THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES OF THE TRANSFORMATIONAL CHANGE MANAGEMENT PROCESS IN THE SOUTH AFRICAN DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONAL SERVICES: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS

Mbongeni A. Mdletye, Jos Coetzee and Wilfred I. Ukpere *

Abstract

Change management research has become a critical focus area for change scholars because of the low success rate in change implementation. This exposition of how the transformational change process has been managed at the Department of Correctional Service was meant to show managers, particularly in the said department, that unless managers pay serious attention to certain critical aspects which must form part of the change management process, no real change would be attained. This becomes critical if one considers that there is still a long way to go in the process of transformation to the philosophy of rehbilitation, namely transforming correctional centres to effective institutions of offender rehabilitation. There is currently limited literature on organisational change approaches that are people-oriented. The available literature seems to focus more on the technical aspects (hard issues such as structures, systems and practices) in terms of change management at the expense of people issues (soft issues such as the human factors). It has been argued that the neglect of people issues in the management of organisational change processes is responsible for the high failure rate in change implementation. For purposes of contextualising transformational change management within the setting of the Department of Correctional Services, an extensive literature study was undertaken. This was followed by an empirical analysis of data collected through survey questionnaires from correctional officials and offenders respectively. The research established that there were strong and weak points in the DCS transformational change management process from the perspective of both research participants.

Key Words: Change, Transformational Change, Management, Leadership, Organisational Culture

* Department of Industrial Psychology and People Management, Faculty of Management, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa
E-mail: wiukpere@uj.ac.za

1. Introduction and Background

Organisations aspire for success in their performance in terms of effectiveness and efficiency and this necessitates changes in terms of human and non-human elements of the organisation. Change is required to make an organisation flourishing entity in terms of its performance at individual, team and organisational levels (Herold & Fedor, 2008; Martins, 2008; Liu, 2010). For this reason, change becomes an essential part of organisational life (Lew & Eekhout, 2004; Flash, 2007; Maltz, 2008; Lefkoe, 2010). Hence Wharton Executive Education (2011) puts change at the centre of organisational growth and survival. The desire to remain competitive compels organisations to implement changes at an ever-increasing rate (Schabracq, Winnubst & Cooper, 2003; Burnes, 2004; Imberman, 2009; Kohurt, 2010; Agboola & Salawu, 2011). However, despite this commitment to change, organisations are not succeeding in ensuring effective change implementation and institutionalisation (Mourier & Smith, 2001; Balogun & Hope Hailey, 2004; Bregman, 2009; Lotich, 2011; Choi & Ruona, 2011). The high failure rate in the change implementation indicates serious challenges regarding the implementation and institutionalisation of changes efforts. Despite the many change efforts implemented in organisations, organisations continue to record low success rates (Van Tonder, 2004a; 2006). Recent studies by Aiken and Keller (2009), Turner, Hallencreutz and Haley (2009) and Turner (2011) indicate that the situation is not improving. The high failure rate reflects the extent of the challenge confronting organisations within the domain of change management. The ineffectiveness of the traditional approaches for managing change efforts is to blame for the high failure rate in change implementatio

1.1 Problem statement

The immense challenges facing change implementers within public and private sector organisations stem from the failure to give recognition and acknowledgement to the people issues when it comes to the management of the change process, including the South African Department of Correctional Services where this study was undertaken, thereby contributing to the well documented low success rate in change implementation.

1.2 Objectives

The study is guided by the following objectives:

- To highlight the importance of recognising, acknowledging and addressing people issues during the process of transformational change implementation.
- To explore the strengths and weaknesses of the transformational change management process undertaken by South African Department of Correctional Services.
- To suggest effective ways of implementing change in all organisations across the spectrum.

2. Literature Review

Organisations have unique circumstances and as such, there is no single change management approach that can be applied across the organisational spectrum and bear the desired results. According to Jones, Aguirre and Calderone (2013), there is a set of general change management practices, tools, techniques and principles that can be adapted and applied as a guiding framework for change management to various organisational situations. The first guiding change management principle is that managers should *address the human side of change in a proactive and systematic manner* as part of transformational change management because any significant transformational change initiative creates people issues. Addressing the human dimension of change is important, particularly if one considers Plant's (1987) view that the individual is the basic unit of change. This is also emphasised by Tichy and Devanna (1990) assert that the success of organisational change depends more on human rather than organisational dynamics. This is based on the fact that people perceive and experience change differently as a result of its varying impact on them (Kohurt, 2010). This suggests that people ate not passive recipients of change efforts and as such, it is critical for them to be consulted individually and collectively if change initiatives are to succeed (Imberman, 2009; Zolno, 2009; Panao, 2010). It is therefore important for managers to understand how people perceive, experience and react to change efforts (Evans, 2009).

