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Abstract

The study evaluated organisational change and its impact on employees in the Limpopo Province Pharmaceutical Depot (LPPD). The study focused on factors affecting employee satisfaction; which included job satisfaction, job commitment and impact of the change as well as employee reactions towards the change. The choice of LPPD was influenced by the structural changes that occurred at this place following the takeover of the operational management by the Department of Health. The data was collected through one-on-one administration of a closed-ended questionnaire. Of the 80 employees who were briefed and given questionnaires, 76 volunteered to participate in the study. The results of the study showed that 46% of employees were satisfied with working at LPPD. The results also showed that organisational change that occurred at LPPD had a negative impact on the employees, primarily evidenced through a loss of morale. The study further showed a weak positive correlation \( r = 0.3 \) between the period of employment at LPPD and the level of employee satisfaction. By replicating the study in different organisations, the results could be very helpful for developing an organisational change management model with corrective changes that can be implemented effectively and successfully incorporating the views of employees.
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Introduction

Organisations implement change in order to gain competitive advantage in the competitive environment. This chapter introduces the research title and gives a brief background of the organisation under study. The findings of this study have potential implications to LPPD management on the need to implement the recommendations of the study and find an effective change management model that is accommodative of the employees. Thus this study aims to
evaluate organisational change and its impact on employees, with multiple objectives; 1) to determine the level of satisfaction of employees at LPPD, 2) to establish the relationship between the level of satisfaction and the period of employment at LPPD, 3) to determine the impact of the organisational change on employees and 4) to make recommendations to the LPPD management towards a change management model that can be implemented effectively.

**Background Information:**
The study is conducted in Limpopo Province Pharmaceutical Depot situated in Seshego, 15 KM away from Polokwane city. The depot was purposively chosen because it underwent a takeover in April 2012 and organisational structural changes since then. During the takeover process, the Department of Health took over the depot’s operations management which was previously managed by a private company. The takeover resulted in the depot’s organisational structure being reviewed with multiple posts being created to accommodate a variety of skill, experience and expertise. It also resulted in the loss of employees who were employed by the private company thus changing the culture of working.

The LPPD supplies medicines and surgical products to approximately 40 hospitals and over 400 clinics. The current structure comprises of at least 160 employees, 55% of which represents pharmacy personnel and 45% represents support personnel.

The researcher witnessed the change hence the interest in evaluating the impact of the change on the employees.

According to Nel, Gerber, van Dyk, Haasbroek, Schults, Sono, and Werner (2001:400), the scope of organisational change that occurred in LPPD can be classified as transformational change where an organisation moves to a radically different and at times unknown future state. In this type of change, the organisation’s mission, culture, goals and leadership change dramatically as observed with the change of leadership and culture at the depot.

Organisational change is regularly perceived as being potentially harmful to the individual employee in that the employee is faced with the prospect of losing something of value (Tonder, 2004:177).

Change without exception, is experienced as stressful and will result in a variety of undesirable outcomes which to a large extent, is a function of the manner in which it was implemented (Tonder, 2004:192).

The most commonly indicated consequences of organisational change for the individual employee according to Tonder (2004:179) also include; lowering of morale, the experience of stress, lowered self-esteem, disorientation, increase mistrust, loss of focus or direction, anxiety, uncertainty, insecurity, outrage, sadness, to mention but a few. This study will make use of the primary data from employees.

The impact of organisational change initiatives typically results in a loss of morale and turnover and lack of commitment among employees (Tonder, 2004:178).

The study aims at evaluating organisational change and its impact on the employees of the LPPD.

The study will assist the Pharmaceutical service management in getting feedback from the employees regarding the impact of the change.

**Objectives of the study**
1. To determine the level of employee satisfaction at LPPD.
2. To evaluate the impact of organisational change on employees at LPPD.
3. To establish the relationship between the period of employment at the depot and employee satisfaction.
4. To make recommendations to the LPPD Management on the change management model that can be implemented effectively to improve the level of satisfaction

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**Introduction**

Organisations continually embark on programmes of organisational change which seemingly put a lot of strain not only on organisations but also on individuals. Organisational change challenges the way things are done and as a result individuals experience uncertainty and start having fears about the potential failure in coping with success (Vakola and Nikolaou, 2005:160). According to Andron (2013:192), organizations need to gain awareness on the situation that, given the business environment circumstances, change is inevitable and it has to happen inside the company too, if survival or success is to be achieved, in spite of the changing business conditions. The author emphasizes that, changing the inside of a company is a delicate and long –lasting process and people are to be supported and encouraged to change themselves, by own effort – training, personal development, shifting work relationship from completion to co-operation. She concludes that change is not something new but only the speed of change that we face is really new.

In today’s fast changing workplace, gone are the days of many years of experience at the same company, new skill is required to adapt to change. According to Asuquo and Inaja (2013: 1496), in times of rapid change as currently experienced, individuals who are pre-dispositionally oriented to possess the right skill mix to perform required tasks, will remain highly sort after employable at all times.

This chapter will review the literature on organisational change and its impact on employees and give a detailed theoretical basis for the study. It will use the relevant information drawn from previous studies and authors in order to broaden knowledge and understanding of the research topic.

**Evaluating organisational change that occurred in LPPD**

Khalid (2011:178) defines organisational change as the challenge to the ways things are normally done in an organisation and as a result individuals feel uncertainty, stress and fears about the potential failure of meeting new situation. It is also defined as intentionally generated response to environmental shift

Al-Zu’bi (2011: 111) defines organisational change as a process of organisational change in the organisation and its members to move through the stages of sequential organisation and to change the status quo. He refers organisational change as any alteration in activities or tasks and further defines it as the process of analyzing the past to elicit the present actions required for the future.

According to Al-Zu’bi (2011: 111), there are three types of individuals’ or groups’ response to organisational change: affective, cognitive and instrumental response. He clarifies affective response as the feeling of being linked to satisfaction or anxious about the change, cognitive response as opinions relating to usefulness and necessity and knowledge required handling the change and instrumental response as actions already taken or which was taken to handle the change.

Thompson (2010:167) defines organisational change as a modification in goals, structure or operations of an organisation. He clarifies organisational change on the basis of generating knowledge that informs decisions to improve the organisation and its performance.
According to Thompson (2010:167), one way to understand change is to conceptualize the types of change. He defines the types of change as either transitional change which is making small changes to a process or transformational change, which is making major or radical changes in the organisation such as restructuring as in the Limpopo Pharmaceutical Depot. He further suggested that change can either be planned where discretionary changes are brought about by management or unplanned where unexpected issues create a need for sudden management action. As in the depot, the change was planned.

Change can also be conceptualized in terms of scope, depth and urgency of the change (Thompson, 2010: 167). He refers the scope of change as the extent of the change whether it is a narrow change that affects only one area of the organisation or whether it affects many areas of the organisation. He also refers the depth of the change as the complexity of the change meaning that it may be incremental (changes that reflect a modification of a reporting relationship, the creation of a new service area or reallocation of resources from one functional area to another) or transformational (a change that produces simultaneous changes in multiple system elements, including strategy, structure and culture among others, to achieve rapid organisational improvement) for the whole organisation. Finally, he refers to urgency as the time dependency of the change. His last way of conceptualizing the change is to view change under consideration in terms of the organisational structure or process domains.

According to Chiang (2010:157), there are different types of organisational change; revolutionary change, evolutionary change, convergent change, radical change, first order change, transformational change, episodic change, continuous change and disruptive change. For the purpose of this study, transformational change is adopted to measure the change that occurred at the LPD.

If environments were perfectly static, if employees’ skills were always up to date and should never deteriorate, and if tomorrow were always exactly the same as today, organisational change would have little or no relevance to employee performance and satisfaction, but the real world is dynamic and turbulent, requiring organisations and their members to undergo change if they are to perform at competitive levels (Robbins, 1991: 650).

