
Receptivity	3.18	0.80	2.95**	0.82	2.54
Endurance	3.36	0.61	3.35	0.61	0.08
Enthusiasm	3.36	0.57	3.47*	0.69	-1.68
<i>IV. Employee Affective Responses:</i>					
Job Satisfaction	3.17	0.70	2.90***	0.90	3.26
Organizational Commitment	3.23	0.74	3.15	0.85	0.94
Desire to Leave	2.38	0.95	2.57*	0.97	1.78
<i>V. Endogenous Variable:</i>					
Acceptance of Change	2.68	0.90	2.65	0.89	0.35

^a Significance tests are for gender mean differences with t-tests.

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***P<.001 (2-tailed tests)

mean scores in supervisory support (both $\bar{X}$ scores were 2.88), the women's mean score in quality of leadership was slightly higher than of men by 0.02 points only.

5.3.3 Employee Personality Traits

The study incorporated four variables as important employee personality traits that could impact on the acceptance of change by the employee. These are social boldness, receptivity, endurance, and enthusiasm. The results showed that both male and female employees perceived themselves to be characterized by moderate levels of social boldness and by high levels of receptivity, endurance, and enthusiasm. Tests for gender mean differences showed substantial difference in mean scores for receptivity and enthusiasm. As evident from Table 4, relative to their male counterparts, female employees were significantly less receptive to the opinions (ideas) of other employees ($p < .01$, 2-tailed test). However, contrary to expectations, women were significantly higher than men in enthusiasm ($p < .05$, 2-tailed test). No substantial mean differences were observed for social boldness and endurance meaning that both men and women were equally likely to take risk and to be persevering.

5.3.4 Employee Affective Responses

The final category of substantive variables analyzed by our study was employee affective responses. Under this category we focused on three variables, namely job satisfaction, organizational commitment and desire to leave. Both men and women displayed high levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment and moderate levels of desire to leave. However, the sexes were found to differ substantially in job satisfaction and desire to leave with the outcome that female employees were significantly lower in the former ($p < .001$, 2-tailed test) but higher in the latter ($p < .05$, 2-tailed test). No substantial male-female differences were observed for organizational commitment. That is, both men and women employees were equally likely to be committed to the University of Botswana. However, the mean commitment score for females was less than that for males by 0.08 points

5.4. Effects of the Determinants of Acceptance of Change

As pointed out earlier, no empirical studies focusing on gender differences in employee acceptance of organizational change either in the developed nations or in developing nations like Botswana have appeared in the literature. In Botswana, the few studies that have focused on the subject have emphasized the level of acceptance of organizational change among employees in the public service (see Monyatsi, 2004), or have been mere commentaries about the subject matter (see e.g. Asafo-Adjei, 1999; Nyamunga, 1999; Radithhokwa, 1999). These have totally ignored the factors that affect employee acceptance of organizational change. As a precursor to the analysis of differential effects of the determinants of the acceptance of organizational change among University of Botswana employees, we first focus on the effects of these factors on acceptance of organizational change for both male and female employees. This process is then followed by the comparative analysis of the effects of these factors in which each sex is analyzed separately.

5.4.1 Overall Effects

A causal model for acceptance of organizational change by both males and females was estimated for all four categories of substantive and control variables analyzed jointly. The results are presented in Table 5. For every category of variables standardized (b) regression coefficients are reported. These indicate the relative influence (predictive power) of each reward on the acceptance of organizational change. As evident from Table 5, out of the 19 substantive variables analyzed eight (8) have statistically significant net effects on the acceptance of change. The findings indicate that employees who experience high level of role conflict in their jobs, have low job repetition, participate in the making of decisions and policies that affect them and their work organization, perceive the quality of leadership in the organization to be high, and have trust in the leadership of the organization are more receptive to organizational change. The same is also true for employees who are socially bold, receptive to the ideas of others even when these stand in opposition to their beliefs and values, and have low levels of desire to leave the organization. All these relationships are in the expected direction.

Table 5: Regression Results for Determinants of Acceptance of Change^a

Variables	Beta Coefficients		
	Combined	Males	Females
<i>I. Workplace Features:</i>			
Communication	.097	.200**	.025
Job Security	.077	.126*	.035
Promotional Opportunity	.092	-.010	.161
Work Overload	-.084	-.209***	.099
Role Conflict	.103*	.162**	.002
Resource Adequacy	.055	.121*	-.054
Routinization	-.128**	-.154**	-.163
Job-Skill Match	-.086	-.168**	.060
<i>II. Managerial Features:</i>			
Participative Management	.100*	.080	.261**
Supervisory Support	-.090	-.166*	.054
Quality of Leadership	.139**	.134	.140
Trust in Leadership	.130*	.129*	.034
<i>III. Employee Personality Traits:</i>			
Social Boldness	.149***	.171***	.085
Receptivity	.108*	.092	.102
Endurance	-.071	-.022	-.194
Enthusiasm	-.078	.010	-.284***
<i>IV. Employee Affective Responses:</i>			
Job Satisfaction	.040	.090	.048
Organizational Commitment	.052	-.010	.200
Desire to Leave	-.131**	-.180**	-.041
<i>V. Control Variables:</i>			
Age	-.114*	-.137*	-.108
Gender [Male]	.068	--	--
Education	.087	.184*	.087
Academic Staff	-.139**	-.092	-.207
Tenure	-.094*	-.069	-.041
R² - value	.316	.418	.360

^a Standardized coefficients are reported.

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.00 (one-tailed tests)

The eight (8) variables having significant net effects on acceptance of organizational change are spread across the four categories of variables analyzed for the study as follows: workplace features - two variables; managerial features - three variables; employee personality traits - two variables; and employee affective responses - one variable. The variable social boldness (from the employee personality traits category) has the greatest effect on the acceptance of organizational change followed by quality of leadership (managerial features category), desire to leave (employee affective responses category), trust in leadership (managerial features category), routinization (workplace features category), receptivity (employee personality traits category), role conflict (workplace features category), and participative management (managerial features category).

In addition, the results indicate that out of the five (5) control variables incorporated in the model, three (3) have statistically significant net effects on the acceptance of organizational change by employees at the University of Botswana. These are employee age, category of employee (whether academic or administrative), and tenure (or the length of time the individual had been working for the University of Botswana). More specifically, older employees, and academic staff, and those who had been working for longer periods are shown to be less receptive to the changes taking place at the university relative to their counterparts who are younger, administrative, and had been working for shorter periods, respectively. Jointly, the substantive and control variables explain about 32 percent of the variance in acceptance of organizational change.

