



Antecedents Of Employee Resistance To Change: Workplace Resistance And Organizational Justice

Smitha Kothari Badola, Research Scholar and Assistant Professor, School of Management, Graphic Era Hill University.

Rajesh Kumar Upadhyay, Professor, School of Management, Graphic Era Hill University
Sweta Chauhan, Research Scholar and Assistant Professor, School of Management, Graphic Era Hill University.

Dr. Vinay Kumar Jain, Associate Professor, Department of Commerce, Graphic Era Deemed to be University, Dehradun, Uttarakhand. Vinayjain124@rediffmail.com

Abstract

Proposes that an organizational psychology process termed fairness may act as a buffer against employee resistance to change. Focuses on opposition based on hostility as a divide of all potential combative behaviours. Explains how organisational change frequently makes people feel like losers and increases workers' sensitivity to fairness using the referent cognitions hypothesis. Modern theoretical and empirical research demonstrates that managers and academics may not handle resistance effectively if they focus on the outcomes of any type of justice (e.g., distributive, procedural, or interactional justice). Investigates the connections between all three facets of justice in order to predict resistance to change and provides change managers with some advice.

Keywords: Workplace resistance, Organizational justice and Resistance to change

Introduction

In today's economy, organizational changes are everywhere. It happens frequently and very quickly. Representatives who resist change will damage an organization since hierarchical systems frequently include change. Opposition to any big change is a given. If management doesn't recognize, evaluate, and deal with concerns, even the best-laid plans for reform might fall apart. How people respond to organizational change is among the most important research areas in change management. Employee attitudes regarding change can be either positive or negative. Management and change agents must address employee attitudes and behaviors to encourage organizational change if they want to see successful organizational transformation. In the framework of organizational effectiveness, the capabilities of managers, employees, and the work environment are all analyzed.

Changes to organisational structures within public and commercial organisations are becoming more important given the current economic climate. To guarantee that the process is carried out as fast and successfully as possible, it is important to look over the relevant information because change is a multifaceted process with both positive and negative outcomes. A change is any alteration to a system, whether it be physical, biological, or social. Institutions of higher learning cannot thrive or endure in isolation. The dynamic nature of the modern world requires constant change, and educational institutions must adapt by making structural and functional changes. Unspoken requirement to adapt or risk extinction is brought on by various demographic and technological changes. Numerous writers have acknowledged this necessity, including Dahl (2011), Gattiker & Goodhue (2005), Hallinger (2010), Thomson & Holdsworth (2003), and Uline (2001).

RFC has drawn more attention and is regarded as one of the main factors for change because of its crucial role in the success of change. RFC was described as "the cognitive prelude to the actions of either resistance to, or support for, a change endeavour" by Armenakis et al. in 1993. (Armenakis et al., 1993, pp. 681–682). RFC was defined by Holt et al. (2007a) as the sum of an individual's confidence in his or her capacity to carry out the proposed change, the change's suitability for the company, the support of management, and the change's personal benefits. RFC is the degree to which "workers think that change is necessary, feasible, and desirable, in that the change is needed to improve," according to Ford and Foster-Fishman (2012).

RFC formulations have often emphasised the same elements, including the necessity of change, the advantages for both the company and the person, and the capacity to handle future change (Armenakis et al., 1993; Rafferty et al., 2013; Ford and Foster-Fishman, 2012; Holt et al., 2007a, b). Evidence from empirical study shows how important RFC is to supporting successful transformation (Haffar et al., 2019). Given its positive consequences, it is not surprise that more study has been done on its causes. RFC was shown to be influenced by change-related elements such leadership characteristics that promote change (Adil, 2014) and communication (McKay et al., 2013). Individual-related elements, such as tolerance for risk and organisational commitment (Madsen et al., 2005; McKay et al., 2013)