Any organisational restructuring involves a tradeoff between the impact on the employees and the immediate benefits to the organisation. It is the manager’s responsibility to balance the impact against the benefits (Anthony, Perrewe and Kacmar, 1999: 701).

Organisational change can be initiated by management, it can evolve slowly within a department, it can be imposed by specific change in policy or procedures or it can arise through external pressures. Organisational change can affect all aspects of the operation and functioning of the organisation (Mullins, 2002: 818).

Organisational change is typically activated by a relevant environmental shift that, once recognized by the organisation, leads to an intentionally generated response (Jimmieson, Terry and Callan, 2004:11-27). According to this author, organisational change can be viewed as a critical life event, which has the potential to evoke stress reactions and other negative consequences in employees. He further argues that because organisational change by its very nature is not linear, the most frequent psychological state resulting from organisational change is uncertainty. He emphasizes that role stress may result from uncertainty associated with organisational change.

He unpacks the types of role stress that may be experienced by employees as follows:

Figure 2.1: The types of role stress.
Role conflict may be particularly prevalent during organisational change given that the expectations of the new organisational structure may be in direct contrast to the expectations of the old organisation.

- Role ambiguity may occur when the expectations applicable to the old organisational structure have not been replaced with clear expectations set by the new organisation and
- Role overload may occur when too many tasks are assigned in a given time period or when new job duties go beyond employees’ current knowledge, skills and abilities.

The type of organisational change that occurred at LPPD represents planned organisational change which was triggered by the intention to improve in some way; the operational effectiveness of the organisation. This was the change in nature and composition of the workforce (Mullins, 2002:819).

Changes that are introduced in an organisational restructuring will affect the socio-psychological well-being of organisation members given the potential for uncertainty that may accompany such changes. There is a need to better understand the consequences of organisational restructuring and consider some of its potential side effects on the work environment. Employees in a post structuring context are understandably wary about the future direction of the organisation and their roles within it (Lee, 2005:23). In support of Lee (2005:23), Kuokkanen, Suominen, Harkonen, Kukkurainen and Doran (2009:116) argue that changes that occur in a work environment have negative impact on the psychological well-being of the organisation’s personnel. Changes perceived as threatening were negatively related to job satisfaction. On the other hand, changes experienced as challenging were positively related to job satisfaction and eustress but had no impact on distress and sickness absence. Kuokkanen et al. (2009:116) emphasizes that structural changes in the health care have inevitable impact on the working conditions of both personnel and patients.

According to Scott and Jaffe (1989:22), workers often feel attacked and betrayed by changes announced by management. They are often caught off guard, not really believing that their
The company could do that to them. Many respond with resistance, anger, frustration and confusion. Their response can solidify into a wall of retirement on the job, becoming more afraid to take risks, be innovative or try new things. They experience a loss of traditional relationships, familiar structure and predictable career advancement patterns.

Change can evoke quite different emotional experiences which could range from anxiety, despair, resignation, despondency, hope, anticipation, emancipation, joy and excitement (Tonder, 2004:163). He further argues that fear; anger, grief and depression are intense emotions that convey the degree of intrapersonal disruption that individuals experience in response to externally induced change (Tonder, 2004:178).

The most commonly indicated consequences of organisational change for the individual employee also include a lowering of morale, the experience of stress, lowered self-esteem, disorientation, increasing mistrust, loss of focus or direction and control, anxiety, uncertainty, insecurity, outrage, sadness, diminished loyalty, shattered commitment and fear. Understandably, the individual employee would opt to avoid these unpleasant experiences which typically manifest in very common defensive behaviour of denial and suppression but are also present in self-doubt, doubting behaviour and withdrawal. The impact of organisational change initiatives typically result in a loss of morale, turnover and lack of commitment among employees (Tonder, 2004:179).

Tonder (2004:179) emphasizes that the impact of change on the organisational workforce is indiscriminate, with the intensity of change being experienced by the employee and the manager alike. It is not only the major forms of organisational change that lead to insecurity among employees, even less pronounced forms of change such as new work processes, new work locations and new supervisor/manager similarly have an adverse impact on employees, promoting insecurity. Equally important, is that a climate of constant or continuous change is considered a major source of dissatisfaction and stress with major change in and particularly strong source of job/occupational stress.

Change according to Tonder (2004:180), is particularly the common source of stress; although other work and social factors influence the experience of stress, a significant proportion of stress and stress related illness can be related to change experienced by employees in their organisations, roles, duties, projects, time frames and the like.

Job stress is a pervasive problem in our society (Carrel, Elbert, Hatfield, Grobler, Marx and van der Schyf, 1996: 444). The author argues that it may result in low productivity, increased absenteeism and turnover and other employee problems including substance abuse, mental health problems and cardiovascular illnesses. He further advises that strategies to control stress include: fitness programs, meditation, counseling and leave.

According to Tonder (2004:180), the cost of institutional transformation or organisational change in general is exceedingly high. He also emphasizes that the reported consequences of change programmes include: redundancies, loss of crucial skills, job losses, a redefinition of job content, increased work load, a redefinition of social boundaries within the organisation and therefore changes in the individual employee’s situation, changes in belief structure, values and assumptions held by employees and people involved with the change process, the disruption and loss of organisational memory and a state of malaise.

According to Anthony et al. (1999:670), some of the negative effects companies have reported as a result of implementing organisational changes include; low morale, greater need for retraining, increased retiree health costs, increased use of overtime in both firms and firms with 10000+ employees, just to mention but a few.
As a result of organisational change, there might be mismatch and incompatibility between employee’s personal and organisational goals. Employees might not be sure about their roles in the organisation due to ineffective communication during change process or lack of communication climate during organisational change, which can cause role ambiguity, role conflict and interpersonal conflicts which are collectively known as job stressors (Khalid, 2011:179).

Khalid (2011:178) further argues that, when organisational change happens, organisational setting changes and it breaks the bond between employees and workplace and can possibly reduce employee job involvement. This is the kind of attachment of employees with the workplace, which is developed over period of time. He emphasizes that this is similar in the case of management change during organisational change where the expectation of management regarding the perceived level of output and employee expectation regarding their rewards also changes. These expectations present in the minds of management and employees are regarded as psychological contract between employee and employer.

Robbins (2001: 546) indicates some of the reason for individual resistance to change as;

- Habit: where individuals tend to respond in ways to which they are accustomed to
- Security: where individuals fear that change threatens their current job security
- Economic factors: where individuals fear that changes will result in a lowering of their income.
- Fear of the unknown: where change represents an exchange of the individual’s current known context for a new situation which is characterized by ambiguity and uncertainty and
- Selective information processing where in order to keep their perceptions intact, individuals ignore information which challenges the world which they have created.

It is well established that major organisational change is viewed as a formidable stressor in organisational life associated with negative outcomes such as job loss, reduced status, conflict at work and home and is a threat to the psychological wellbeing of the individual employee. Reactions to organisational change are affected by the individual change schemata which are defined as mental maps or knowledge structures of change attributes and relationships among different change events (Judge, Thoresen, Pucik and Welbourne, 1999:108)

Based on Khalid (2011:178)’s definition of organisational change as the challenge to the ways things are normally done in an organisation, it is clear that the organisational change also affect the organisational culture. On the other hand, organisational culture has been shown to play a key role in job satisfaction as well as higher retention rates among personnel (Macintosh and Doherty, 2010:109). A relationship between organisational culture, job satisfaction and turnover was then examined hypothesizing that culture would influence job satisfaction and that both job satisfaction and culture would impact on turnover intentions as presented below:
According to Pahkin (2011:118), organisational change can act as a stressor, and if perceived negatively (negative appraisal), it can threaten to exceed the adaptive resources of the individual. Organisational change may therefore have adverse effects on employees’ well-being and mental health. On the contrary, organisational change can sometimes be positive for employees thereby improving quality of work and offering opportunities for increased decision latitude. According to Klarner, Todnem and Diefenbach (2011:332), while change is planned by managers at the top organisational level, change recipients are employees at multiple hierarchical levels who need to implement and cope with the change. Among other factors, such as interests, values and beliefs, individual’s reactions to change are a result of their emotions with respect to change. He argues that employees’ adaptive behaviour is driven by their emotions which he classified as either positive emotions such as joy and excitement or negative emotions, such as fear and grief. He referred to positive emotions in the context of organisational change as including being confident about change and enhancing trust while negative emotions are those including feeling stressed or insecure about the change and leading to mistrust.