5.4.2 Differential Effects

One of the objectives of this study, as stated earlier, is to test for female-male differences in the effects of the major factors that impact on the acceptance of organizational change among employees at the University of Botswana. To pursue it, separate regression analysis was performed for each gender group. In each case substantive and control variables were entered jointly to determine if they influence acceptance of organizational change for the particular sex in question. The results are presented in Table 5. As evident from the Table, overall men

and women differ in the factors that significantly determine their acceptance of organizational change. In all out of the 24 substantive and control variables analyzed, 13 have significant effects on acceptance of organizational change for male employees whereas only two substantially impact on acceptance of organizational change for female workers. Jointly, the substantive and control variables explain about 42 percent of the variance in acceptance of organizational change for males and 36 percent of the same for females. A more detailed presentation of the results is undertaken below. For ease of comparison the results for each category of factors utilized by the study are presented separately starting with workplace structures.

Workplace Features

Based on Table 5, seven (7) of the eight (8) workplace features analyzed had statistically significant effects on the acceptance of change among male employees. These are communication, job security, work overload, role conflict, resource adequacy, routinization, and job-skill match. This means that male employees who are able to transmit information up their organization's hierarchy, are guaranteed to hold their jobs for as long as they wish, have low work loads, and experience high level of role conflict in their jobs are more receptive to organizational change. The same is also true of male workers who have sufficient resources to execute their duties, have low job repetition, and whose skills and training are less matched with the jobs they do. The variable workload has the greatest effect on male acceptance of organizational change followed by communication, job-skill match, role conflict, routinization, job security, and resource adequacy. None of the eight (8) variables analyzed as workplace features are shown to be significant determinants of acceptance of organizational change among female employees.

Managerial Features

The regression results for the effects of managerial features on acceptance of organizational change among male employees indicate that two of the four variables analyzed - supervisory support, and trust in leadership - substantially affect acceptance of change for male workers (see Table 5). Specifically, supervisory support has a negative effect on the acceptance of

change by male employees. This effect, however, is not in the expected direction. The effect of leadership trust is positive, meaning that male employees who have high trust in the leadership of the organization have greater acceptance of organizational change. On the other hand, only one of the four managerial features analyzed - that is, participative management - has significant effects on acceptance of change for female employees. The results show that female employees who are involved in making decisions and developing policies that impact on functioning and operation of employees and on the organization are more likely to embrace the changes taking place in the workplace.

Employee Personality Traits

The results for employee personality traits show that that only one of the four factors analyzed has a significant affect for men at the .05 or better level of significance (one-tailed test). Male employees who are high in risk taking are shown to have a greater propensity to accept organizational change relative to their more cautious counterparts. Similarly, only one factor has a significant effect on acceptance of organizational change among female workers. Specifically, enthusiasm has a negative effect on the acceptance of change by male employees. The effect, however, is not in the expected direction.

Employee Affective Responses

Of the three employee responses analyzed, only one – desire to leave – significantly impacted on the acceptance of change among male employees at the University of Botswana. As evident from Table 5, men who are low in their wish to find employment in a place other than the University of Botswana are more inclined to support change relative to their counterparts who are high in the desire to leave. None of the three employee affective responses has significant effects on the acceptance of organizational change for female employees.

Control Variables

The results indicate that out of the four control variables allowed to impact on acceptance of organizational change, two have statistically significant net effects for males. Male employees who are older are less receptive to change relative to their younger counterparts

whereas those who have high educational qualifications are more likely to accept and support change. None of the four control variables analyzed is a significant determinant of acceptance of organizational change for female workers.

CHAPTER SIX

6.0 SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND CONCLUSIONS

This chapter summarizes and discusses the main findings of the study. It is organized into five major sections. While section one presents a synopsis of the key findings, section two discusses (interprets) the results of the study. In the third and fourth sections conclusions are drawn and recommendations for addressing problems identified by study findings offered, respectively. The fifth section presets some suggestions for further research.

6.1 Summary of Findings

A total of 360 respondents drawn from academic and administrative staff at the University of Botswana were analysed for this study. These included 235 males and 125 females aged 21 and 67 years with a mean age of 40.7 years. The respondents incorporated a broad mix of employee ranging from senior academic and administrative staff to lower level academic and supervisory staff. Those studied ranged in educational attainment from diploma to doctoral degrees with the majority (73.4 percent) having attained master degree and above levels of education. The respondents' work life experience ranged from 1 to 41 years (the mean working period was 14.7 years) and earned a gross monthly income of between P2 500.00 to P25 000.00.

Overall, the study showed that the acceptance of organizational change among employees at the University of Botswana was moderate. Out of a possible total score of 4.00 points, the mean acceptance of change for the study sample was 2.67. This was slightly below the rating for high which was set at 2.70 points. Concerning the specific categories of factors analyzed as determinants of acceptance of change, the results showed that employees ranged from moderate to high in the levels of all variables. Mean scores ranged from 2.28 points to 3.40 points with eight (8) out of the 20 factors analyzed recording average scores and the remaining 12 factors high scores. The assessment of gender based differences revealed that male and female employees did not differ significantly in the acceptance of change. Both sexes were equally likely to accept the changes taking place at the University of Botswana in

general and the restructuring of the university in particular. However, the sexes differed significantly in the levels of 10 of the 20 factors analyzed as determinants of acceptance of organizational change. The results showed that women were substantially lower than men in seven (7) and higher in three (3) variables. They were lower in promotional opportunity, work overload, job-skill match, participative management, trust in leadership, receptivity, and in job satisfaction and higher in routinization, enthusiasm and desire to leave.

Results for regression analyses showed that out of 19 substantive variables analyzed, eight (8) had statistically significant net effects on the acceptance of change for employees at the University of Botswana. These were spread across all four categories of variables utilized for the study. In addition, three (3) of five (5) control variables analyzed significantly impacted on the acceptance of change. The regression model explained about 32 percent of the variance in acceptance of organizational change for all employees. The separate regression models for men and women showed great variations in the factors that are important in explaining acceptance of change among the sexes. Whereas 11 of 19 substantive variables, spread across all four groups of factors analyzed, and two (2) of four (4) control variables had significant effects on the acceptance of organizational change for the male sub-sample, only two substantive variables significantly impacted on acceptance of change among female workers. For the males, the variable work overload had the greatest effect ($b = -0.209$) followed by communication ($b = 0.200$) while the lowest effect was in the variable resource adequacy ($b = 0.121$). The models explained about 42 percent and 36 percent of the variance in acceptance of change for males and females, respectively.