Theoretical Background

Workplace resistance

Employee workplace resistance has been a key problem for organizational psychologists (e.g. Lewin, 1951; Plant, 1987) and managerial authors (Taylor, 1947) for more than 50 years. Employee actions that aim to challenge, disrupt, or invert prevailing language, power dynamics, and assumptions have been defined as acts of resistance (Collinson, 1994). However, academics **have come to the conclusion that resistance is a countermeasure to management control (e.g. Jermier et al., 1994). When organisations evolve, there seems to be a tendency for more intense responses to injustice (Cobb et al., 1995; Novelli et al., 1995).**

Given that in risky conditions, people prefer to engage in hyper vigilance, in which every social interaction is scrutinized for hidden meaning and ominous purpose, this is not surprising (Janis, 1983). According to Baron et al. (1996), a sensitivity to justice is associated to organizational change (such as restructuring and reengineering). In this essay, we focus on the resentment-based opposition of disgruntled workers to the perceived injustice of the shift. Employees frequently feel as though external change has been "done to them" when they practice it (Kyle, 1993). The perpetrators of resentment-based resistance behaviors, which range from mild acts of non-cooperation to industrial disruption, frequently view these actions as justifiable personal attempts to "get even" for apparent exploitation and as a means for workers to exercise their power to restore perceived unfairness (Jermier et al., 1994). By limiting our attention to emphasize resentment-based resistance, we consider opposition as a sign of the process's fairness and maybe the circumstances under which the reform attempt should be abandoned (see Shapiro and Kirkman, in press).

However, resentment-based resistance should not be compared to intentionally destructive or dysfunctional workplace actions, such as workplace deviance (Robinson and Bennett, 1997) or rebellious conduct (Giacalone and Greenberg, 1997). For instance, abnormal conduct implies improper and inherently harmful behavior on the side of the employee. However, some business owners and managers may behave improperly toward workers amid unfairness and resistance to change, which may make the opposition to change more anticipated than unlawful. Additionally, Fiorelli and Margolis (1993) contend that some resistance to change may be detrimental to the organization's bottom line. The bottom line of the company may suffer from some reluctance to change, according to Fiorelli and Margolis (1993). Not every intervention is appropriate since doing so in the organization might change the incorrect thing. Just as conflict may occasionally be utilized productively for change, there are situations when legitimate opposition might result in additional managerial adjustments that are required. In addition, it is not entirely a blue-collar (i.e., shopfloor) phenomenon, contrary to the focus of much of the study conducted to date; managers and technocrats have enough power to participate in oppositional behavior. LaNueza and Jermier (1994) asserted that potential saboteurs "may be able to cause more harm with a keyboard than with a bomb" and that decision-making sabotage is on the increase.

Organizational Justice

The importance of fairness in the workplace, or organizational justice, is well acknowledged (Greenberg, 1987). Individual conceptions of fairness inside organizations are referred to as organizational justice, according to Foster (2010). It is logical to assume that when employees are treated properly, they may grow to have positive attitudes and behaviors. Particularly, when fairness and appropriate techniques, mechanisms, and processes for results are provided, employees are more willing to embrace change. Employees may have a favorable or negative perspective of an organisational shift, which is described as the

transition of a situation from one stage to another. This is because they are human. When employees are aware of the fairness of the process and the results, they may be more willing to embrace organizational transform.

This lesson has been created based on the premise of Adams' (1965) equity theory, which states that when a workforce is presented with change where the outcome is beneficial, they must adjust the nature of their perceived inputs. We believe that an employee's relationship with the social environment and the decision-making issue is a contractual one. Over the past forty years, the social sciences have noticed this construct. It is viewed as an understanding of outcome equality that is distinguished as distributive and procedural justice (Adams, 1965; Thibaut and Walker, 1975; Bernerth et al., 2007).

