The Relationship Between an Individual's Margin in Life and Readiness for Change

Susan R. Madsen
Cameron John
Duane Miller
Emily Warren
Utah Valley State College

Effectively managing change is one of the most critical challenges organizations today face. Increasing the readiness for change (RFC) of employees may be one of the most important interventions an organization can initiate. This study investigated the relationship of employee RFC and margin in life (MIL). It studied the relationship of various demographics to employees' MIL. Results suggest there is a significant correlation between MIL and RFC, age, educational level, and length of employment.

Keywords: Readiness for Change, Change, Margin in Life

Effectively managing change is one of the most critical challenges organizations today face. History shows that organizations that continually and consistently rise to meet that challenge are those that are most successful. According to McNabb and Sepic (1995), change is the process of "altering people's actions, reactions, and interactions to move the organization's existing state to some future desired state" (p. 370). Because of the constant changes confronting employees, some degree of adjustment and improvement can and should occur continuously. Often changes result, however, in dissatisfied or distressed employees. When anxiety is high, performance is lowered and job satisfaction is reduced. Staff resistance to the desired change is often excessive and immediate (McNabb & Sepic, 1995). In fact, it is often suggested that it may be easier, at times, and less costly to start a completely new organization than it is to change the culture of an existing one. McNabb and Sepic purported that a key goal of a company is to "introduce desired changes, while keeping anxiety, resistance, and subsequent stress to an absolute minimum" (p. 372). Many of these change challenges reflect complicated human dynamics between individuals, departments, and even with outside organizations and the environment (Backer, 1995).

In the human resource development (HRD) arena, change is discussed at various levels. Organizational change interventions cannot be successful unless individual change takes place. Individual change cannot effectively occur unless employees are prepared and ready. Increasing the overall readiness for change (RFC) of all employees may prove to be one of the most effective interventions an organization can initiate. Employee RFC is a challenge for any organization and is often neglected in planning and implementing (Backer, 1995). It is essential that individuals work through their fears, resistances, and anxieties about changes. This process is one that increases an individual's RFC. Identifying individual change readiness characteristics can help business professionals in prescribing and implementing more effective change interventions. One of the reasons this topic is of such importance to research is not only because of its complexity but also because of its applicability to the work of practitioners in various fields. Backer (1995) explains that

> Individual readiness for change is involved with people's beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding the extent to which changes are needed and their perception of individual and organizational capacity to successfully make those changes. Readiness is a state of mind about the need. It is the cognitive precursor to behaviors of either resistance or support…readiness for change is not a fixed element of individuals or system. It may vary due to changing external or internal circumstance, the type of change being introduced, or the characteristics of potential adopters and change agents. Thus, interventions to enhance readiness are possible…change can occur under conditions of low readiness, of course, but behavioral science research indicates that the probability of success is reduced when low readiness leads to low motivation to change or to active resistance. (p. 22-24)

By designing and implementing research in this area, we can assist organizations with tools to increase their employees' RFC which, in turn, will benefit both the organization and the individual.

Hanpachern (1997) conducted an interesting study comparing an individual's overall margin in life (MIL), and many of its work and nonwork aspects, with an individual's RFC level. Even though the study resulted in some significant correlations between work aspects and individual RFC, it contained a number of limitations in its research methodology that prevents it from significant generalizability. We were also interested in studying the relationships between MIL and RFC and chose to utilize the general framework of Hanpachern's work while

making extensive changes to the MIL scale, sample and population, and other methodological components. Because the relationship between work and nonwork domains continues to be of great interest to researchers and employees (Kirchmeyer, 1995), we felt continuing to give attention to these domains in our study was important.

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this survey questionnaire study was to investigate the concepts of McClusky's theory of margin including both the work and nonwork aspects of MIL and their relationship to readiness for change. We wanted to determine if employees who have higher MIL levels are more open and prepared for change. If we felt that supportive findings were discovered, implications for types of change interventions may surface. In addition, the cost-benefit of designing and implementing person-focused, small group, or large group interventions that can assist employees in increasing their margin in life (work and non-work aspects) may be strengthened. Another purpose of this study is for overall discovery. Armenakis, Harris, and Mossholder (1993) stated that "readiness assessments may be for the purpose of discovery as much as for the purpose of confirmation" (p. 688).