Based on the findings from the study conducted by Giaever and Helles (2010:43), respondents reported many different negative emotional experiences ranging from the general (feeling negatively about the situation) to the specific (feeling fear and sadness). Some of the emotions that were indirectly revealed in the study included: “disbelief”, “not feeling needed”, “feeling overwhelmed”, “resignation”, “anger/rage”, “guilt” and “feeling incompetent”. In addition, the respondents also reported a range of experiences that were interpreted as the body related outcomes of different emotional experiences for example. “Crying”, “sweating”, “increased heart rate” and “feeling exhausted”. The respondents also revealed these emotions: “worry”, “feeling of loss”, “frustration”, “feeling sorry for/ compassion”, “panic”, “annoyance”, “sadness”, “hatred” and “dread”.

The relationship between period of employment and employee satisfaction
Msweli-Mbang and Potwana (2006:23) links change to personal dispositional factors in which the construct is embedded in a three variable network comprising of: locus of control, dogmatism
and organisational commitment. According to the authors, people who believe that they have control over change events are not likely to resist change and are generally satisfied whereas, those who feel they have no control over the source of change may reject it and will obviously not be satisfied. A highly dogmatic person (highly rigid and close minded) will reflect rigid beliefs about the value and consequences of change. The author further argues that a person committed to an organisation accepts values, is willing to exert effort on its behalf and wishes to remain in the organisation as such; a highly committed person might more readily identify with and accept organisational change.

According to Lotz and Donald (2006:2) organisational change has many different interpretations, the way in which people make sense of the change varies from person to person and is influenced by particular circumstances. According to the author, through this sense making process, employees develop a shared understanding that helps shape future actions. In addition to discovering the meaning of the new reality that follows from an organisational change, sense making process also creates the reality that will exist. He further suggests that different environment and the characteristics of particular jobs create varying perceptions of organisational change. He further confirms that employees at different organisational levels interpret and react to change in different ways. Further, the employees with characteristics associated with greater job mobility (for example, higher levels of education, more years until retirement and more work experience) tend to hold more favorable attitudes towards change.

This literature is suggestive that the reaction towards change is personal related and may be influenced by other factors which is what the study wants to explore. It supports the possibility of a positive correlation between period of employment and level of employee satisfaction.

According to Fedor, Caldwell and Herold (2006:4), although change processes have been conceptualized in a variety of ways, the manner in which management treats and involves employees during change has received the greatest amount of attention and has been shown to be powerful determinant of individuals’ reaction to major organisational changes. Change is its own challenge and is driven by many factors and forces; in turn it unleashed many reactions among affected individuals.

According to Khalid (2011: 178), when organisational change is considered as a challenge then it triggers positive response and when it is considered as threat, then it triggers negative responses. In case of threat, change has impact on employee’s perception of job insecurity, anxiety and depression and in case of challenge; change has impact on motivation, loyalty, job commitment and job satisfaction. So organisations need to develop sense of challenge in their employees in order to get positive response of change and in order to avoid dissatisfaction and depression among employees.

Top managers must realize that both trust and work satisfaction are important ingredients for the effective functioning of an organisation and to actively ensure that support systems or structures are adequate and available to mitigate the negative impact, particularly if the changes to be implemented are extensive (Lee and Teo, 2005:24).

According to Carrel et al. (1996: 230) if employees believe that despite the apparent success of an organisation, few opportunities for promotion exist due to the absence of a proper internal staffing programme, they may become bored with their jobs. Employees who are also passed over for promotion in favour of persons appointed from outside, may lose confidence in their employer and consequently work less diligently.

Carrel et al. (1996:231) further emphasizes that this can result in employees becoming discouraged who will consequently lead to their ceasing to develop themselves and improving their job performance. He advises that managers should at all times strive to assist employees to
perform effectively by creating an environment within which personal growth and satisfaction are possible. He confirms that the desirable situation can only be achieved by having a properly designed and satisfactory internal staffing programme. He also recommends a re-induction programme involving all current employees to be implemented periodically. He emphasizes the importance of the re-induction programme especially in situations where policies and structures have taken place as in the case of the LPD (Carrel et al., 1996:213). The author emphasizes that induction is a never ending process as it introduces both old and new employees to the current state of the organisation.

According to Yukl (2006:305), an important part of the process of implementing change involves motivating, supporting and guiding people. Even the people who initially endorse a change will need support and assistance to sustain their enthusiasm and optimism as the inevitable difficulties and setbacks occur. Major change is always stressful and painful for people, especially when it involves a prolonged transition period of adjustment, disruption and dislocation.

For successful implementation of change, Yukl (2006:302-307) recommends two distinct but overlapping categories called organisational actions and people orientated actions as detailed below:

---

**Figure 2.7 Guidelines for implementing change through organisational actions (Yukl, 2006:303)**

- **Determine who can oppose or facilitate change**
- **Monitor the progress of change**
- **Build a broad coalition to support the change**
- **Make dramatic, symbolic changes that affect the work**
- **Fill key positions with competent change agents**
- **Use task forces to guide implementation**

These guidelines describe current thinking about the best way to deal with political and structural issues when implementing major change in an organisation.

- **Determine who can oppose or facilitate the change**
To evaluate the feasibility of various strategies for accomplishing major change in the organisation, a leader must understand the political processes, the distribution of power and the identity of people whose support is necessary to make the change happen.

- **Build a broad coalition to support the change**
  Successful change in an organisation requires cooperative effort by people who have the power to facilitate or block change. It is essential to build a coalition of supporters both inside and outside the organisation.

- **Fill key positions with competent change agents**
  It is especially important to get the commitment of people directly responsible for implementing the change, the people in key positions who will make it happen. People in key positions who cannot be won over to the new vision and strategy should be replaced to avoid blockade to change and to signal the seriousness about the change.

- **Use task forces to guide implementation**
  Temporary task forces are often useful in guiding the implementation of major change in an organisation especially when it involves modification of the formal structure and the relationships among subunits.

- **Make dramatic, symbolic changes that affect the work**
  An effort to implement major change in the organisation should begin with dramatic, symbolic changes that demonstrate commitment to new vision and affect the everyday lives of organisational members in significant ways. Symbolic changes may involve cultural forms such as symbols, ceremonies and rituals.

- **Monitor the progress of change**
  Monitoring is important to coordinate different aspects of the change. Feedback about the effects of change should be collected and analyzed to evaluate progress and refine mental models about the relationship among key variables that affect performance of the organisation. Accurate, timely information can be gathered by holding frequent review meetings with people in key positions.

*Figure 2.8: Guidelines for implementing change through people oriented actions (Yukl, 2006:305)*

- **Create a sense of urgency about the need for change:**
  It is essential to explain why change is necessary and to create a sense of urgency around it. Explain why not changing will eventually be more costly than making the proposed change.
- **Prepare people to adjust to change:**
  Even when change is necessary and beneficial, it will require difficult adjustments by people who are most affected. If people are unable to handle stress and trauma of change, they will become depressed and rebellious. Rather than presenting change as a panacea without cost or problem, it is better to help people understand what adjustments will be necessary.

- **Help people deal with the pain of change:**
  The trauma of change can be experienced regardless of whether the change involves new strategies and programs, new equipment and procedures, new facilities, new management practices and or new leaders. It may be necessary to help people accept the need for change without feeling personally responsible for the failure.

- **Provide opportunities for early successes:**
  The confidence of an individual or team can be increased by making sure people experience successful progress in the early phases of a major change.