The success of organisational change initiatives hinges on people's acceptance of the change. People's acceptance of change requires that people, as individuals, undergo a process of personal change. The importance of personal change is emphasised by Shapiro (2011) who emphasises that organisations can only change if people in them change as well. Without people's concerns about change being addressed, change cannot be sustained because change is enacted and experienced by people (Van Tonder, 2004c; Rodda, 2007; Imberman, 2009; Sloyan, 2009). Agboola and Salawu (2011) emphasise that people are the primary inhibitors of change in all organisations across the business spectrum. Change has a significant effect on people as individuals and as groups (intrapersonal and interpersonal impact) (Bellou, 2007b; Johnston, 2008; Paton & McCalman, 2008; Dahl, 2010; Kohurt, 2010; Scandura, 2011). The human element within the organisation plays a significant role in determining the success or failure of organisational change initiatives (Armenakis & Harris, 2009; Panao, 2010). There is a relationship between people's perceptions and experience of the change and the perceived status of the change (Decker, Wheeler, Johnson & Parsons, 2001; Van Tonder, 2004b; Social Media Directory, 2011). The recognition of the critical role that people's different perceptions, reactions, and experiences of change play in the implementation of change efforts is one area that is still a universal challenge (Briner & Kiefer, 2005). These micro or individual perspectives on the perception and experience of, and reaction to organisational change on the part of employees have not been properly addressed as part of the change management process (Van Tonder, 2004a; 2006).

The inadequate attention paid by managers to the human dimension of organisational change results in the low success rate in change implementation (Devos, Beulens & Bouckenooghe, 2007; Rodda, 2007; Smith, 2009; Social Media Directory, 2011). Increase in resistance to change is also attributed to poor management practices (Ferres, Connell & Travaglione, 2005; Bareil, Savoie & Meunier, 2007). This points to the existence of a relationship between managerial intervention or non-intervention and the degree or level of employees' reactions and resistance to change, as well as between managerial intervention or non-intervention and success or failure of change efforts. It is on the basis of the above that Jones, Aguirre and Calderone (2013:1) emphasise that *"leadership teams that fail to plan for the human side of change often find themselves wondering why their best-laid plans have gone awry"*. Therefore, it is important for managers to *focus on organisational members as individuals by taking each individual on a journey of personal transformation* in order to make sure that each person within the organisation is ready for the change in terms of his/her attitude, beliefs and behaviour. It is for this reason that Jones, Aguirre

and Calderone (2013) regard change as both an organisational and a very personal journey.

The second change management principle is that change agents must ensure that both the *executive and senior leadership of the organisation embrace the change* through not only speaking with one voice, but also modelling the desired behaviours (Pierce, Gardner & Dunham, 2002). This is necessary in order to ensure that the leadership team gives the required direction, support, strength and motivation to the rest of the organisation. It is an old principle of social psychology that people who work co-operatively and collaboratively achieve more than people who work individually. Informed by the foregoing, it is critical for organisational leadership to work together for the sake of ensuring success in change management. As Jones, Aguirre and Calderone (2013) put it, executive managers who work co-operatively with one another are better placed to ensure success in organisational change management. The third guiding change management principle is that for any organisational change initiative to be a success, change implementers must ensure that *leaders are identified and capacitated at every level of the organisation* for purpose of utilising them *to cascade the change and the responsibility for managing its implementation down to the lowest levels of the organisation*. This is what Jones, Aguirre and Calderone (2013) call the "cascading leadership" change management methodology.

The fourth guiding principle relates to the *articulation and selling of the vision for change* to the rank and file of organisational members with a view to securing their buy-in (Senior, 2002). Making a formal case for change is important in order to reach out to people in terms of convincing them why change is needed and how important it is for them to support the change. Articulating an extremely compelling need for change is very important. Articulating a compelling vision for change is necessary given the fact that lack of *effective and efficient information flow between management and employees (communication)* creates a fertile ground for employees to perceive change in a negative light in terms of the impact that change will have on them. Face-to-face communication is always recommended, particularly when it comes to handling sensitive issues associated with organisational change management (Pierce, Gardner & Dunham, 2002).