The ultimate goal of this study is to learn more about whether employees' levels of RFC are influenced by their MIL and various demographics by exploring the following research questions:

1. Is there a relationship between overall MIL and RFC scores?
2. Is there a specific relationship between MIL work and nonwork scores and readiness for change scores?
3. Are the demographic variables of gender, age, marital status, educational level, number and age of children, and length of time with company related to MIL scores?

Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

A review of the literature can assist in developing a theoretical framework for this research study. First, the results of Hanpachern's (1997) study will be discussed after which literature on the following topics will be reviewed: the importance of creating readiness and reducing resistance to change efforts; the participative method of change interventions; readiness for change characteristics and factors; the manager's role and employee empowerment; the influence of nonwork aspects on employee performance; and the applicability of the transtheoretical model for employee overall readiness for change.

MIL was developed from McClusky's theory of margin, which he first presented in a 1963 publication (Merriam & Caffarella, 1999). Merriam and Caffarella (1999) explained that it is a theory of adult potential. His theory is grounded in the "notion that adulthood is a time of growth, change and integration in which one constantly seeks balance between the amount of energy need and the amount available" (p. 279-80). Hanpachern, Morgan, & Griego (1998) defined this theory, its components, and MIL in the following passage.

> The basic concepts in this theory are load, power, and margin. Load is any intangible thought feeling, physiological function, or concrete task that dissipates energy when mentally entertained or physically implemented. High load puts responsibilities or burdens on an individual. Power is any source of energy or any resource that can be used to balance the load; it is positive and creates joy, pleasure, strength, or richness for a person. MIL is determined by load and power according to the formula: [Margin = 1-Load/(Load + Power). If load is higher than power, margin is less than .5. In that case, a person's energy is channeled into self-maintenance. By decreasing load, increasing power, or doing both, a person acquires margin, or the ability to act. If people have a high level of MIL (greater than .5) they will have a higher level of satisfaction and feel that more options are open to them, resulting in freedom of choice. A larger MIL equips people to handle emergencies and changes in life. (p. 340)

Hanpachern et al. (1998) make fairly bold conclusions in their article reporting the results of their MIL/RFC research study. They reported significance in all of the work aspects of margin even though the readiness correlations only ranged from .20-.34 ($p<.05$; $p<.01$). They did not find significance in any of the nonwork aspects of margin but the overall MIL produced a .28 correlation ($p<.01$). They concluded from their statistics that the theory of margin can be extended for use in the organization development (OD) field and that MIL can help identify workers' RFC. In their study, work factors (especially management-leadership relations and job skills and knowledge) predicted readiness for change. They explained that "although the nonwork factors themselves were not predictors of readiness in this study, the factors of self, family, and health were generally rated as more important than the work factors. The nonwork factors also had more power than load, indicating positive MIL" (p. 349). Even though significance was noted in many correlations, their bold conclusions in the report were not supported in whole by the statistical findings. Their sample was also such that generalizations outside the one Rocky Mountain company

cannot be professionally made. The results, however, were very interesting and can be utilized for the purpose of discovery as Arkmenakis, Harris, and Mossholder (1993) suggested.

Much of research in the area of RFC is housed in the behavioral sciences fields which studies both organizational and individual levels of change. This literature does support the concept that RFC is significant in the business arena as well as many others. Armenakis et al. (1993) emphasized the importance of creating readiness as a precursor to organizational change. They examined the influence strategies available to help general readiness. They argued that an organization should be actively creating readiness. Backer (1995) reported that failure to analyze and deal with readiness issues can actually lead to "abortive organization development efforts" (p. 21). He explains that resistance to change is directly related to not providing an effective unfreezing process before attempting a change. He theorized that Lewin's unfreeze element of his change theory is a major element of RFC. If proper and complete *unfreezing* or *readiness* does not occur, long-term successful change cannot occur.

There has been discussion of the relationship between RFC and resistance to change. Armenakis et al. (1993) argued that RFC is distinguished from resistance to change. "Readiness is the cognitive precursor to the behaviors of either resistance to, or support for, a change effort" (p. 681). Trahant (1996) argued that employees' resistance to change is an important component in successful organizational change interventions. He explained that "managing change effectively requires a sophisticated appreciation and understanding of the multiple variables at play. People and processes must be in tight alignment in order to support goals" (p. 37).