- **Keep people informed about the progress of change:**
  A major change, like any other crisis, creates anxiety and stress in people who are affected by it. People will be more enthusiastic and optimistic if they know that the change programme is progressing successfully.

- **Demonstrate continued commitment to the change:**
  Continued attention and endorsement signal a leader’s commitment to see the change programme through to a successful conclusion.

- **Empower people to implement the change:**
  Empowering people also means reducing bureaucratic constraints that will impede their efforts and providing the resources necessary for them to implement change successfully.

Having an effective change management model should not be the final stage; management should monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the plan to avoid failure. According to Kreitner and Kinicki (2004:683), the following errors may lead to failure:
Figure 2.9: Errors that may lead to failure

According to Vakola et al. (2005:160), people involved in the management of change need to acknowledge the fact that increased pressure and stress are put on employees because of continuous organisational change and that it is necessary for organisations to think of incorporating a stress management programme within the change management programme. An effective change management model with a very detailed implementation plan will not guarantee success and the sustainability of the plan; there are several key management competencies that managers need to possess to effectively manage the change within their organisations:
Figure 2.10: Key management competencies that managers should possess.

- **Embrace change and be a change agent**
- **Address support and resistance to change effectively**
- **Employ a change management process**
- **Recruit staff and succession plan with change management in mind**
- **Use change management to make organization innovative and successful in future**

Key managerial competencies that managers need to possess to effectively manage the change within their organisations (Tompson et al., 2010: 167-173):

- These competency involves creating a culture of change and improvement that is embraced and shared among the staff members where staff members serve also as change agents.
- Regardless of the specific type of change under consideration, a structured process for management of the change is required. Such a process helps staff members and stakeholders to know that a systematic approach is used to make changes and this will facilitate common understanding, even though not all changes under consideration will be welcomed.
- Effective and frequent communication with staff members about the benefits of change is critical and listening to concerns and taking them into consideration is important to successfully managing change.
- Fostering organisational learning concerning what works and what does not is helpful in identifying what can be done to make the organisation innovative, effective and successful in future and
- In order to build and sustain a change-oriented organisation focused on improvement, focus should be placed on individuals with innovative and creative thinking skills in their staff recruitment as well as succession planning efforts.
Pahkin (2011:118) emphasizes that organisational change may have a double-edged role from the employee’s perspective where on one hand it threatens the health of some workers by causing stress and on the other hand, enhancing the health of those who experienced improvement in their work related resources.

**Research Methodology:**

**Target population**
The study desired opinions of pharmacy personnel employed at the LPPD. The study targeted 80 Participants. Participation was sampled based on the participant’s employment status that is, personnel registered with pharmacy council and employed as pharmacy personnel. The remaining portion of pharmacy personnel are part of management hence they were excluded to avoid subjectivity and bias.

**Limitations and suggestions for future studies**
Participation on the study was voluntary; this aspect limited the possibility of generalizing from the study findings. The results of the study could only be generalized to LPPD Pharmacy personnel thus the findings were interpreted with caution since the employees only represented LPPD Pharmacy personnel and not all employees at the depot and in the country. The survey was subjected to bias and prejudice of the respondents hence 100% accuracy could not be guaranteed. The study served as a foundation for future studies in different provinces. The results of such studies would assist in developing an organisational change management model with strategies that could be implemented.

**Results, Discussion and Interpretation of Findings**

**Introduction**
The data collected and captured will be presented in this chapter in both tabular and graphical forms according to each demographic characteristic. It will also give a detailed discussion and interpretation of the findings using both descriptive and inferential statistics to draw conclusions.

**Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics characteristics of participants</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 20-25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 26-30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 31-35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 36-40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 41-45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 45</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12 only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12 with certificate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12 with Diploma</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12 with Degree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grade 12, Degree and other qualifications 3 3
Less than 6 months of employment 1 0
More than 6 months and less than 1 year of employment 8 11
More than 1 year and less than 2 years of employment 8 19
More than 2 years of employment 16 10

In terms of gender of participants; 45% of participants were males and 55% were females.
In terms of ages of participants; 7% were aged between 20 and 25 years, 23% were aged between 26 and 30 years, 29% were aged between 31 and 35 years, 16% were aged between 36 and 40 years, 14% aged between 41 and 45 years and 11% were aged above 45 years.
In terms of school qualifications; none of the participants had secondary education only, 7% had grade 12 only, 49% had grade 12 and certificate, 25% had grade 12 and a diploma, 11% had grade 12 and a degree and only 8% had grade 12, a degree and other qualifications.
In terms of period of employment at LPPD; 1% of participants had been employed for less than 6 months, 26% had been employed for more than 6 months and less than 1 year, 37% had employed for more than a year and less than 2 years and only 36% had been employed for more than 2 years at LPPD.

**TABLE 2: AGES OF A SET OF PARTICIPANTS TO ESTIMATE MEAN AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group in years</th>
<th>Midpoint mᵢ</th>
<th>Number of participants fᵢ</th>
<th>fᵢmᵢ</th>
<th>mᵢ²</th>
<th>fᵢmᵢ²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>506.25</td>
<td>2531.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>13328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>1089</td>
<td>22869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>1444</td>
<td>17328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>18490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>2304</td>
<td>18432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k = 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} mᵢ = 212.5 ]</td>
<td>[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} fᵢ = 73 ]</td>
<td>[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} fᵢmᵢ = 2551.5 ]</td>
<td>[ \sum_{i=1}^{k} fᵢmᵢ² = 92978 ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \bar{x} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} fᵢmᵢ}{fᵢ} \]
\[ = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} fᵢ}{fᵢ} \]
\[ = 2551.5 / 73 \]

The mean age is 34.9 years.

\[ S² = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} fᵢmᵢ² - n(\bar{x})²}{fᵢ} \]
\[ = 92978 - 73(34.9)² / 72 \]
\[ = 56.4 \]

Standard deviation = \[ \sqrt{56.4} = 7.5 \]

The coefficient variation of: S * 100%
\[ \bar{x} = 7.5 \times 100\% = 34.9 = 0.2 \]

Table 3: Ages of a set of participants to estimate median age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group in years</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
<th>Cumulative frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( f_i )</td>
<td>( c_i )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k = 6 )</td>
<td>( \sum f_i = 73 )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = \sum_{i=1}^{k} f_i = 73 \]

Since there are \( n = 73 \) observations from the grouped data, the median \( \bar{x} \) is the \( \left( \frac{n}{2} \right) \) position that is \( \left( \frac{n}{2} \right) = 36.5 \)th observation

An inspection of the table 3 shows that the 36.5th lies in the class interval ’31 -35’, which is therefore the median class.

\[ \bar{x} = L + I \left( \frac{n}{2} - C \right) F \]

Where: \( L = 35, \sum_{i=1}^{k} f_i = 73, C = 22, F = 21, I = 35-31 = 4, \)

\[ \bar{x} = 35 + 4 \left( \frac{73}{2} - 22 \right) 21 \]

The median age is 37.8 years

Table 4: Ages of a set of participants to estimate modal age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group in years</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( f )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( k = 6 )</td>
<td>( 73 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The highest frequency is 21 suggesting that the modal class is 31-35. Based on this observation, the following can be obtained:
L = 31, I = 35-31 = 4, d1 (21-17) = 4, d2 (21-12) = 9.
The modal age ($M_o$) is given by: $L + I (d_1/d_1+d_2)$
$= 31 + 4 (4/13$

The modal age is 32 years.

Based on the information in table 2, the mean age of the participants is 34.9 years. Table 3 and equation 2 show the median age of 38 years whereas table 4 and equation 3 show the modal age of 32 years. Given this information, it is evident that the age distribution for the participants is not normally distributed. It is observed from these given information that the mean is less than the median which implies an age distribution graph that is negatively skewed, leaning to the right with a tail stretching to the left. A standard deviation of 7.5 (table 2) shows a more concentration of ages around the mean age. This is further supported by a small coefficient of variation of 0.2 indicating a less spread of ages around the mean age. The measures of central tendencies suggest that more participants are aged around 34 (the mean age) where 29% of participants are in the age group; 31 to 35 years (table 1).