There are four different dimensions of justice that have been studied: procedural justice, distributive justice, informational justice, and interpersonal justice. However, procedural justice and distributive justice have received the most attention (Colquitt, 2001; Foster, 2010). For the support of organisational justice, researchers have discovered consistency on two factors, such as procedural justice and distributive justice (Greenberg, 1990). Distributive justice is defined as the perceived fairness of the results or allocations that a person receives, according to Folger & Cropanzano (1998), p. xxi. They went on to say that distributive justice may deal with fairness in terms of results like salary and recognition, whereas recognition may take the form of employee promotions to higher levels within an organization. Change in literature addresses

Discussion and contribution of the study

Change is a necessary and constant occurrence that organizations deal with on a daily basis, and its effects are felt directly by the workforce. Employee responses can have an impact on an organization's performance and growth; as a result, organizations need to be ready for change in order to maintain their current levels of effectiveness. It is difficult to understand human attitudes, behaviors, and expectations since they change from hour to hour and perhaps from moment to moment (Davis, 1979). Employee viewpoint and perceptions are crucial for unbeaten organisational transformation, according to research on change management (Weber and Weber, 2001). Several scholars (Armenakis et al., 1993; Bernerth, 2004; Madsen et al., 2008) emphasised the importance to analyse the potential employee perception components that could maintain as an employee to be amenable for organisational change.

In this sense, the link between organizational justice and employee change preparedness served as the foundation for this study's development. Fairness in the workplace is referred to as organizational justice. Due to the possibility that various socioeconomic, political, religious, and cultural variables may have an impact on employees' attitudes and behaviors, this element may have a greater impact on workers in developing nations. According to research, an organization's employees may behave based on social contexts and organizational decisions.

Conclusion

To encourage favorable employee attitudes and behaviors for organizational transformation, one might impact the organizational justice factor. A conceptual framework has been created that takes a variety of aspects into account, including employee preparation, distributive justice, procedural fairness, and demographic traits. The research shows how these characteristics affect a person's preparedness for change. Results may indicate substantial positive or negative correlations between scores, indicating that workers may form attitudes and behaviors

based on organizational equality and fairness. However, fascinating findings about the relationships between several parameters, including gender, age, education, marital status, and position held, may be anticipated from demographic information. Additionally, our research may uncover connections that demonstrate the need of taking these elements into account in policy.

References

Adil, M.S. (2014), "Impact of leader's change-promoting behavior on readiness for change. A mediating role of organizational culture", *Journal of Management Sciences*, Vol. 1 No. 2, pp. 113-150.

Ambrose, M.L. and Schminke, M. (2009), "The role of overall justice judgments in organizational justice research: a test of mediation", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 94 No. 2, pp. 491-500.

Ambrose, M.L., Wo, D.X.H. and Griffith, M.D. (2015), "Overall justice: past, present, and future", in Cropanzano, R.S. and Ambrose, M.L. (Eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Justice in the Workplace*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 109-135.

Armenakis, A.A., Harris, S.G. and Mossholder, K.W. (1993), "Creating readiness for organizational change", *Human Relations*, Vol. 46 No. 6, pp. 681-703.

Arneguy, E., Ohana, M. and Stinglhamber, F. (2018), "Organizational justice and readiness for change: a concomitant examination of the mediating role of perceived organizational support and identification", *Frontiers in Psychology*, Vol. 9, p. 1172.

Blau, P.M. (1964), *Exchange and Power in Social Life*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, NY.

Colquitt, J.A., Scott, B.A. and LePine, J.A. (2007), "Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: a metaanalytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 92 No. 4, pp. 909-927.

Eby, L.T., Adams, D.M., Russell, J.E. and Gaby, S.H. (2000), "Perceptions of organizational readiness for change: factors related to employees' reactions to the implementation of team-based selling", *Human Relations*, Vol. 53 No. 3, pp. 419-442.

Eisenberger, R. and Stinglhamber, F. (2011), *Perceived Organizational Support: Fostering Enthusiastic and Productive Employees*, American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S. and Sowa, D. (1986), "Perceived organizational support", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 71 No. 3, pp. 500-507.

Fiske, S.T., Cuddy, A.J.C., Glick, P. and Xu, J. (2002), "A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 82 No. 6, pp. 878-902.

Fiske, S.T., Cuddy, A.J.C. and Glick, P. (2006), "Universal dimensions of social cognition: warmth and competence", *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, Vol. 11 No. 2, pp. 77-83.

Haffar, M., Al-Karaghoul, W. and Ghoneim, A. (2014), "An empirical investigation of the influence of organizational culture on individual readiness for change in Syrian manufacturing organizations", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 27 No. 1, pp. 5-22.