Some of the survey questions used in Hanpachern's (1997) study related to the literature suggesting that the participative method of change interventions is important in order to overcome resistance to change. This means that employees participate more successfully in change if they are included in the decision-making process for the change intervention. However, Locke, Schweiger and Latham (1986) noted that, even though evidence does support participation, in decision-making there is some evidence that it is not always a precursor for successful change interventions. Of 50 employee-participation studies reviewed, 26% found that participation resulted in lower productivity. Locke et al concluded that “participation is useful only under certain circumstances, a key requirement being that the subordinate has expertise to bring to the decision-making process" (p. 65).

McNabb and Sepic (1995) introduced a model from their research that identified the relevant factors determining readiness for change for an individual and an organization. These include organizational culture, organization climate, organizational policies, and organizational performance outcomes. According to their model, these are directly linked to readiness for change. It was suggested that the "effective integration of culture, climate, and policies determines the ability of an organization to carry out its mission and to accept and integrate change" (p. 372). "Inertia, manifested as a resistance to change in the operating philosophy of an organization, has been shown to be a powerful force" limiting the adoption of change (p. 381). Backer (1995) presented elements defining efforts to enhance change readiness which include contextual factors, message characteristics, and communication approaches that can be used to deliver them; attributes of change agents; interpersonal and social dynamics of the organization in which change is to take place; and specific enhancement interventions. He presented a model for this enhancement that included three stages: assessing readiness, contextualizing readiness, and enhancing readiness. This literature does support Hanpachern's (1997) and Stevenson's (1982) decision to include a number of work aspect MIL domains, subscales, and individual survey items in their questionnaires.

Cabana, Rand, Powe, Wu, Wilson, Abboud, and Raubin (1999) identified 5,658 articles and selected 76 published studies to review regarding additional RFC characteristics. Each of these studies included at least one barrier to adherence of physicians to clinical practice guidelines, practice parameters, clinical policies, or national consensus statements in an attempt to develop an approach toward improving adherence. These barriers appeared to decrease physicians’ RFC and to increase their reluctance to change at least in this specific context. These barriers included lack of awareness, lack of familiarity, lack of agreement, lack of self-efficacy, lack of outcome expectancy, inertia of previous practice, and external barriers (e.g., cumbersome, confusing). Even though their results were not generalized to other employment occupations, further research may show that reducing these barriers may be helpful for other occupations in other types of organizations. These barriers relate directly or indirectly to a number of questionnaire items as well as to the majority of the work aspects of margin Hanpachern (1997) presented.

Hanpachern (1997) showed correlation between an employee's relationship with management/leadership, job knowledge and skill, job demands, social relations, and in his/her MIL. Burke (1997) found that an employee’s RFC is reduced when role and task responsibility ambiguity regarding the employer's expectations is present. The employee is more likely to experience feelings of job insecurity as well as possible reduced motivation. Another reason the readiness may not be present is that the employee is not receiving feedback. This naturally contributes to insecurity and reduced motivation. Pronk (1999) studied the hypothesis that willingness to communicate is directly associated with an individual's readiness to change behavior. The results of the study demonstrated this to be the case. Schleusener (1999) studied the RFC of individuals in organizations. "A hierarchical regression analysis of the

elements of the supported employment model on empowerment of individuals in six different departments showed that readiness for change and self-efficacy for teamwork were significant contributors to empowerment" (p. iii).

There is also literature available supporting the findings that nonwork aspects of MIL (i.e., self, family, and health) have an effect on an employee's productivity and stress. A study by Kirchmeyer (1992) provided support that participation in nonwork domains can enrich human resources available for work. The aim of another study by Kirchmeyer (1995) was to test a conceptual framework for managing the work-nonwork boundary. She surveyed men and women who faced considerable demands in both work and nonwork domains because many often report high levels of interdomain conflict. It was found that there is spillover to work from nonwork aspects. Even though the connection was implied, more research is needed to solidify a specific link of these boundaries to readiness for change. Cohen (1995) conducted research to examine the relationship between work commitment form (i.e., organization commitment, occupational commitment, job involvement, Protestant work ethic, work involvement) and nonwork domains. Even though the return rate was only 47%, it was found, with the use of correlational analysis (i.e., regression analysis), that nonwork domains affect all work commitment forms examined in this study, especially organizational commitment. Work commitment forms have been shown to predict important work outcomes such as "turnover, turnover intentions, performance, organizational citizenship behaviors, absenteeism, and tardiness" (p. 240). It was also noted that the way in which organizations react toward nonwork domains of their employees can increase or decrease work commitment. Research in each one of the nonwork aspects of the MIL survey also provides evidence of a positive relationship on an individual's *power* and *load* as defined previously.