6.2 Discussion of Findings

This study set out to explore for gender differences in the acceptance of organizational change among employees at the University of Botswana. To do so the study was guided by three objectives as follows: To test for male-female differences in the acceptance of change, to explore for male-female differences in the levels of the factors that impact on the acceptance of change, and to test for female-male differences in the effects of the

determinants of acceptance of organizational change. For ease of presentation, the discussion of the study's findings ensuing hereafter follows these three objectives in the same order they appear in the study.

6.2.1 Gender Differences in the Acceptance of Change

Overall, the study found that employees at the University of Botswana have a positive attitude towards change. The mean acceptance of change for all respondents was moderate and both male and female employees were equally likely to support organizational change. The results suggest that both academic and administrative staff are not apathetic to change. Rather, they have a positive predisposition towards change and their acceptance of change can be improved further by rethinking the way the change is initiated. This view is bolstered by information gathered from informal discussions with key persons within the academic and administrative establishments of the University and from the study's finding that academic staff were more likely to resist change than administrative staff. Most of the key personalities interviewed informally, and especially academic staff, echoed the sentiments expressed in the literature review (see subsection 2.4.1) that the new structure was rather inappropriate because it marginalized certain sections of the workforce (read academic staff) and shifted the balance of power amongst the various administrative structures within the University, with a tilt towards more corporate management practices. Academic staff also felt that they were not adequately consulted despite the fact that the University is, first and foremost, an academic rather than a corporate organization. While one may applaud the University of Botswana management's recognition that change is imperative in an increasingly globalized world characterized by greater competition in most spheres including tertiary education, one cannot lose sight of the fact that management needs to rethink its approach to the change process. More specifically, a more participative approach to the implementation of the change process would significantly elevate the levels of acceptance of change among all cadres of employees.

The finding that both males and females were equally willing to support organizational change also suggests that change managers at the University of Botswana have the opportunity to rally both sexes whenever change becomes necessary to the competitiveness and very survival of the organization. This is contrary to the situation obtaining in most organizations in which women, because of their marginalized (token) positions in the decision making structure, tend to not only drop out of the important processes taking place within the organization but to also become very apathetic to every change initiated by the male dominated management. As will be pointed out shortly, female employees at the University of Botswana are marginalized like their counterparts in other sectors. However, the results of this study suggest that they still have the potential to embrace changes taking place in the workplace.

6.2.2 Gender Differences in the Determinants of Acceptance of Change

The second objective of our study was to test for male-female differences in the factors affecting the acceptance of change. The results showed that men and women differed substantially in the levels of important determinants of change acceptance. More specifically, it was found that women were substantially lower than men in promotional opportunity, work overload, job-skill match, participative management, trust in leadership, receptivity, and in job satisfaction and higher in routinization, enthusiasm and desire to leave. With the exception of enthusiasm, these results are consistent with most of the literature about gender inequalities in general and in the workplace in particular (see, e.g., Nyati-Ramahobo, 1992; Bradshaw and Wallace, 1996; House-Midamba, 1996; United Nations and Government of Botswana, 1998; Mueller and Mulinge, 2001; Mulinge, 2001, 2002). Generally speaking these studies have demonstrated that women compared to men continue to suffer a host of disadvantages in the workplace both in the industrialized and the developing countries. Consistent with the findings of this study, women have persistently been found to have less access to promotional opportunities especially to promotion that puts them in top managerial positions. Female employees are also said to have less workload than men, to suffer greater

alienation from decision-making, and to occupy positions characterized by tasks lacking in task variety.

This study found that women were substantially lower in job satisfaction as well as more enthusiastic in their work than men. These findings are rather unique and run counter to the general trends depicted in the literature. Concerning job satisfaction, the literature (see e.g., Bokemeier and Lacy, 1986; Hodson, 1989; Phelan, 1994) has often suggested that despite experiencing inferior conditions and labor market outcomes relative to men, women workers tend to be more satisfied with their jobs than their male counterparts. Our study suggested that the disadvantages suffered by women at the University of Botswana acted to lower their level of job satisfaction relative to their male counterparts. One possible explanation for this trend is the caliber of employees studied. This study focused on highly educated workers and completely excluded industrial class workers. It may be concluded that this category of employees are very interested in developing and furthering their careers. As such, they are also likely to be sensitive and react to the practices characteristic of their workplace. Like job satisfaction, the finding that women are substantially more enthusiastic about their work than men appears to be counter normative. It dispels the general notion that most female employees pay closer attention to activities in the domestic scene rather than to their work roles. Again, this may be a reflection of the fact that most of the women studied were individuals who were interested in developing strong careers.

6.2.3 Effects of the Determinants of Acceptance of Change

For ease of presentation the discussion in this subsection occurs in two steps. In the first step we focus on the overall effects of the both the substantive and control variables incorporated in the study whereas the second step zeroes-in on the differential effects of these two categories of variables for the two sexes.

Overall Effects

At the broad level this study found that eight (8) of 19 substantive factors and three (3) of four (4) control variables analyzed emerged as significant determinants of acceptance of

change for the combined sample of male and female employees. The results showed that employees who experienced high levels of role conflict, low levels of task routinization, participated in decision making at the workplace, perceived the management of the organization to be of good quality, and who had trust in the management of the organization were likely to support organizational change in the workplace. The same applied to employees characterized by high levels of risk taking, willingness to accommodate others' ideas and suggestions, and low levels of desire to exit the organization. Similarly, younger employees, administrative staff, and those who had been working for the University for shorter periods were more likely to support change compared to the old, academic staff and those who had been with the University for much longer. A more specific treatment of these findings by way of interpretation is undertaken in the ensuing paragraphs.

The findings that employees whose jobs are characterized by high levels of role conflict and routinization, who are socially bold, and who have high levels of desire to find a job elsewhere are not surprising. First, it is logical that employees who experience role conflict or are performing mainly routine activities in their jobs will support organizational change especially if the change is likely to be a solution to these dilemmas. That is, they will support change in the hope that it will reduce conflict in job demands as well as constitute a basis for more improved tasks and work roles characterized by greater variety of activities. Logically, also risk takers are more likely to embrace change given that change itself constitutes a form of risk. It involves abandoning the known to venture into new ways of doing things (the Unknown) without sufficient guarantee that the new approach will be successful. Those who desire to leave are employees who have lost interest in the organization and do not care much about the processes taking place within it including the initiation of change. Hence, the low likelihood that these workers will accept the changes taking place in the workplace.