**Level of satisfaction for LPPD employees**

Employee satisfaction is defined as a global feeling about one’s work or a related cluster of attitudes about various facets of work environment. It is also perceived as a positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences.

A common aspect that connects these two definitions is that employee satisfaction is concerned with what people in an organisation feel about their overall work (Mafini et al., 2013: 1-9).

Based on the study conducted by Dahl (2011:240-256), organisational changes are associated with significant risks of employee health problems which will obviously affect employee’s reaction towards the change and ultimately the level of satisfaction. The study conducted by Zhou et al. (2006:248) suggests that organisational change disrupts the internal routines and external linkages of an organisation and may therefore be detrimental to organisational performance which will lower customer satisfaction.

**Figure 4.2.1 Overall level of satisfaction for participants at LPPD**

![Figure 4.2.1](image)

According to figure 4.2.1, the study shows that an average of 46% of employees is satisfied with working for LPPD and 37% are satisfied with their jobs, 53% are committed towards their jobs, 36% reacted positively towards the change and 44% agree that there was impact from the change. The results also reveal that 23% of employees are neutral about their feelings and 31% are not satisfied with working at LPPD.
An analysis of the results revealed that 55% of employees are not satisfied with working conditions at LPPD, 60% are not satisfied with pay and 50% are not satisfied with LPPD management. A further analysis revealed that 51% of employees lost morale, trust, focus and friends during the change whilst 49% are neutral about their reactions towards the change.

**Figure 4.2.2: Level of satisfaction for male participants**

![Graph showing overall satisfaction level for male employees at the LPPD](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors affecting job satisfaction</th>
<th>Job commitment</th>
<th>Impact of depot changes</th>
<th>Reaction towards the change:</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2.2 shows that 46% of male respondents are satisfied with working at LPPD and that 31% of male respondents are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows that 65% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes occurring at LPPD. It further shows that 45% of these respondents agree that there was some impact from the change while only 41% reacted positively towards these changes. An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 61% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD, 70% is dissatisfied with pay, 61% is dissatisfied with LPPD management and 45% is dissatisfied with recognition of performance. Further analysis shows that 27% of male respondents have lost morale whilst 78% indicated loss of trust.
Figure 4.2.2 shows that 47% of female respondents are satisfied with working at LPPD and that 42% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows that 70% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes occurring at LPPD. It further shows that 43% of these respondents agree that there was some impact from the change while only 33% reacted positively towards these changes.

Female respondents in the age group; 36-40 with grade 12 and certificate, who have worked at the LPPD for more than 1 year but less than 2 years, have shown a higher level of satisfaction with 77% of respondents agreeing with factors affecting employee satisfaction. The same applies to the female respondents with the same number of years of working experience in the same age group but with grade 12 only. In terms of the study conducted by Cabrita and Perista (2007:12), women report higher job satisfaction than men despite a clearly disadvantaged position in the labour market in terms of earnings, recruitment, dismissal, promotions and career prospects.

The female respondents of different age groups have respondent as follows; in the age group, 20-25 years, 35% of respondents are satisfied, 26-30, 39% are satisfied, 31-35 years, 47.9% are satisfied, 41-45 years, 50.4% are satisfied and in the age group, above 45 years, 50% of respondents are satisfied.

The female respondents with more than 1 year and less than 2 years of working experience have shown the following levels of satisfaction towards factors affecting employee satisfaction:

- With grade 12 only; 70% are satisfied, grade 12 and certificate; 51.7% are satisfied, Grade 12 and Diploma; 42% are satisfied, grade 12 and degree; 46.8% are satisfied, and grade 12, Degree and other qualifications; 39.6% are satisfied.
- Female respondents with more than 1 year and less than 2 years of working experience have shown an average of 45.7% of satisfied employees whilst those with less than 1 year and more than 6 months of working experience have shown an average of 44.4% of satisfied employees.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 50% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD, 53% is dissatisfied with pay and 40% is dissatisfied with LPPD management. Further analysis shows that 22% of female respondents have lost morale whilst 13% indicated loss of trust.
Figure 4.2.4: Overall satisfaction for participants aged between 20 and 25 years

Figure 4.2.4 shows that an average of 32% of employees aged between 20 and 25 are satisfied with working for LPPD and 27% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows that 40% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes that occurred. It further shows an average of 40% confirmed that they felt some impact and 20 % reacted positively towards these changes.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 60% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD, 60% is dissatisfied with pay, 100% is dissatisfied with leave management and 60% is dissatisfied with LPPD management. Further analysis shows that 13% of these respondents have lost morale whilst 13% indicated loss of trust. A further 60% and 40% indicated that they will neither work for the depot nor advice a friend to apply for employment.

Figure 4.2.5: Overall satisfaction for employees aged between 26 and 30 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors affecting job satisfaction</th>
<th>Job commitment</th>
<th>Impact of depot changes</th>
<th>Reaction towards the change:</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.2.5 shows that an average of 41% of employees aged between 26 and 30 years are satisfied with working for LPPD and 27% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows an average of 66% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 38% of these respondents confirmed that they felt some impact and 31% reacted positively towards these changes.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 47% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD, 71% is dissatisfied with pay, 60% is dissatisfied with LPPD management and 47% is dissatisfied with recognition of performance. Further analysis shows that 24% of these respondents have lost morale whilst 14% indicated loss of trust.

**Figure 4.2.6: Overall satisfaction for participants aged between 31 and 35 years**
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Figure 4.2.6 shows that an average of 47% of employees aged between 31 and 35 years are satisfied with working for LPPD and 32% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows an average of 66% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 49% of these respondents confirmed that they felt some impact and 41% reacted positively towards these changes.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 62% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD, 62% is dissatisfied with pay and 33% is dissatisfied with LPPD management. Further analysis shows that 27% of these respondents have lost morale whilst 17% indicated loss of friends.

**Figure 4.2.7: Overall satisfaction for participants aged between 36 & 40 years**

![Bar chart showing satisfaction levels for participants aged between 36 & 40 years]

Figure 4.2.7 shows that an average of 57% of employees aged between 36 and 40 years are satisfied with working for LPPD and 44% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows an average of 66% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 44% of these respondents confirmed that they felt some impact and 44% reacted positively towards these changes.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 44% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD, 77% is dissatisfied with pay and 33% is dissatisfied with LPPD management. Further analysis shows that 27% of these respondents have lost morale whilst 17% indicated loss of friends.
Figure 4.2.7 shows that an average of 56% of employees aged between 36 and 40 years are satisfied with working for LPPD and 57% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows an average of 77% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 44% of these respondents confirmed that they felt the impact of the change and 44% reacted positively towards these changes.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 58% is dissatisfied with LPPD management. Further analysis shows that 39% of these respondents have lost morale.

**Figure 4.2.8: Overall satisfaction for participants aged between 41 and 45 years**

Figure 4.2.8 shows that an average of 56% of employees aged between 41 and 45 years are satisfied with working for LPPD and 48% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows an average of 73% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 35% of these respondents confirmed that they felt the impact of the change and 43% reacted positively towards these changes.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 60% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD, 70% is dissatisfied with pay and 60% is dissatisfied with LPPD management. Further analysis shows that 37% of these respondents have lost morale whilst 13% indicated loss of trust.

**Figure 4.2.9: Overall satisfaction for participants aged above 45 years**

Figure 4.2.9 shows that an average of 56% of employees aged between 41 and 45 years are satisfied with working for LPPD and 48% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows an average of 73% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 35% of these respondents confirmed that they felt the impact of the change and 43% reacted positively towards these changes.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 60% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD, 70% is dissatisfied with pay and 60% is dissatisfied with LPPD management. Further analysis shows that 37% of these respondents have lost morale whilst 13% indicated loss of trust.
Figure 4.2.9 shows that an average of 56% of employees aged above 45 years are satisfied with working for LPPD and 35% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows an average of 75% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 56% of these respondents confirmed that they felt the impact of the change and only 25% reacted positively towards these changes.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 63% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD, 50% is dissatisfied with pay, 63% is dissatisfied with LPPD management and 63% is dissatisfied with recognition of performance. Further analysis shows that 21% of these respondents have lost trust whilst 17% indicated loss of morale.