Another perspective on RFC can be found in the transtheoretical change model that has been extensively researched during the past 20 years. It was originally developed to study the process of smoking cessation but has expanded to include many other change efforts. The model integrates two interrelated dimensions of change, stages of change and processes of change, along with the constructs of self-efficacy and decisional balance. The stages of change dimension is represented when an individual is ready to change (Barrett, 1997). The five stages of change are precontemplation, contemplation, preparation, action, and maintenance (Barrett, 1997; Block & Keller, 1998; Morena, Johnson, Freels, Parsons, Crittenden, Flay, & Warnecke, 1998). Characteristics of readiness for change are present in both the contemplation and preparation stages. Block and Keller (1998) proposed a segmentation approach (Prochaska & DeClemente's transtheoretical model and Roger's protection motivation theory) to suggest that people at different stages of readiness for change are differentially affected by levels of these predictor variables (i.e., vulnerability, severity, response efficacy, and self-efficacy) which is supported by their research. They do admit, however, that they cannot determine with the correlational statistics, the direction of the correlation. Morena et al. (1998) discussed the debate surrounding the measure of stage of readiness to change and the transtheoretical model. They concluded that their research results indicated that the measure of readiness for change showed high levels of stability and reliability in their specific setting. Further study of the literature in this area will help solidify some of the elements (e.g., health, self, social relations) discussed and designed for this study.

The reviewed literature assisted in the development of a theoretical framework for this research study. The literature does support the importance of RFC as well as a high MIL in overall human productivity. It has also supported the design choices in Hanpachern's (1997) study of the eight work and nonwork aspects of margin and also supports the items in our revised and simplified MIL scale that has yet to be presented.

Research Methods

In this section, information on five topics will be provided: participants and sample selection (size and process), measures/instrumentation, data collection procedures, data analysis procedures, and limitations. This research study involved a survey questionnaire being given to employees in corporate settings. It can be classified as a correlation relational study because two or more different kinds of data will be gathered from the same groups of subjects to test for relationship between the independent and dependent variables. It is concurrent because the independent and dependent variables occur at the same time.

Participants and Sample Selection

The population of this study was the group of individuals that conformed to specific criteria and to which we intend to generalize the results of this research study. This target population included the populations of four organizations (three for-profit and one non-profit) within the state of Utah with numbers of local employees ranging from approximately 200 to over 2,000. These organizations varied greatly in industries, products, and services. One organization distributed surveys to all employees while another distributed surveys to all employees within six predetermined departments. A third conducted a random sample of all supervisors, management, and leadership within the organization. Finally, we ran a random sample of about two-thirds of all employees for the fourth company. A total of 758 surveys were given to employees and 464 were returned for a return rate of over 61 percent.

Measures/Instrumentation

We had originally explored doing a complete replication of Hanpachern's (1997) study; but after some troubling pilot test results, we substantially changed the MIL scale for our study. For our revised study, RFC served as the dependent variable, overall, work, and nonwork MIL served as independent variables, and the intervening demographic variables included gender, age, marital status, educational level, number of children, age of children, and length of time with company.

We used two instruments for this research project. First, we used Hanpachern's original 14-item RFC scale (with slight alterations) which was based in part on McNabb and Sepic (1995) and several unpublished studies. The stem question asked "My willingness or openness to…" and some sample items include the following: 1) work more because of the change is; 4) create new ideas is; 7) change the way I work because of the change is; and 12) support change is. Participants were asked to circle one of seven numbers on a Likert scale (1=very unlikely; 7=very likely). Schleusener (1999) explained that Hanpachern identified three dimensions of readiness for change: promoting change, participating in changes, and resisting change. These dimensions serve as subscales. Promoting includes 4 items, participating includes 6, and resisting change includes the remaining 4 items used in this scale. Hanpachern pilot tested three versions of this scale and Cronbach's alphas was measured to be .82 which indicates good internal consistency (Hanpachern, 1997; Hanpachern et al., 1998; Schleusener, 1999). Our slightly adjusted instrument had a Cronbach's alpha of .81 which is very consistent.