Other not so surprising findings are the observations that older employees, academic staff and those who have been with the University for longer periods are less likely to embrace change. Concerning older and long tenured employees, it is not unlikely for these to suffer the

nostalgia of tradition and therefore to exude conservatism when confronted with the prospects for change. Finally, the lower acceptance of change among academic staff can be understood in terms of perceived disadvantages suffered by these due to the restructuring. As indicated earlier, academic staff felt that the administrative restructuring process alienated and disempowered them despite the fact that the university is an academic institution with academic staff as the nerve of its workforce. Furthermore, academic staff tend to be more conservative with respect to change especially when the change is initiated by administrators. They tend to see such change as undermining academic standards, isolating them, and as devaluing their work.

The results of this study underlined the importance of managerial features to the acceptance of change among employees. That participative management, quality management, and trust in management emerged as important determinants of acceptance of organizational change points to the centrality of management in driving the change process and in making it both legitimate and acceptable among employees. At a more specific level, we wish to highlight the importance of participative management in organizational change. The study results demonstrated the importance of consultation in the successful initiation and implementation of change at the University of Botswana. The variable participative management not only significantly impacted on acceptance of change for the total sample, it was also one of only two variables that emerged to be significant determinants of the acceptance of change for female employees. It should be remembered that male and female respondents differed substantially in this variable with women reporting being less consulted than men. Based on this finding, one may conclude that change initiated by management alone or imposed by forces external to the university is less likely to be supported by employees compared to that resulting from adequate consultation between management and all cadres of staff.

The finding that participative management plays a key role in the acceptance of organizational change among employees was reinforced during informal interviews with key persons who expressed the strong wish that the university's management should involve all

stakeholders in the initiation and implementation of change for the change to bring the desired results and to be supported by everyone who is likely to be affected by it. According to them, by adopting a participative approach to change management the university will nurture and enlist the full support of their workforce during crucial moments of transformation. In particular, all employees - male and female as well as academic and administrative - should be involved in the entire process from planning to implementation. This finding is consistent with that realized by Monyatsi (2004) in his focusing on attitudes towards the acceptance of change in the Public Service in Botswana. We concur with his position that being active participants in the change process, employees will take ownership of the change process and of the destiny of the organization which, in turn will increase their effort to implement the proposed change and their desire to ensure that it succeeds.

Differential Effects

The results for the separate regression analyses suggested that generally different factors are important determinants of the acceptance of change for male and female employees. This is clearly evident from the fact that whereas 11 out of 19 substantive variables and one (1) out of three (3) control variables analyzed significantly impacted on acceptance of change for male employees, only two substantive variables - participative management and enthusiasm - emerged as significant determinant of change acceptance for female employees; the effect of enthusiasm was not in the expected direction. It should be noted that the two factors that impacted on acceptance of change among female employees were not important for the male respondents. Evidently, the patterns emerging from the separate regression analyses testify to the differential positions held by male and female employees with respect to the decision-making process at the University of Botswana. What emerges is a situation in which, overall, depicts males as the active decision makers which women employees can be described as the passive passengers in the process. The pattern tends to suggest that women are tokens who do not input much into and possibly care less about the change process. Indeed, it would not be far fetched to argue that women, though physically pertinent members of the academic and administrative staff, have literally dropped out of the system and remain apathetic to it. A

closer look at the representation of women within the academic and administrative hierarchies of the University of Botswana attests to the view articulated here.

Existing employment records for the University of Botswana show that there are 760 academic staff comprised of 534 males and 226 females (University of Botswana, 2004b). The positions occupied by academic staff rank from lecturer to Professor. The statistics clearly show that women are mainly confined to the lowest rank of lecturer while males dominate high level and influential ranks such as professor and associate professor. The gender representation at the various ranks is as follows: Lecturer - 335 males against 194 females, Senior Lecturers - 122 males and 25 females, Associate Professors - 40 males against 6 females, and professors - 37 men and one (1) woman (University of Botswana, 2004b). Similar trends exist for administrative staff. All four (4) top executives of the university male while only 10 out of 36 senior managers (directors, deputy directors, assistant directors, and senior managers) are women. It is only in ordinary managerial level where women outnumber men by two (2); there are 69 women compared to 67 male managers. The patterns depicted here were clearly evident from the representation of female employees in the study sample. For instance, those interviewed from academic staff included one (1) female and 16 male professors, one (1) female and 12 male Associate Professor, and eight (8) female and 50 male Senior Lecturers.

Finally, the results for the separate regression analyses suggested that most factors that are important determinants of acceptance of change among female employees were not incorporated in the regression model estimated by the study. However, it is also possible that some of the factors analyzed are important to the explanation of the acceptance of change among females but their significance was undermined by poor specification which led to the inclusion of some somewhat irrelevant variables. Else, the findings for female employees could have been due to chance rather than a true reflection of a general trend that applies across situations in the country.

6.3 Conclusions

There are three major conclusions that can be drawn from the results of this study. First, it may be concluded that the level of acceptance of change at the University of Botswana does not differ by the sex of employees. Both male and female employees are characterized by approximately equally levels in the acceptance of change. Despite the fact that, the study results and the current structure point to male employees being the main movers of change in the organization, the sexes are potentially equally receptive to change. The second conclusion that can be reached from the study is that women employees at the University of Botswana experience greater disadvantages relative to men with respect to the factors that influence the acceptance of change. Out of 19 substantive analyzed, nine (9) had means that were significantly different for males and females and in the expected direction; the group mean in enthusiasm was significantly different but not in the expected direction. The logical conclusion that one can decipher from this trend is that female employees at the University of Botswana are not guaranteed equal treatment with male counterparts. This persistence of differential treatment among employees at the University of Botswana obtains despite the existence of a well entrenched Gender Policy and Programme Committee (GPPC) since 1991.

The third and final conclusion that can be reached based on the findings of this study is that although the four categories of substantive variables are all important in our understanding of the determinant of acceptance of change, there are major differs in the effects of these factors for male and female and female employees. What may be leading explanatory factors of the acceptance of change among males may not necessarily be equally important for females. In light of this, it may be concluded that male and female employees have different orientations to the change processes taking place in the organization and warrant separate treatment by management if organizational change is to be successful and yield the desired results. One way to guarantee that change achieves the intended purposes with minimal costs is for management to fully identify and understand the factors responsible for the acceptance of change for male and female employees.