**Figure 4.2.10: Overall satisfaction for participants with grade 12 only**

![Chart showing overall satisfaction]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors affecting job satisfaction</th>
<th>Job commitment</th>
<th>Impact of depot changes</th>
<th>Reaction towards the change:</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2.10 shows that an average of 54% of employees with only grade 12 as a qualification are satisfied with working for LPPD and 53% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows an average of 85% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 50% of these respondents confirmed that they felt the impact of the change and only 27% reacted positively towards these changes.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 60% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD. Further analysis shows that 20% of these respondents have lost trust whilst 20% indicated loss of morale.
Figure 4.2.11: Overall satisfaction for participants with grade 12 and certificate

![Bar chart showing job satisfaction, commitment, impact of changes, and reactions to change.]

Figure 4.2.11 shows that an average of 46% of employees with grade 12 and certificate as qualifications are satisfied with working for LPPD and 31% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows an average of 68% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 44% of these respondents confirmed that they felt the impact of the change and only 40% reacted positively towards these changes.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 61% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD and 58% is dissatisfied with LPPD management. Further analysis shows that 30% of these respondents have lost morale whilst 17% indicated loss of friends.

Figure 4.2.12: Overall satisfaction for participants with grade 12 and Diploma

![Bar chart showing job satisfaction, commitment, impact of changes, and reactions to change.]

Figure 4.2.12 shows that an average of 47% of employees with grade 12 and Diploma as qualifications are satisfied with working for LPPD and 42% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows an average of 71% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 44% of these respondents confirmed that they felt the impact of the change and only 31% reacted positively towards these changes.
An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 50% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD, 72% is dissatisfied with pay and 44% is dissatisfied with LPPD management. Further analysis shows that 24% of these respondents have lost morale.

Figure 4.2.13: Overall satisfaction for participants with grade 12 and Degree

![Bar chart showing overall satisfaction for participants with grade 12 and Degree.](image)

Figure 4.2.13 shows that an average of 46% of employees with grade 12 and Degree as qualifications are satisfied with working for LPPD and 42% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows an average of 56% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 38% of these respondents confirmed that they felt the impact of the change and only 46% reacted positively towards these changes.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 50% is dissatisfied with LPPD management and 63% is dissatisfied with leave management. Further analysis shows that 29% of these respondents have lost morale and 17% indicated a loss of focus.

Figure 4.2.14: Overall satisfaction for participants with grade 12, Degree and other qualifications

![Bar chart showing overall satisfaction for participants with grade 12, Degree and other qualifications.](image)
Figure 4.2.14 shows that an average of 42% of employees with grade 12, Degree and other qualifications are satisfied with working for LPPD and 39% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows an average of 58% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 42% of these respondents confirmed that they felt the impact of the change and only 28% reacted positively towards these changes.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 67% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD. Further analysis shows that 22% of these respondents have lost morale. A further 50% and 67% indicated that they are neither willing to work for the depot nor will they advise friends to apply for employment at LPPD.

Figure 4.2.15: Overall satisfaction for participants with less than 6 months of working experience at LPPD

Figure 4.2.15 shows that an average of 42% of employees with less than 6 months of working experience at LPPD, are satisfied with working for LPPD and 67% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows that 100% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that none of these respondents confirmed that they felt the impact of the change and none of them reacted positively towards these changes. This group has shown a highest level of commitment towards their jobs and this could be related to the period of employment.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 100% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD and 100% is dissatisfied with pay. Further analysis shows that 100% of these respondents are neutral about their reaction towards the change.

Figure 4.2.16: Overall satisfaction for participants with more than 6 months and less than 1 year of working experience at LPPD
Figure 4.2.16 shows that an average of 45% of employees with more than 6 months and less than 1 year of working experience at LPPD, are satisfied with working for LPPD and 40% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows that 71% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 43% of these respondents confirmed that they felt the impact of the change and only 26% reacted positively towards these change.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 58% is dissatisfied with working conditions at LPPD, another 58% expressed dissatisfaction with pay and 37% is dissatisfied with management at LPPD. Further analysis shows that 19% of these respondents have lost morale whilst 16% have lost trust.

Figure 4.2.17: Overall satisfaction for participants with more than 1 year and less than 2 years of working experience at LPPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors affecting job satisfaction</th>
<th>Job commitment</th>
<th>impact of depot changes</th>
<th>Reaction towards the change:</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2.17 shows that an average of 51% of employees with more 1 year and less than 2 years of working experience at LPPD, are satisfied with working for LPPD and 45% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows that 73% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 43% of these respondents confirmed that they felt the impact of the change and only 41% reacted positively towards these change.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 44% is dissatisfied with pay and another 44% expressed dissatisfaction with management at LPPD. Further analysis shows that 27% of these respondents have lost morale.

Figure 4.2.18: Overall satisfaction for participants with more than 2 years of working experience at LPPD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors affecting job satisfaction</th>
<th>Job commitment</th>
<th>impact of depot changes</th>
<th>Reaction towards the change:</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.2.18 shows that an average of 43% of employees with more than 2 years of working experience at LPPD, are satisfied with working for LPPD and 26% are satisfied with their jobs. It also shows that 59% of these respondents remain committed to their jobs despite the changes. It further shows that 47% of these respondents confirmed that they felt the impact of the change and only 41% reacted positively towards these change.

An analysis of the results shows the following areas of dissatisfaction: 69% is dissatisfied with pay, 77% is dissatisfied with pay, 65% is dissatisfied with LPPD management and another 42% expressed dissatisfaction with recognition of performance. Further analysis shows that 33% of these respondents have lost morale whilst 21% indicated a loss of friends.

**Table 5: Response to Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors affecting job satisfaction</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Job satisfaction is simply how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like (satisfied) or dislike (dissatisfied) their jobs (Carita and Perista, 2007: 4). Job satisfaction is a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experience (Islam and Islam, 2011:28).

Based on Table 5, the study found that 12% of the respondents strongly agree with the factors affecting job satisfaction. About 26% of respondents agree with these factors, 20% remained neutral about their feelings, 18% disagree and 24% strongly disagree with the factors affecting job satisfaction. Based on these findings and in relation to the overall level of satisfaction, the study can conclude that employees of the LPPD are not satisfied with the factors affecting job satisfaction.

**Table 6: Response to Job Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job commitment</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As a result of organisational change, there might be mismatch and incompatibility between employee’s personal and organisational goals. Employees might not be sure about their roles in the organisation due to ineffective communication during change process or lack of communication climate during organisational change, which can cause role ambiguity, role conflict and interpersonal conflicts which are collectively known as job stressors (Khalid, 2011:179).

Based on Table 6, the study can reveal that 26% of respondents strongly agree with factors affecting job commitment, about 42% agree with these factors, 15% of respondents remained neutral about their feelings, 10% and only 7% disagree and strongly disagree with factors.
affecting job commitment, respectively. Based on these findings, the study can conclude that employees of the LPPD remain committed to their jobs despite the changes that occurred.

**Impact of the change on LPPD employees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact of the change</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Changes that are introduced in an organisational restructuring will affect the socio-psychological well-being of organisation members given the potential for uncertainty that may accompany such changes. There is a need to better understand the consequences of organisational restructuring and consider some of its potential side effects on the work environment. Employees in a post structuring context are understandably wary about the future direction of the organisation and their roles within it (Lee, 2005:23).