Second, we formed the MIL scale by studying Hanpachern's MIL Revised scale which had already been modified from the original published survey by Stevenson in 1982. The MIL Revised scale consisted of 50 questions design to measure many aspects of life in relation to work and nonwork. The work aspects of margin are divided into five categories including job knowledge and skill, job demands, social relations in the workplace, management-leadership relations, and organizational culture. The nonwork aspects of margin are divided into three categories which include self, family, and health. Our simplified instrument included nine questions in total, with only one question focused on each of the work and nonwork areas discussed. Participants were asked to read each statement carefully and then circle the number (on the list provided below) that best represented their feelings and views.

1 = Takes *a lot* of my energy – it physically or mentally drains – a load on my shoulders

2 = Takes *some* of my energy – it *somewhat* drains me – somewhat of a load on my shoulders

3 = Neither takes energy nor provides joy, pleasure, strength, or richness for me.

4 = Provides or creates *some* joy, pleasure, strength, or richness for me – gives me *some* energy/power in life.

5 = Provides or creates *a lot* of joy, pleasure, strength, or richness for me – gives me energy/power in my life.

The participants were asked to answer the following nine questions by circling one of the numbers (1-5) provided above.

1. My job…
2. Balancing my work and family…
3. My physical and mental health…
4. My relationship with my boss…
5. My social relationship in the workplace…
6. My current job knowledge and skills…
7. The demands of my job…
8. My commitment to this organization…
9. My family…

The Cronbach's alpha for this scale was .73 which is lower than Hanpachen's version (alpha = .85) but still within an acceptable range. The new version of the MIL instrument was pilot tested (n=44) to ensure internal consistency which was found. Even though Stevenson (1982) and Hanpachern (1997) established validity, stability, and internal consistency on their instrument, because of the substantial changes in the current form, establishment will need to be re-explored.

Data Collection Procedures

A key contact at each organization was used to distribute surveys. This individual had a list of the employees to be given surveys and the survey number each should be given. We kept a list of survey numbers given to each organization, and we recorded which surveys were returned. Researchers did not have a list of employee names so confidentiality was maintained. Numbers were used to identify organizations. After about 10 days we asked the organizational contacts to provide a general reminder to all participants to return surveys. Additional copies of surveys were given to the contacts so that they could provide additional copies to employees who may have misplaced their original copy. In three of the organizations, an envelope with a pre-addressed and stamped envelope was provided so they could mail them directly to us. One organization asked participants to seal them in an envelope and drop them off in a large *drop* envelope located in each of their departments. The following week a researcher

picked up the sealed envelopes. Again, a total of 758 surveys were distributed to employees and 464 were returned for a return rate of over 61 percent. After the data collection phase, results were entered into SPSS for analysis.

Data Analysis Procedure

We used Pearson correlations and multiple regressions to explore the relationships between MIL and RFC. The Pearson correlation coefficient was used to test magnitude and direction of the relationship. Multiple regressions were used to determine the correlation between the criterion variable and a combination of demographics (Gall et al., 1996). Along with other regression tests, the unstandarized B coefficient will be reported.

Limitations

There are five primary limitations for this study:

- First, our study was limited to only specific aspects of MIL. It did not and could not address all variables that can increase an individual's power or all of the variables that can decrease an individual's load;
- Second, an individual's RFC can be influenced by variables not measured in this study. A questionnaire survey cannot accurately control many variables within an organization's culture or for an individual's situation;
- Third, participants may not have a clear understanding of *power* and *load* even though it will be briefly addressed on the questionnaire. There was not time nor finances for interviews, so the participants were limited to just a brief written description;
- Fourth, a questionnaire cannot probe deeply into respondents' opinions and feelings which would be helpful in taking a more comprehensive look at RFC and its relationship to MIL;
- Fifth, the study will be limited to 758 employees in four organizations. A larger and fully randomized sample would have improved generalizability.

Results and Discussion

Table 1 contains a table of the demographics of the participants who returned their surveys. As is shown, male and female respondents were nearly equal; and most employees were between the ages of 21 and 54 (see additional demographics below).