6.4 Policy Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following suggestions are offered by way of strengthening the implementation of change at the University of Botswana:

- Overall management needs to rethink its approaches to the initiation and implementation of change in the organization with the view to improving the levels of acceptance of change for all employees. The moderate score realized by this study must be improved if changes are to improve the competitiveness of the organization and push it closer to its vision of being a leading academic institution in the Southern African region, the African continent as a whole, and in the world.
- There is a need for the University of Botswana and other organization in Botswana to initiate steps that would reduce the disadvantages suffered by women in the workplace. It is only through such changes that male and female employees can become equal partners as well as equal owners and supporters of most changes that are necessary for the organization to sustain its competitiveness. Otherwise, the change process will continue to be male driven and thus alienating to the female segment of the workforce.
- To bring on board the support of both male and female employees for the change process, it is recommended that organizations take the necessary steps to understand the different orientations of male and female employees to the process of change. In particular, management must strive to identify the major factors that nurture change acceptance for each gender and cease treating the two categories of employees as though they constituted a homogenous group.
- The need for a more participative approach to the change process cannot be overemphasized. This has been demonstrated clearly in this study. Through a more consultative approach change agents will be able to command the attention of groups that have tended to be less receptive to change and especially academic staff and older

workers. Greater participation will also eliminate the fear, cynicism, and aloofness that have characterized certain categories of employees, particularly academic staff and females. This way most changes will be able to achieve the desired goals. Consultation must begin at the time the need for change is recognized and throughout the change process.

6.5 Suggestions for Further Research

As hinted earlier, this study pioneers the analysis of gender differences in the determinants of the acceptance of organizational change in Botswana. In lieu of this fact, there is definitely a need for more research focusing on this subject area. A good starting point would be the replication of this study using respondents operating in different work environments such as the private sector, the public sector, the industrial sector, and the service sector, to name but a few. This is important because different work environments are characterized by different working conditions and employee experiences. In addition, the characteristics of employees may vary by the sector and the type of activities performed by employees. While the current study may be a welcome step in the right direction, its findings would be enhanced tremendously if they received support or otherwise from a host of other similar studies conducted in varied work environments. For instance, the support of its findings by subsequent studies would validate its findings thus making them more generalizable.

To obtain a much clearer picture of gender differences in the determinants of the acceptance of change, further research should also be carried out taking into account other possible causal factors not included in our study. This is important considering that the general model estimated by this was able to explain only about 32 percent of the variance in acceptance of change whereas the different regression models for males and females explained only 42 percent and 36 percent of the same respectively. For instance, there are a host of other important employee personality traits that may impact on the acceptance of change that were not focused on by our study. The inclusion of these may improve the prediction power of the regression models for the total sample as well as for males and females analyzed separately.

Concerning gender differences, it would be important to assess whether these were just chance findings or they are a true reflection of a general trend in Botswana. It is also important to assess whether such differences may be due to cross-cultural and/or cross-sectoral differences in employee attitudes towards change or could be attributed to differences in the level of development and in cultural factors.

7.0 REFERENCES

- Aaron, J. N. 1985. *Participation in Organizational Change: The TVA Experiment*. New York: Praeger.
- Abedian, I. 1998. "Introduction", in I. Abedian and M. Biggs (eds.), *Economic Globalization and Fiscal Policy*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press [Pp. xi - xiii]
- Allen, N. J. and Meyer, J. D. 1990. "The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment." *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18
- Altman, Y. and Iles, P. 1998. "Learning, Leadership, Teams: Corporate Learning and Organizational Change." *Journal of Management Development*, 17: 1- 44
- Angle, H. and J. Perry. 1983. "An Empirical Assessment of Organizational Commitment and Organizational Effectiveness." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26:1-14
- Asafo-Adjei, K. 1999. "Achieving Organizational Excellence and Competitive Edge Through Strategic Management Process." *Public Service Management Journal*, 1 (2): ...
- Baron J. N., Haman, M.T. and Burton M.D. 2001. "Labor Pains: Change in Organizational Models and Employee Turnover in Young High-Tech Firms." *American Journal of Sociology* 106 (4): 960-1012
- Bateman T. S. and Snell, S. A. 2002. *Management: Competing in the New Era* (5th Edition). New York: The McGraw-Hill Companies
- Bennett, H. 2000. "The Effects of Organizational Change on Employee Psychological Attachment." *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15 (1/2): 126-137
- Blank, R. E. 1990. "Gaining Acceptance: The Effective Presentation of New Ideas." *Total Quality Management*, 1 (1): 69 - 83
- Blau, P.M. 1964. *Exchange and Power in Social Life*. New York: Wiley
- Blunt, P. and Jones, M. L. 1992. *Managing Organizations in Africa*. New York: Walter de Gruyter
- Bokemeier, J.L. and W.B. Lacy. 1986. "Job Values, Rewards, and Work Conditions as Factors in Job Satisfaction among Men and Women." *The Sociological Quarterly*, 28 (2): 189-204
- Bradshaw, Y. and Wallace, M. 1996. *Global Inequalities*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Fine Forge Press
- Carnall, C. A. 1999. *Managing Change in Organizations*. London: Prentice-Hall

- Carr, D. K., Hard, K. J, and Trahant, W. J. 1996. *Managing the Change Process: A Field Book for Change Agents, Consultants, Team Leaders, and Reengineering Managers*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Carrell, M. R. Jennings, D. F., and Heavrin, C. 1997. *Fundamentals of Organizational Behavior*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Chou, H.T. 2000. "The Impact of Congregational Structure on the Transformation of Christian Worship Style." *Dissertation Abstract International in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 61 (6): 2481- 2482
- Cohen, A. R. Fink, S. L. Gadon, H. and Willitz, R. D. 2001. *Effective Behavior in Organizations: Cases, Concepts and Student Experiences*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Collins, J. 2001. "Good to Great, Fast Company [Internet]". Available: General Business File International. http://www.gale.com/customer_service/sample_searches/gbfi.htm
- Cross, M. 1990. *Changing Job Structures: Techniques for the Design of New Jobs and Organizations*. Oxford: Heinemann Newnes
- Dessler, G. 1992. *Organization Theory: Integrating Structure and Behavior*. New York: Prentice-Hall
- DPSM. 2002. Implementation of the Performance Management System (PMS): The PMS Philosophy Document. Gaborone: Government Printers
- DPSM. 1997. *Work Improvement Teams: Questions and Answers*. Gaborone: Government Printers
- DPSM. 1994. *Pulling Together is Like Working Together and that's Productivity: Strategy for Productivity Improvement in the Botswana Public Service*. Gaborone: Government Printers
- Duck J. D. 1998. "Managing Change: The Art of Balancing." In *Harvard Business Review*, New York: Harvard Business School Press
- Eales-White, R. 1994. *Creating Growth from Change*. Paris: McGraw-Hill Book Company
- Eccles, T. 1984. *Succeeding With Change: Implementing Action Driven Strategies*. London: McGraw-Hill Book Company
- Farrell, D. and Rusbult, C. 1981. "Exchange Variables as Predictors of Job Satisfaction, Job Commitment, and Turnover; The Impact of Rewards, Costs Alternatives and Investment." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 27: 78-95
- Guest, H. R.; Hersey, P. and Blanchard, H. K. 1986. *Organizational Change Through Effective Leadership*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall
- Gumport, P. J. 2000. "Academic Restructuring: Organizational Change and Institutional Imperatives." *Higher Education*, Vol. 39, 67-91