In support of Lee (2005:23), Kuokkanen, Suominen, Harkonen, Kukkurainen and Doran (2009:116) argue that changes that occur in a work environment have negative impact on the psychological well-being of the organisation’s personnel. Changes perceived as threatening were negatively related to job satisfaction. On the other hand, changes experienced as challenging were positively related to job satisfaction and eustress but had no impact on distress and sickness absence.

Kuokkanen et al. (2009:116) emphasizes that structural changes in the health care have inevitable impact on the working conditions of both personnel and patients. Tonder (2004:179) emphasizes that the impact of change on the organisational workforce is indiscriminate, with the intensity of change being experienced by the employee and the manager alike. It is not only the major forms of organisational change that lead to insecurity among employees, even less pronounced forms of change such as new work processes, new work locations and new supervisor/ manager similarly have an adverse impact on employees, promoting insecurity. Equally important, is that a climate of constant or continuous change is considered a major source of dissatisfaction and stress with major change in and particularly strong source of job/ occupational stress.

Based on Table 7, the study found that 17% of employees strongly agree that the changes that occurred at the LPPD had impact on them, 27% agree that there was impact from these changes, 18% of respondents remained neutral about their feelings, 24% disagree and 15% strongly disagree that there was impact from these changes. Based on these findings and the overall level of satisfaction, the study can conclude that employees of the LPPD have been negatively affected by the changes that occurred at the LPPD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reactions towards the change</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very positive, excited with a loss of focus</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive, happy with a loss of morale</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative, sad with a loss of friends</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very negative, stressed</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reactions to organisational change are affected by the individual change schemata which are defined as mental maps or knowledge structures of change attributes and relationships among different change events (Judge, Thoresen, Pucik and Welbourne, 1999:108). A pattern of reactions with four stages is assumed to occur during organisational change; denial, anger, mourning and adaptation. The initial reaction involves denying that the change will be necessary. The next stage is to get angry and look for someone to blame (in most cases, the management). It is during this stage that people resist giving up accustomed ways of doing things. In the third stage, people stop denying that change is inevitable, acknowledge what has been lost, and mourn it. The final stage is to accept the need to change and continue with one’s life (Yukl, 2006:287).

According to Anthony et al. (1999:670), some of the negative effects companies have reported as a result of implementing organisational changes include: low morale.

Based on the findings from the study conducted by Giaever and Helles (2010:43), respondents reported many different negative emotional experiences ranging from the general (feeling negatively about the situation) to the specific (feeling fear and sadness).

The most commonly indicated consequences of organisational change for the individual employee also include a lowering of morale, the experience of stress, lowered self-esteem, disorientation, increasing mistrust, loss of focus or direction and control, anxiety, uncertainty, insecurity, outrage, sadness, diminished loyalty, shattered commitment and fear. Understandably, the individual employee would opt to avoid these unpleasant experiences which typically manifest in very common defensive behaviour of denial and suppression but are also present in self-doubt, doubting behaviour and withdrawal. The impact of organisational change initiatives typically result in a loss of morale, turnover and lack of commitment among employees (Tonder, 2004:179).

Change is its own challenge and is driven by many factors and forces; in turn it unleashed many reactions among affected individuals.

Based on Table 8, the study found that 10% of the respondents reacted very positively and were excited about the changes that occurred at LPPD with just a loss of focus. 27% reacted positively and were happy with just a loss of morale, 40% remained neutral about their reactions to the changes. 11% reacted negatively and were sad about these changes indicating a loss of friends whilst only 12% reacted very negatively and indicated that they were stressed about the changes with a loss of trust.

The primary appraisal of planned change according to Liu et al. (2005:266) induces an intense, mixed emotional state of excitement and fear in employees which makes them hesitate to react behaviourally or attitudinally to the change programme hence the study reveals employees who were neither positive nor negative towards the change. For the employees that were excited about the change, Liu et al. (2005:266) suggests that excitement is positively related to pro-active coping behaviours while fear is related to passive coping behaviours. He attests that employees who cope pro-actively are more likely to obtain desirable change outcomes than those who cope passively. He further suggests that emotions of sadness are related to neglect while emotions of happiness are related to loyalty.
The relationship between number of years of working experience at LPPD and level of satisfaction

**Table E 9: Measure of association between level of satisfaction and number of years of experience**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation between years of experience and overall satisfaction</th>
<th>Number of years of working experience</th>
<th>Overall satisfaction</th>
<th>x(x)</th>
<th>y(y)</th>
<th>X(y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>x(x)</td>
<td>y(y)</td>
<td>X(y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1764</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>2601</td>
<td>918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>1849</td>
<td>1032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total sum</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>8239</td>
<td>2742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
\begin{align*}
n & = 4, \sum x = 60, \sum xx = 1080, \sum xy = 2742, \sum yy = 8239 \\
\bar{x} & = \frac{\sum x}{n} = \frac{60}{4} = 15 \\
\bar{y} & = \frac{\sum y}{n} = \frac{181}{4} = 45.25 \\
s_{xy} & = \sum xy - n \bar{x} \bar{y} = 2742 - 4(15)(45.25) = 27 \\
s_{xx} & = \sum xx - n \bar{x} \bar{x} (\bar{x}) = 1080 - 4(15)(15) = 180 \\
s_{yy} & = \sum yy - n \bar{y} \bar{y} = 8239 - 4(45.25)(45.25) = 48.75 \\
r & = \frac{s_{xy}}{\sqrt{s_{xx} * s_{yy}}} \\
& = \frac{27}{93.7} \\
& = +0.3
\end{align*}

According to Msweli-Mbanga and Potwana (2006:23), people who believe that they have control over the change events are not likely to resist it and are generally satisfied whereas those who feel they have no control over the source of change may reject it and will obviously not be satisfied. Lot and Donald (2006:2) on the other hand suggest that, employees at different organisational levels interpret and react to change in different ways. He emphasizes that employees with characteristics associated with greater job mobility (for example, higher levels of education, more
years until retirement and more work experience) tend to hold more favourable attitudes towards the change.

Table 9 shows the association between the number of years of working experience at LPPD and the level of satisfaction. The study reveals a weak positive correlation of 0.3 between the number of years of working at LPPD and the level of satisfaction. This finding implies that LPPD management cannot rely with confidence on the number of years of working experience to gauge employee satisfaction.

The study found a strong positive correlation of 0.98 between male and female participants. The findings imply that management of LPPD can confidently rely on the level of satisfaction as it cuts across both genders.

The study also found a strong positive correlation of 0.95 between participants with less than 2 years of working experience and participants with more than 2 years of working experience at LPPD. Management of LPPD can confidently rely on this association.

The study found a strong positive correlation of 0.97 between the participants aged between 26 and 30 years and participants in the age group; 31-35 years. These finding implies that the participants in the two age groups share similar outlooks about the factors affecting employee job satisfaction and therefore Management of LPPD can rely on these association.

The study further found a strong positive correlation of 0.97 between participants with grade 12 and certificates as qualifications and participants with grade 12 and degree as qualifications. The implication is that the two categories of participants share similar views on the factors affecting employee satisfaction.

- **Inferential statistics**
  - Hₒ: \( \pi \geq 0.46 \) (claim: the percentage of satisfied employees at LPPD \( \geq 46\% \))
  - H₁: \( \pi < 0.46 \) (counter claim: the percentage of satisfied employees at LPPD is < 46%)
  - The area of acceptance for this one-sided upper tailed hypothesis test at 5% (\( \alpha = 0.05 \)) level of significance, is \([ z \geq 1.645 \])
  - For a sample size of 73 and a population of 160, \( Z_{\text{calc}} = -0.039 \)
  - Based on the sample statistics, the study rejects the null hypothesis at 5% level of significance.

**CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Findings from the study**

**Findings from the literature review**

- **The level of employee satisfaction for employees at LPPD**
  - Based on the study conducted by Dahl (2011:240-256), organisational changes are associated with significant risks of employee health problems which will obviously affect employee’s reaction towards the change and ultimately the level of satisfaction. The study conducted by Zhou et al. (2006:248), suggests that organisational change disrupts the internal routines and external linkages of an organisation and may therefore be detrimental to organisational performance which will lower customer satisfaction. The various authors agree that organizational change lowers employee satisfaction.