Table 1. *Demographic Frequencies of the Sample*

Demographic	Categories and Frequencies
Sample	n=464
Gender	Male (n=222); Female (n=229)
Age range	Less than 21 (n=10); 21-30 (n=230); 31-40 (n=97); 41-54 (n=92); 55+ (n=22)
Marital status	Single (n=96); Separated/Divorced (n=33); Widowed (n=3); Married (n=316)
Highest educational level	High School (n=135); Associate Degree (n=141); Bachelor Degree (n=152); Masters Degree (n=21); Doctorate Degree (n=2)
Age of children	None (n=180); 0-5 (n=144); 6-11 (n=98); 12-18 (n=87); Over 19 (n=51)
Length of time with company	0-6 months (n=53); 7-11 months (n=63); 1-2 years (n=95); 3-5 years (n=145); 6 or more years (n=95)
Company	1 (n=128); 2 (n=145); 3 (n=127); 4 (n=54)

The first research question asked if there was a relationship between overall MIL and RFC scores. The Pearson's correlation coefficient (r=.298) did show that there was a significant correlation at the .01 level between an individual's MIL and his or her RFC responses. This supports Hanpachern's (1997) findings (r=.28, p<.01) already discussed. This means that individuals who perceive they have more *power* than *load* (MIL) also believe they are more open and ready for change.

The second question focused on a specific relationship between MIL work and nonwork scores and readiness for change scores. This question is asking us to look deeper within the MIL score to see if there are correlations between the six work MIL work items and RFC as well as the three nonwork MIL items and RFC. As for the work MIL items, there is a significant correlation (p=.01) of .288 between work MIL and RFC. This means that employees' perceptions of work related *load* and *power* does have a relationship with their RFC. In other words, the more *power* or the higher MIL related to work (relationship with boss, commitment to company, relationship with coworkers, and such)—the more the employee is open and ready for the changes that he or she may confront or be asked to make at work. There is also a correlation (although very low) of RFC and nonwork MIL (family, work-

family balance, physical and mental health) (r=.181). This means that there is a relationship between the *power* employees may feel from their families/health that may be related to their RFC as well.

The final question revolves around the demographic variables of gender, age, marital status, educational level, number of children, and length of time with company and their relationship with their MIL. Unlike Hanpachern's study, which found no relationship between demographics and MIL, it appears that there is a significant relationship between MIL and age of employee (p=.045), education level (p=.002), and the length of time an employee has been working with the company (p=.041) (see Table 2) in our study. In general terms, the older the employee is the higher MIL level he or she perceives (more power than load). Another interesting finding was that education level was very significant and it looks like there is actually a negative relationship between the level of education and MIL. This means that employees with less education perceive themselves as having higher levels of MIL. This may be because people with more education typically have more responsibility, tend to be salaried instead of hourly (hence often work more hours), and may have more complex jobs. These individuals may feel more of a *load* than those who are not as educated. Finally, it appears that those who have been with the company the shortest periods of time have higher level MIL levels. The past literature provides no findings to explain why this would be the case. Literature does find that new employees often adapt better to change than employees who have worked longer (Hogarty, 1996). Maybe new employees also feel a lighter *load* because they are not fully entrenched into an organizational culture that may become more of a burden or *load* the longer an employee works for the same company.

Table 2. *The Relationship Between MIL and Selected Demographics*

Variables	B	Sig.	R^2	ΔR^2	F
(Constant)	29.465	.000	.251	.063	2.599**
Gender	.841	.104			
Age of employee	.791	.045*			
Marital status	.218	.316			
Educational level	-.863	.002**			
# of children	7.616E02	.839			
Length of time with company	-.422	.041*			

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$

Conclusions, Recommendations, and Contributions

Identification of factors that influence readiness for individual change are important to identify. Changing individual employees is a complex task, especially when they are not open or supportive of change efforts. This study found that employees who have higher MIL levels (meaning they feel more energy, strength, joy, and power from their work and nonwork lives and environments) may be more open and ready for changes the organization may require of them. Furthermore, employees who feel good and are not burdened down by various work (job in general, job demands, relationship with boss, workplace social support, job knowledge and skills, and commitment to the organization) and possibly nonwork (family, balancing work and family, physical and mental health) appear to be ready to make the changes that may be needed by the organization. This provides some support for organizations to offer assistance or help to employees so that they can have more energy to commit to change efforts. Interventions may include assisting employees with balancing work and family responsibilities (flexible schedules, childcare assistance, job-sharing, training, and more), offering wellness programs, organizing communication improvement activities with management and employees, providing continual help related to improving job knowledge and skills, adjusting job demands when appropriate, and providing programs to improve organizational commitment, increasing employee autonomy, and more.