Building a formal case for change starts with articulating a vision and this assists in developing *ownership of change* on the part of organisational members, which is one of the critical change management guiding principles. Giving organisational members the ownership of change, helps to develops in them a strong sense of organisational belongingness and commitment which, in turn, guarantee support for change. Change ownership can be secured through providing opportunities for organisational members to *get involved and participate in decision-making* regarding change management, which is another critical guiding principle in change management. It is for this reason that Kandt (2002) emphasises that key stakeholders must be involved in change processes because insufficient involvement and influences of key stakeholders in the change management process creates resentment and ultimately resistance to change. Change must involve the people. Change must not be imposed upon the people. Whenever an organisation imposes new things as part of transformational change on people, there will be resistance. Participation, involvement and open, early, and full communication are the important factors that facilitate change implementation. Information-sharing workshops are very useful processes to develop collective understanding, approaches, policies, methods, systems and ideas when it comes to change implementation. Employees need to be able to trust the organisation. Thoughtful planning, sensitive implementation, consultation with, and involvement and participation of, people affected by the changes hold the key to effective change implementation (Senior, 2002; Pierce, Gardner & Dunham, 2002). Change should not be forced on people as it can be very unsettling. People need to be made to understand change through organisational leaders serving as a settling influence (Lunenburg, 2010).

Organisational readiness in terms of organisational culture is critical for ensuring success in change implementation (McNabb & Sepic, 1995; Lawson, 2003). According to McNabb and Sepic (1995), some of the challenges experienced with the implementation of change initiatives may be attributed to organisational culture and organisational climate which are not conducive for the acceptance of change. Lawson (2003) concurs with this view when he states that change interventions that are implemented for purposes of enhancing organisational performance experience challenges due to negative organisational cultures and organisational climates. McNabb and Sepic (1995) emphasise that both organisational culture and organisational climate determine organisational readiness for change. They further state that if the culture and climate of the organisation are not conducive to the acceptance of change, any change initiative implemented is likely to fail. Therefore, it is important for managers to *assess organisational readiness for change in terms of the organisational cultural landscape* in order to ensure that the organisation has a culture that is receptive to change (Ingersoll, Kirsch & Lightfoot, 2000; Weeks, Roberts, Chonko & Jones, 2004). Organisational change efforts have a greater chance of success in unified organisational cultures than in fragmented organisational cultures.

3. Research methodology and design

A literature study and a quantitative empirical study were undertaken as part of this research. The study utilised applied a mixed method of three research designs of the exploratory, the survey and the descriptive designs. A random, purposive and probability samples of 1000 and 500 out of 7593 correctional officials and 13 520 sentenced offenders respectively in the KwaZulu-Natal Region of the South African Department of Correctional Services were selected. A pilot study preceded the main empirical study, which entailed administering two survey questionnaires and scoring the responses. The views of correctional officials and offenders regarding how the transformational change management process was managed were measured by means of a 5-point Likert response scale. Descriptive statistics was employed to establish the reliability and validity of measuring instruments. Frequency analysis was undertaken to describe the sample, as suggested by Kerlinger (1992). Factor analysis was also conducted with a view to determining the factor structure of the measuring instruments. The adequacy and sphericity of the intercorrelation matrix was determined through he Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO), measure of sampling adequacy (MSA) and the Bartlett's test of sphericity. A reliability analysis conducted assisted in calculating a reliability coefficient (Cronbach Alpha). The correctional officials' sample recorded a return rate of 71.3% and the frequency rate of 98.2% for valid responses; while the offenders' sample recorded a return rate of 58.2% and the frequency rate of 97.6 for valid responses. The **face validity** of the individual items on both questionnaires revealed high face validity, and **the content validity** of the items relevant to the research question dealing with the management of the DCS transformational change process was in order. It was also established that the two questionnaires utilised in the study measured what they were designed to measure in terms of the management of the DCS transformational change process and as such, the construct validity was positive.

4. Data analysis and discussion of findings

4.1 Descriptive statistics of the management of the DCS change process

Table 1 displayed below reveal that there are serious shortcomings in the management of the DCS transformational change process.