- Hackman, J.R. and Oldham, G.R. 1975. "Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey." *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1975, 60, 151-170
- Halaby, C.N. 1986. "Worker Attachment and Workplace Authority." *American Sociological Review*, 51: 634-49
- Hale, R. and Whitlam, P. 1997 *Towards the Virtual Organization*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company
- Hamlin, B; Keep, J and Ash, K. 2001. *Organizational Change and Development: A Reflective Guide for Managers, Trainers and Developers*. Harlow: Prentice-Hall
- Hampden-Turner, C. 1990. *Corporate Culture: From Vicious to Virtuous Circle*. London: The Economist Books Limited
- Henkel, M. 1997. "Academic Values and the University as Corporate Enterprise." *Higher Education Quarterly*, 51 (2), 134-143
- Hodson, R. 1989. "Gender Differences in Job Satisfaction: Why Aren't Women More Dissatisfied?" *The Sociological Quarterly*, 30(3): 385-399
- Homans, G. C. 1961. *Social Behaviour: Its Elementary Forms*. New York: Harcourt: Brace and World
- Homans, G. C. 1958. "Human Behaviour as Exchange" *American Journal of Sociology*, 63:597-606
- House-Midamba, B. 1996. "Gender, Democratization, and Associational Life in Kenya." *Africa Today*, 43: 289-306
- Hrebiniak, L.G. and J.A. Alutto. 1972. "Personal and Role-Related Factors in the Development of Organizational Commitment." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17: 555-573
- Iverson, R. D. 1996. "Employee Acceptance of Organizational Change: The Role of Organizational Commitment." *Journal of Human Resource Management*, 7 (1): 122-149
- Iverson, R. D. and McLeod, C. S. 1996. "The Role of Employee Commitment and Trust in Service Relationship." *Marketing Intelligence and Planning*, 14 (3): 36-53
- Kalleberg, Arne. 1977. "Work Values and Job Rewards: A Theory of Job Satisfaction." *American Sociological Review*, 42: 124-143
- Katz, D, and Kahn, R. 1978. *The Social Psychology of Organizations* (2nd Edition). New York: Wiley

- Kessler, I., Duckworth, J and Shapiro, J. C. 1997 "Case Study: Surrey County Council." *People Management: The Magazine for Professionals in Personnel, Training and Development*, 32-34
- Kirkpatrick, D. 1985. *How to Manage Change Effectively: Approaches, Methods and Case Examples*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers
- Knox S. and Irving J. A. 1997. "Nurse Manager Perception of Healthcare Executive Behaviors During Organizational Change." *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 27, 11, 33-39
- Koeck, C. 1998. "Time for Organizational Development in the Healthcare Organizations." *British Medical Journal*, 7: 1248-1267
- Kotter, J. 1973. "The Psychological Contract: Managing the Joining-up Process." *California Management Review*, 15 (3): 91-99
- La-Anyane, S. 1985. *Economics of Agricultural Development in Tropical Africa*. Chichester: John Wiley and Sons, Ltd.
- Lawrence, P. R. 1970. "How to Deal With Resistance to Change", in G. W. Dalton, P. R. Lawrence, and L. E. Greiner (eds.), *Organizational Change and Development*. Homewood, IL: Irwin-Dorsey. [Pp 181-197]
- Leifer, R. 1989. "Understanding Organizational Transformation Using Dissipative Structure Model." *Human Relations*, 42: 899-916
- Leiter, M.D. and Harvie, P. 1998. "Conditions for Staff Acceptance of Organizational Change." *Anxiety, Stress and Coping*, 11 (1): 1-25
- Leonard, D.K. 1977. *Reaching the Peasant Farmer: Organizational Theory and Practice in Kenya*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Levin, J. and Fox, J. A. 1985. *Mass Murder: Americas Growing Menace*. New York: Plenum Press
- Marks, M. 2000. "Transforming Robcops? A Case Study of Police Organizational Change." *Society in Transition*, 31 (2): 144-162
- Mayo, E. 1933. *The Human Problems of Industrial Civilization*. New York: Macmillan
- McGregor, D. 1960. *The Human Side of Enterprise*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Meyer, L. J. and Shadle, C. C. 1994. *The Changing Outplacement Process*. Westport: Quorum Books
- Meyer, J. W., Nagel, J. and Snyder, (Jr.) C. W. 1993. "The Expansion of mass Education in Botswana: Local and World Society Perspectives." *Comparative Education Review*, 37 (4), 453-475