Continued research in the area of RFC is essential. Even though the concepts have been around for many years (e.g., Kurt Lewin) and much has been done in the general area of change, little research has been done in HRD and management arenas related to readiness for change at the individual level. Research focusing on identification of RFC factors and resistance to change constructs is needed. In addition, research is needed on specific interventions that can result in increased RFC. Finally, research needs to be continued in the area of the transition from workplace readiness to the actual change movement.

What are the implications to HRD? It is probably obvious. HRD is all about change. Change is foundational to both organization development and training and development. Many focus on organizational change, but individual change can be just as important to understanding and facilitate. Practitioners who do not understand individual readiness will develop and implement change interventions that will not be as successful (short-term and long-term) as those who design interventions to prepare employee to be open and ready for change when it is needed. Overall, we (HRD professionals) can be more effective and efficient if we understand readiness for change and its antecedents, determinants, moderators, outcomes, connections, and complexity.

References

Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. *Human Relations, 46*(6), 681-703.

Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Field, H. S. (1999). Making change permanent: A model for institutionalizing change. In W. Passmore & R. Woodman (Eds.), *Research in organization change and development* (Vol.XII, pp. 97-128). Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Backer, T. E. (1995). Assessing and enhancing readiness for change: Implications for technology transfer. In T. E Backer, S. L. David, & G. Soucy (Eds.), *Reviewing the behavioral science knowledge base on technology transfer* (pp. 21-41). Rockville, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse.

Barrett, B. S. (1997). *An application of the transtheoretical model to physical activity.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota, St. Paul.

Block, L. G., & Keller, P. A. (1998). Beyond protection motivation: An integrative theory of health appeals. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 28*(17), 1584-1608.

Burke, W. W. (1997). The new agenda for organization development. *Organizational Dynamics, 26*(1), 6-20.

Cabana, M. D., Rand, C. S., Powe, N. R., Wu, A. W., Wilson, M. H., Abboud, P. C., & Rubin, H. R. (1999). Why don't physicians follow clinical practice guidelines?: A framework for improvement. *The Journal of the American Medical Association, 282*(15), 1458-1465.

Cohen, A. (1995). An examination of the relationship between work commitment and nonwork domains. *Human Relations, 48*(3), 239-263.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). *Educational research: An introduction* (6th ed.). White Plains, NY:Longman Publishers.

Hanpachern, C., Morgan, G. A., & Griego, O. V. (1998). An extension of the theory of margin: A framework for assessing readiness for change. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 9*(4), 339-350.

Hanpachern C. (1997). *The extension of the theory of margin: A framework for assessing readiness for change.*Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Colorado State University, Fort Collins.

Hogarty, D. B. (1996). The young and the restless. *Working Women, 21*(7-8), 27-28.

Kirchmeyer, C. (1995). Managing the work-nonwork boundary: An assessment of organizational responses. *Human Relations, 48*(5), 515-536.

Kirchmeyer, C. (1992). Nonwork participation and work attitudes: A test of scarcity vs. expansion models of personal resources. *Human Relations, 45*(8), 775-791.

Locke, E. A. Schweiger, D. M., & Latham, G. P. (1986). Participation in descition making: When should it be used? *Organizational Dynamics, 14*(3), 65-80.

Merriam, S. B., & Caffarella, R. S. (1999). *Learning in adulthood: A comprehensive guide* (2nd ed.). San Francisco:Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Morera, O. F., Johnson, T. P., Freels, S., Parsons, J., Crittenden, K. S., Flay, B. R., & Warnecke, R. B. (1998). The measure of stage of readiness to change: Some psychometric considerations. *Psychological Assessment, 10*(2), 182-186.

McNabb, D. E., & Sepic, F. T. (1995). Culture, climate, and total quality management: Measuring readiness for change. *Public Productivity & Management Review, 18*(4), 369-385.

Pronk, N. P., Tan, A. W. H., & O'Connor, P. (1999). Obesity, fitness, willingness to communicate and health care costs. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise, 31*(11), 1535-1543.

Schleusener, R. D. (1999). *Empowerment in organizations: Dimensions of the supported employment model.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Colorado State University, Fort Collins.

Stevenson, J. S. (1982). Construction of a scale to measure load, power, and margin in life. *Nursing Research, 31* (4), 222-225.

Tranhant, B., & Burke, W. W. (1996). Traveling through transitions. *Training & Development, 50*(2), 37-42.