Haffar, M., Al-Karaghoul, W., Irani, Z., Djebarni, R. and Gbadamosi, G. (2019), "The influence of individual readiness for change dimensions on quality management implementation in Algerian manufacturing organisations", *International Journal of Production Economics*, Vol. 207, pp. 247-260.

Hameed, I., Roques, O. and Ali Arain, G. (2013), "Nonlinear moderating effect of tenure on organizational identification (OID) and the subsequent role of OID in fostering readiness for change", *Group and Organization Management*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 101-127.

Hayes, A.F. (2015), "An index and test of linear moderated mediation", *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, Vol. 50 No. 1, pp. 1-22.

Holt, D.T., Armenakis, A.A., Feild, H.S. and Harris, S.G. (2007a), "Readiness for organizational change: the systematic development of a scale", *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 232-255.

Kim, K.Y., Eisenberger, R. and Baik, K. (2016), "Perceived organizational support and affective organizational commitment: moderating influence of perceived organizational competence", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 37 No. 4, pp. 558-583.

Kurtessis, J.N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M.T., Buffardi, L.C., Stewart, K.A. and Adis, C.S. (2017), "Perceived organizational support: a meta-analytic evaluation of organizational support theory", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 43 No. 6, pp. 1854-1884.

Lind, E.A. (2001), "Fairness heuristic theory: justice judgments as pivotal cognitions in organizational relations", in Greenberg, J. and Cropanzano, R.S. (Eds), *Advances in Organizational Justice*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA, pp. 56-88. *JOCM*

Madsen, S.R., Miller, D. and John, C.R. (2005), "Readiness for organizational change: do organizational commitment and social relationships in the workplace make a difference?" *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, Vol. 16 No. 2, pp. 213-234.

Marzucco, L., Marique, G., Stinglhamber, F., De Roeck, K. and Hansez, I. (2014), "Justice and employee attitudes during organizational change: the mediating role of overall justice", *Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée/European Review of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 64 No. 6, pp. 289-298.

Mayer, R.C., Davis, J.H. and Schoorman, F.D. (1995), "An integrative model of organizational trust", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 20 No. 3, pp. 709-734.

McKay, K., Kuntz, J.R.C. and Neaswall, K. (2013), "The effect of affective commitment, communication and participation on resistance to change. The role of change readiness", *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 42 No. 2, pp. 29-40.

Rafferty, A.E., Jimmieson, N.L. and Armenakis, A.A. (2013), "Change readiness: a multilevel review", *Journal of Management*, Vol. 39 No. 1, pp. 110-135.

Rhoades, L. and Eisenberger, R. (2002), "Perceived organizational support: a review of the literature", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87 No. 4, pp. 698-714.

Searle, R., Den Hartog, D.N., Weibel, A., Gillespie, N., Six, F., Hatzakis, T. and Skinner, D. (2011), "Trust in the employer: the role of high-involvement work practices and procedural justice in European organizations", *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol. 22 No. 5, pp. 1069-1092.

Shah, N. (2011), "A study of the relationship between organisational justice and employee readiness for change", *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, Vol. 24 No. 3, pp. 224-236.

Shore, L. and Shore, T. (1995), "Perceived organizational support and organizational justice", in Cropanzano, R.S. and Kacmar, K.M. (Eds), *Politics, Justice, and Support in Work Organizations: Managing the Social Climate of the Workplace*, Quorum, Westport, CT, pp. 149-164.

Siemsen, E., Roth, A. and Oliveira, P. (2010), "Common method bias in regression models with linear, quadratic, and interaction effects", *Organizational Research Methods*, Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 456-476.

Soenen, G., Melkonian, T. and Ambrose, M.L. (2017), "To shift or not to shift? Determinants and consequences of phase shifting on justice judgments", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 60 No. 2, pp. 798-817.

Walker, H.J., Armenakis, A.A. and Bernerth, J.B. (2007), "Factors influencing organizational change efforts: an integrative investigation of change content, context, process and individual differences", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 20 No. 6, pp. 761-773.