- Mink, O. G.; Mink, B. P., Downes, E. A. and Owen, K.Q. 1994. *OPEN Organizations: A Model for Effectiveness, Renewal and Intelligent Change*. New York: Jossey-Bass
- Mmusi, P.S. 1985. *Budget Speech 1985*. Gaborone: Government Printer
- Mogae, F.G. 1995. *Budget Speech 1995*. Gaborone: Government Printer
- Monyatsi, B. 2004. *Employee Attitudes towards Acceptance of Change in the Botswana Public Service: The Case of WITS and PMS*. An Unpublished MA Thesis, Gaborone: University of Botswana
- Moorhead, G. and Griffin, R. 1992. *Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organizations*, 3rd edition. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
- Morgan, G. 1988. *Riding the Waves of Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- Mottaz, C. 1985. "The Relative Importance of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Rewards as Determinants of Work Satisfaction." *The Sociological Quarterly*, 26(3): 365-385
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. and Steers, R. 1982. *Employee-Organization Linkages*. New York: Academic Press
- Mueller, C. W. and Mulinge, M. M. 2001. "Justice Perceptions in the Workplace: Gender Differences in Kenya." *African Sociological Review*, 5 (2): 102-121
- Mulinge, M. M. 2002. "The Perceived Nature and Extent of Gender Discrimination in the Teaching Profession in Botswana". *Gender Issues Research Report Series* - no 18. Addis-Ababa: Organization of Social Science Research in Eastern and Southern Africa (OSSREA)
- Mulinge, M. M. 2001. "The Gendered Workplace in Kenya: A Comparative Analysis of the Public and Parastatal Sectors." *Eastern Africa Social Science Research Review*, Vol. XVII, No. 1: 53-77
- Mulinge, M. and Mueller, C. W. 1998. "Employee Job Satisfaction in Developing Countries: The Case of Kenya." *World Development*, 26 (12): 2181-2199
- Nadler, D. 1983. "Concepts for the Management of Change", in J. R. Hackman, E. E. Lawler, and L. Porter (eds.), *Perspectives on Behavior in Organizations*, 2nd Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Newson, J. 1992. "The decline of faculty influence: confronting the effects of the corporate agenda." In Carroll, W., Christiansen-Ruffman, L., Currie, R. and Harrison, D. (eds.) *Fragile truths: 25 years of sociology and anthropology in Canada*. Ottawa: Carlton University Press, Pp 227-246
- Nicholson, N. 1995. *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Management: Organizational Behavior*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers.

- Nyamunga, M. 1999. "The Changing Role of Government and the Transition Management". *The Public Service Management Journal* 1 (2): 34-36
- Nyati-Ramahobo, L. 1992. *The Girl-Child in Botswana: Educational Constraints and Prospects*. Gaborone: UNICEF
- O'Neil D. J. and Kenski H. C. 1977. "Manipulated Change in Belief Patterns: Political Resocialization in Tudor." *England. Social Science Journal*, 14 (3):
- Parker, C. 1997. "Converting Lawyers: The Dynamics of Competition and Accountability Reform." *Australian New-Zealand Journal of Sociology*, 33 (1): 39-55
- Patty, R. J. 1974. "Organizational Resistance to Change: The View from Below", *Social Service Review*, 48: 371-372
- Pettigrew, A. M. 1972. "Information Control as a Power Resource", *Sociology*, 6: 187-204.
- Phelan, Jo. 1994. "The Paradox of the Contented Female worker: An Assessment of Alternative Explanations." *Sociological Quarterly*, 57 (2): 95-107
- Porter, L.W. Steers, R.M. and Mowday, R. T. 1974. "Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction and Turnover Among Psychiatric Technicians". *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59: 603-609
- Price, J.L. and Mueller, C.W. 1986. *Absenteeism and Turnover Among Hospital Employees*. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press
- Pritchett, P. 1994. *Firing Up Commitment During Organizational Change*. Dallas: Pritchett and Associates
- Raditlhokwa, L. 1999 "Why Managers Fail to Transform Organizations" *The Public Service Management Journal* 1 (2): 40-41
- Reece, B. L. and Brandt, R. 1987. *Effective Human Relations in Organizations*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company
- Republic of Botswana. 1997. *National Development Plan 8, 1997/8-2002/03*. Gaborone: Government Printers
- Republic of Botswana. 1993. *Improving the Quality of Public Service through Positive Attitude and Behavioral Skills*. Gaborone: Government Printers
- Republic of Botswana. 1992. *Raising Productivity in Botswana: A Practical Handbook for the Botswana Public Service*. Gaborone: Government Printers
- Republic of Botswana. 1991. *National Development Plan 7, 1991-1997*. Gaborone: Government Printers
- Republic of Botswana 1985. *National Development Plan 1985-1991*. Gaborone: Government Printers

- Republic of Botswana. 1968. *National Development Plan 1968-1973*. Gaborone: Government Printers
- Robbins, S. P. 2000. *Essentials of Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall
- Robbins, S. P. 1990. *Organizational Theory: Structure, Design and Applications*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall
- Saradmoni, K. 1996. "Women's Rights and the decline of Matriarchy in Southern India." *Indian Council Social Research*, 133-154.
- Scarborough, H., Swan, J., Preston, J, (Eds.). 1999. *Knowledge Management: a Literature Review. Issues in People Management*. London: Institute of Personnel and Development.
- Scholl, R. W. 1981. "Differentiating Organizational Commitment from Expectancy as a Motivational Force." *Academy of Management Review*, 6 (4): 589-599
- Shriver, T. 2002. "Wrestling a Gorilla, Association Management". Available: http://www.gale.com/customer_service/sample_searches/gbfi.htm
- Smilovich, D.G. 1999. "A Case Study of a Large Scale Intervention Viewed Through the Lens of Organizational Learning Chaos/Complexity." *Dissertation Abstract International A Humanities and Social Sciences*, 60 (4): 1355-1356.
- Smith, M. 1998. "Culture and Organizational Change." *Management Accounting: Magazine for Chartered Accountants*, 76 (7): 60-63
- Smith, M.; Masi, A. C; van de Berg, A. and Smucker, J. 1997. "Insecurity, Labor Relations, and Flexibility in Two Industrial Processes: A Canada/Sweden Comparison." *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 22 (1): 33-63
- Stanislao, J. and Stanislao, B. 1983. "Dealing with Resistance to Change", *Business Horizons*, 26: 74-78.
- Strebel, P. 1998. "Why Do Employees Resist Change." *Harvard Business Review* November-December 1998, New York
- Strugwig M.; Smith, E. and Venter, D. 2000. "The Interaction Between Training and Change in South African Organizations." *South African Journal of Business Management*, 31 (3): 113-120
- Tabulawa, R. 2004. "Administrative and Management Restructuring at the University of Botswana (UB), 1990 – 2000: Demystifying a 'Messy' Exercise." An Unpublished Paper
- Taylor, F. W. 1911. *The Principles of Scientific Management*. New York: Harper and Row

- Triolo, P.M. K. and Allgeier P.A and Schwartz C. E. 1995. "Layoff Survivor Sickness: Minimizing Organizational Transformation." *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 25 (3): 56-63
- United Nations and Government of Botswana. 1998. *National Gender Programme Framework*. Gaborone: TA Publications Botswana (Pty) Limited
- University of Botswana. 2004a. *Report of the Task Group on the Review of the University of Botswana Act and Governance Structures* (The Youngman Report). Gaborone: University of Botswana
- University of Botswana. 2004b. *Annual Report 2003-2004*. Gaborone: University of Botswana
- University of Botswana. 1998. "Agenda for the 103rd Special Council Meeting held on 14th August 1998"
- University of Botswana. 1993. *Task Force 1. Final Report (No. 2) on Restructuring the University Administration*. Gaborone: University of Botswana
- University of Botswana. 1991. *Preparing for NDP VIII: Strategic Planning for the University of Botswana*. Report of a workshop held at the University of Botswana, 18th – 29th November, 1991.
- University of Botswana. 1990. *Report of the Review Commission of the University of Botswana*. Gaborone: University of Botswana