- **The impact of the organisational change on LPPD employees**
  - Kuokkanen et al. (2009: 116) suggests that changes that occur in a work environment have negative impact on the psychological well-being of the organisation’s personnel. Tonder (2004:
emphasizes that the impact of organisational change initiatives typically result in a loss of morale. The common view of authors suggests that organizational change has a negative impact on employees.

- The relationship between number of years of working experience and level of employee satisfaction

Lotz and Donald (2006: 2) suggest that organisational change has many different interpretations with people making sense of the change in varying ways. He emphasizes that employees with more work experience tend to hold more favourable attitudes towards change implying that there is a strong positive correlation between the number of years of working at an organisation and employee satisfaction.

Findings from the primary research

- What is the level of employee satisfaction at the LPPD?

The findings of the study shows that 46% of employees are satisfied with working at LPPD with 16% of participants strongly agreeing with factors affecting employee satisfaction and 30% of participants agreeing with these factors. According to the study, this figure is not satisfactory.

- What is the impact of organisational change on employees of the LPPD?

The study also shows that organisational change that occurred at LPPD left employees with a loss of morale, loss of trust and loss of focus. According to the study these findings support that the organisational change had a negative impact on the employees of LPPD

- What is the relationship between the period of employment at the depot and employee satisfaction?

The study further shows a weak positive correlation between the number of years of working experience at LPPD and the level of employee satisfaction with a correlation coefficient of +0.3. The study concludes that the association between these two variables is insignificant and therefore management of LPPD cannot rely on number of years of experience to gauge employee satisfaction.

Conclusions

The literature review supports the findings of the study in terms of the employee satisfaction and the impact that organisational change has on employees. The literature review suggests that organisational change is associated with significant risks of employee health problems and that it is detrimental to organisational performance which will lower employee satisfaction and ultimately customer satisfaction. The study found that 46% of employees are satisfied with working for LPPD which can be improved. The review further suggests that changes in a work environment have negative impact on the psychological wellbeing of employees with a loss of morale as is the case with the study findings. However, the study findings oppose the literature review that suggests a positive association between years of experience and the level of employee satisfaction as dictated by a weak positive correlation coefficient of 0.3 implying an insignificant relationship between the two variables.

Recommendations

The following recommendations which are strongly based on the findings will improve the level of satisfaction at LPPD if implemented effectively:

1. A re-induction programme involving all employees should take place periodically. This type of programme is especially important if a significant change in organisational policies or structures takes place as in the case with the LPPD. It is important to note that induction is a never ending process, introducing both old and
new employees to the current state of the organisation (Carell et al., 1996: 212-213). A re-induction programme will increase the sense of belonging.

2. Conduct employee satisfaction surveys on a regular basis to get in touch with the views of employees especially about the areas of concern with regard to working conditions and LPPD management.

3. Benchmark with other Pharmaceutical depots with higher levels of satisfaction to improve on the current level of satisfaction.

4. Organize team building for the employees on an annual basis to improve employee morale.

5. Review the pay structures to match pay with skill, experience and expertise.

6. Review the current change management model to accommodate guidelines that will lead to successful implementation of organisational change.

Successful implementation of organisational change often requires employee acceptance and support (Fedor et al., 2006:1).

The following change management model is recommended for LPPD for successful and effective implementation of planned and unplanned organisational change:

Figure 5.1: Change management model for planned organisational change
**Figure 5.2: Change management model for unplanned organisational change**

- **Identify the need for change and communicate the need to the employees:**
  Firstly, Managers must realize that change is needed and cultivate the employee interest in identifying the need for change. Communication at this stage plays a very important role and serves as a foundation for transparency and trust.

- **Plan the implementation process**
  This stage involves the development of a strategy to implement the change. At this stage, it is critical to explain the basis for the change, solicit ideas on implementation of the change while also addressing employees concerns to increase support and buy-in.

- **Determine the employees who will support the change and build a coalition of support**
  Before beginning a major change effort, it is useful to identify likely supporters and opponents. It is essential to build a coalition of supporters both inside and outside the organisation. Successful change in an organisation requires cooperative effort by people who have the power to facilitate or block the change (Yukl, 2006: 302-303)
Empower employees to implement the change

Empowering people also means reducing bureaucratic constraints that will impede their efforts and providing the necessary resources for them to implement change successfully (Yukl, 2006: 302-303)

Implement the change

At this stage, all planned activities in relation to the implementation process need to be carried out.

Help the employees to deal with the change

The trauma of change can be experienced regardless of whether the change involves new strategies and programs, new equipment and procedures, new facilities, new management practices and or new leaders. It may be necessary to help employees accept the need for change without feeling personally responsible for the failure. Communication that addresses specific concerns for employees is more effective than general communication about the change.

Re-inducting employees about the change

Carrel et al. (1996:213) recommends a re-induction programme involving all current employees to be implemented periodically. He emphasizes how never ending re-induction is as it introduces both old and new employees to the current state of the organisation.

Monitor the progress of implementation process

Continuous monitoring of the change process is also important in ensuring that gaps are identified and addressed while feedback is obtained from the employees (Scott et al., 1989: 22)

Evaluate the impact of the change on the employees

This last stage involves evaluating the impact of the change which is necessary to compare results with expectations and to identify the source of variations. Thompson (2010: 173) recommends a psychological evaluation of the change because emotions may be affected as a result of the change. The most common error in managing change according to Scott et al. (1989: 22), is underestimating the effect it has on people.

Meeting the needs of employees remains the prime employee satisfaction enhancement strategy Mafini et al. (2013:1-9).

Areas of further research

The participation in the study was voluntary and was conducted at a Pharmaceutical Depot in Limpopo Province. These factors limit the possibility of generalizing from the study findings. The results of the study can only be generalized to LPPD employees. The findings calls for a cautious interpretation since the participants do not represent all employees of the LPPD.

The study has opened a broad spectrum of opportunities for future studies. The study serves as a foundation for future studies at LPPD, in different organisations as well as in other provinces. For further studies a few suggestions are recommended; evaluating organisational change and its impacts on employee performance and other factors affecting employee satisfaction. It is suggested that focus be shifted towards other factors that affect job satisfaction such as role ambiguity and job level.

This study also suggests more research is needed in assessing the impact of organisational change on customer satisfaction, the association between employee satisfaction and customer satisfaction. The findings of the study can also be used as a baseline for measuring level of employee satisfaction at LPPD in future. Lastly the study suggests research on the impact of performance management system on employee performance.
Conclusion
Based on the deliberations from the literature review and the findings, the study can conclude that the scope of organisational change that occurred in Limpopo Pharmaceutical Depot is transformational which is the most massive scope of change where in an organisation moves to a radically different and at times unknown future state. In this type of change, the organisation’s mission, culture, goals and leadership change dramatically as observed with the change of leadership and culture at the depot.
The study cannot confidently conclude that employee satisfaction was lowered or improved as the study was not conducted before the change; hence the study suggests that the value be used as a baseline for future studies.
The study concludes that organisational change that occurred at LPPD had a negative impact on the employees of LPPD primarily evidenced through a loss of morale.
The study further concludes that the relationship between the number of years of working at LPPD and the level of employee satisfaction, is not significant and therefore management of LPPD cannot rely on number of years of experience to gauge employee satisfaction.
The study suggests that recommendations given be taken in to consideration as this will help in improving the level of employee satisfaction at LPPD.

NOTE: The principal author submitted this dissertation to the Regent Business School in 2014 for the award of the Master of Business Administration Degree (MBA). The dissertation was supervised by Jenny Bux, a former Manager Human Resources and Lecturer at the Regent Business School. The dissertation was edited by Professor Anis Mahomed Karodia for purposes of producing a journal article for publication.
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