As can be seen from frequency Table 1, the implementation of the transformational change in the Department of Correctional Services was not handled in a properly insofar as the management of the process was concerned in terms of the frequencies

shown above. The higher frequencies in support of the questionnaire statements are an indication of the fact that the DCS change process was not properly managed, particularly in terms of internal stakeholder involvement and participation in decision-making.

4.2 Managing the DCS change

43.8% of correctional officials claimed that the DCS change process was not managed properly and this is a cause for concern in that in terms of the literature study, the majority of organisational change efforts fail due to poor management. Only 21.7% correctional officials support the view that the DCS change process was well managed. Offenders also expressed their dissatisfaction with the management of the DCS change process. The change strategists and implementers in the Department of Correctional Services should take note of this empirical finding, particularly if they consider the fact that a higher percentage of offenders (54.4%) declared that the DCS change process was poorly managed. The dissatisfaction with the management of the DCS change process by the two critical internal change stakeholders (that is, correctional officials as change implementers and offenders as change recipients) indicates that there are flaws in the management of the change process. The management of Correctional Services should build on the finding that 56.1% of correctional officials believed that the DCS change process was being reasonably well-managed.

The second significant finding was that the majority of valid respondents (55.7%) claimed that the DCS change was being achieved through management decision. Correctional officials' responses revealed that 59.4% of correctional officials believed that the DCS transformational change was sustained by management energy. This is contrary to literature evidence that success in change implementation can only be attained through taking employees along as active partners in the change process. Furthermore, the majority of correctional officials (67.5%) indicated that the top management of the Department of Correctional Services is leading the initiation and implementation of the transformation process. Gilmore (2009) maintains that the creation of a balance between top-down and collaborative implementation of organisational change efforts holds the key to the effective management of change. In line with the above findings, it is also worrying that both correctional officials (45.4%) and offenders (51.1%) believe that the DCS transformational change initiative was imposed on them. It should be remembered that change ownership is critical for the success of organisational change initiatives and this can be secured through providing organisational members with opportunities to get involved and participate in decision-making regarding change management. Kandt (2002) emphasises that key internal and

external stakeholders must be involved in change processes because insufficient involvement and influences of key stakeholders in the change management process creates resentment and ultimately resistance to change. The view that the DCS transformational change was imposed on correctional officials and offenders explains why both correctional officials and offenders have displayed negative emotions towards the DCS transformational change and why the study also picked up resistance-to-change behaviour amongst correctional officials as per Table 2 and Table 3 below.

Table 1. Frequency Table: The Management of the DCS Transformational Change Process

Statement	Frequency		Percentage		Valid Percentage	
	Officials	Offenders	Officials	Offenders	Officials	Offenders
Poorly managed.	101	78	14.2	26.8	14.6	**30.1**
Not managed well.	202	63	28.3	21.6	29.2	**24.3**
Reasonably well managed.	238	57	33.4	19.6	34.4	**22.0**
Well managed.	119	44	16.7	15.1	17.2	**17.0**
Managed very well.	31	17	4.3	5.8	4.5	**6.6**
The transformation is sustained by management energy.	423		59.4		63.2	
The transformation is sustained by its own energy.	246		34.5		36.7	
Full implementation is taking longer than expected.	414	187	58.1	64.2	61.9	**74.2**
Full implementation is taking sooner than expected.	255	65	35.7	22.3	38.1	**25.7**
Is imposed on employees/offenders.	324	140	45.4	51.1	49.4	**54.7**
Is being realised through employee/offender collaboration - agreed with employees.	332	116	46.6	39.9	50.5	**45.3**
Is achieved through management decision.	368		51.6		55.7	
Is achieved through employee collaboration.	293		41.1		44.4	
The transformation is generally chaotic.	261	129	36.6	44.4	40.4	**49.6**
The transformation is generally orderly.	386	130	54.1	44.7	59.6	**50.0**
The transformation process is poorly managed.	315	141	44.1	48.8	47.4	**56.0**
Is characterised by substantial conflict.	356	128	49.9	44.0	66.7	**50.4**
Is characterised by the absence of conflict.	308	126	43.2	43.3	46.4	**49.7**
Valid	696					
Missing	17					
Total	**713**					

Source: Authors' Fieldwork.