Newspaper Articles

- Chilisa, E. 2001. 'Solutions to a Skewed Procurement System'. In *Mmegi/ The Reporter* 19-25 January 2001, p.15
- Information World Review. 2001. Turbulence of Ingenta. *Information World Review*, July/August, 171, 5.
- Mmegi/ The Reporter 2001. Cosatu Stages Two Day Strike. *Mmegi/ The Reporter Newspaper* 31 August-06 September, B.5.
- Nkala, G. 2001. 'Batswana are 'Stupid, Promiscuous'-Former Stanbic MD. In *Mmegi/ The Reporter* 11-18 January 2001, p.2
- The Botswana Guardian. 2001. 'Changing to Meet Challenges of a Changing World', *The Botswana Guardian Newspaper*, Friday August 31, 2001, p. 37
- Van Rensburg, P. 2001. 'What Changes are Needed in the Local Government', In *Mmegi/ The Reporter* 26 January- 01 February 2001, p18

Web Sites:

- <http://www.nwlink.com/~donclark/leader/leadchr.html>
- <http://www.chadduck.com/ymarines/useful/traits.htm>

8.0 APPENDIX: RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

SURVEY OF EMPLOYEE ACCEPTANCE OF CHANGE

Dear Respondent,

This questionnaire is part of a research that is designed to gain a better understanding of employee responses to change in the University of Botswana. It investigates the factors that are likely to affect the acceptance of change among employee. By completing this survey you will help identify what may improve the diffusion of change among employees.

I would appreciate if you **use a pencil** to enter the response that most accurately represent you views in the space provided in the questionnaire. Kindly complete the survey at once; this will require between 15 to 20 minutes. Also answer the questions in the order in which they are presented in the questionnaire. There is no "right" or "wrong" answer to any of the questions. However you should be as honest as possible and also ensure that responses to closely related questions **are not contradictory**.

Your participation in this survey is highly appreciated and the information obtained will be kept completely confidential.

I want to thank you in advance for your time and co-operation.

RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

QUESTIONS 1 THROUGH 8: The following questions are intended to gather information regarding your present job. Please circle one answer or fill in the gap for each question.

1. In which of the following sections is your department located?

- | | |
|--|----------------------------|
| 1. Faculty of Business | 12. Human Resources |
| 2. Faculty of Education | 13. Campus Services |
| 3. Faculty of Engineering and Technology | 14. Information Technology |
| 4. Faculty of Humanities | 15. Student Affairs |
| 5. Faculty of Science | 16. Academic Services |
| 6. Faculty of Social Sciences | 17. Student Welfare |
| 7. Academic Affairs Division | 18. Careers and Counseling |
| 8. Academic Development | 19. Sports and Culture |
| 9. Centre for Continuing Education | 20. Health Services |
| 10. Library Services | 21. Bookstore |
| 11. Financial Services | 22. Other [specify] _____ |

2. Which of the following best describes your rank?

1. Professor
2. Associate professor
3. Senior Lecturer
4. Lecturer
5. Staff Development Fellow
6. Director
7. Deputy Director
8. Assistant Director/Manager/Chief Technician/Faculty Administrator
9. Assistant Manager/Senior Officer/Senior Lab Technician
10. Officer/Technician/Lab Supervisor/Office Assistant
11. Other [specify] _____

3. How long have you been working in this organization? _____ [Enter actual number]

4. For how many years have been working with your current job description? _____ [Enter actual number]

5. What is your overall working experience in years? _____ [Enter actual number]

6. What type of contract do you have with your employer?
1. Permanent and pensionable
 2. Fixed term for two or more years
 3. Temporary-Full time for one year
 4. Other [specify] _____
7. Which of the following best describes your current responsibilities?
1. A mixture of teaching and research, with some administrative duties [e.g. Head of Department]
 2. Teaching and research, including some service
 3. Academic support services and administration [e.g., Counseling, library, finance]
8. Which of the following categories best describes your citizenship status?
1. Citizen of Botswana
 2. Permanent Resident
 3. Temporary Resident
 4. Other [specify] _____

SECTION II: FACTORS AFFECTING ACCEPTANCE OF CHANGE

QUESTION 9 THROUGH 33: The following questions address your workplace experiences in terms of your current job. Select from the following scale to indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements [Only one answer should be selected for each statement].

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree

<u>Item</u>	<u>Rating</u>
<u>I Workplace Features:</u>	
9. Overall conditions of work in my job are good	
10. I am very secure in my job	
11. Communication between management and staff in my organization is very good	
12. I have good prospects for promotion in my job	
13. My skills and training are appropriate for my responsibilities at work	
14. My co-workers are supportive in my job	

1. Strongly agree 2. Agree 3. Disagree 4. Strongly disagree

15.	I receive conflicting work demands from my supervisors and/or co-workers	
16.	In my job my duties and responsibilities are very clear to me	
17.	I am generally overworked	
18.	There is adequate equipment and other resources for the type of job I do	
19.	My organization has effective orientation programmes for new staff	
20.	The job I do largely involves routine operations	
21.	There is considerable variety and variability in my job	
22.	I am satisfied with the overall management of my organization	
23.	The management of my organization is trustworthy	
24.	I always have the freedom to make the decisions that affect my job	
25.	I participate in making important decisions at work	
26.	I have great willingness to take risks	
27.	I am tolerant to the views of others even when they are at odds with my beliefs and values	
28.	I have the ability to go through tough situations	
29.	I am full of enthusiasm in performing my job	
30.	I am satisfied with the job I do	
31.	If I had my way I would work for my organization forever	
32.	I wish I could find another job elsewhere	
33.	I do not like the changes taking that have taken place in my organization during the last five years	

SECTION III: BIOGRAPHIC DATA

QUESTIONS 34 THROUGH 42: The final set of questions is intended to collect information on your personal background. Please either fill in the blank or circle the response that best describes you. Although the questions are about you please keep in mind that they are to be used in statistical form only.

34. How old were you during your last birthday? _____ [Enter actual years]

35. In what gender category do you belong?

1. Male 2. Female

- [illegible]

Thank you very much for your cooperation