Table 2. Frequency Table: Resistance to the DCS Change

Statement	Very Unlikely	Unlikely	Not Applicable	Very Likely	Likely	No. Valid	No. Missing
The likelihood that you will willingly (choose to) be part of another new transformation project.	10.8	10.4	11.8	40.9	26.2	646	67
The likelihood that you will willingly (choose to) change the way you work because of the transformation process.	9.9	14.5	13.3	41.8	20.5	655	58
The likelihood that you will willingly (choose to) focus on improving the current situation rather than pursuing the transformation process.	7.9	17.2	14.0	42.4	18.4	662	51
The likelihood that you will willingly (choose to) take the blame when the transformation process or elements thereof fail.	13.5	26.9	22.8	29.0	7.8	658	55
The likelihood that you will willingly (choose to) provide support for the remainder of the transformation process.	5.0	11.6	12.1	50.1	21.2	655	58
The likelihood that you will willingly (choose to) be part of the transformation process / programme.	5.0	9.7	9.7	38.7	36.7	659	54
Total No. of Respondents: 713							

Source: Authors' Fieldwork

Table 3. Frequency Table: Resistance to the DCS Change

Statement	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
If a similar transformation process is to be introduced tomorrow, I will actively resist the process.	38	5.3	5.5	**5.5**
If a similar transformation process is to be introduced tomorrow, I will firmly denounce participation.	23	3.2	3.3	**8.9**
If a similar transformation process is to be introduced tomorrow, I will maintain a neutral stance.	160	22.4	23.3	**32.2**
If a similar transformation process is to be introduced tomorrow, I will actively support participation.	355	49.8	51.7	**83.8**
If a similar transformation process is to be introduced tomorrow, I will volunteer to lead / facilitate the process.	111	15.6	16.2	**100.0**
Valid	687	96.4	100.0	
Missing	26	3.6		
Total	**713**	**100.0**		

Source: Authors' Fieldwork

The admission by certain correctional officials that if faced with another transformational change effort, they would resist, denounce, or adopt a neutral stance (responses of 5.5%, 3.3% and 23.3% respectively) vindicates an assertion by Carr, Hand and Trahant (2006) and Agboola and Salawu (2011) that resistance to change is an effort to maintain the status quo. The act of disengagement through the maintenance of a neutral stance points to low psychological ownership of organisational change processes (Lorenzi & Riley, 2000) and to psychological withdrawal from any transformational change within Correctional Services (Tanner, 2011). It is on the basis of this that Tanner (2011) regards

resistance to change as an organisational change reality that change implementers must deal with if organisational change efforts are to bear the desired results. Resistance to change can be avoided by addressing the issue of people involvement and participation in the change planning and implementation phases of the transformational change process because if people are not involved, negative perceptions and experiences, which are the basis of people's negative attitude towards change, develop. Information sharing through regular communication between managers and employees can serve as a panacea in terms of facilitating change implementation (Evans, 2012).

Table 4 below shows that information sharing was a serious shortcoming during the planning and implementation phases of the DCS transformational change management process. It should be a worrying factor to the management of Correctional Services that a substantial number of respondents indicated that they had no complete understanding of the DCS transformational change process. Greater numbers of correctional official respondents and offender respondents (53% and 67.3% respectively) claimed that they had no complete understanding of the transformational change process, as opposed to lesser numbers of correctional official and offender respondents (47% and 32.8% respectively) who indicated that they had complete understanding of the transformational change process. The understanding of change is created through regular two-way communication between managers and employees or key stakeholders. Although 61.1% and 50.8% of correctional official and offender respondents respectively pointed out that the DCS transformational change process was well and clearly communicated, but it should be a concern to Correctional Services management that 38.8% and 49.2% of correctional official and offender respondents respectively claimed that the DCS transformational change process was not well and clearly communicated. Lack of effective and efficient information flow between management and employees creates a fertile ground for employees to perceive change in a negative light in terms of the impact that the change will have on them in terms of their work and private lives. Surely this lack of complete understanding of the DCS transformational change process as informed by gaps in transformational change communication management will impact negatively on the implementation process, given the fact that lack of information does contribute to resistance to change (Evans, 2012). Furthermore, lack of information hinders the development of a strong sense of not only organisational ownership, but of change ownership as well. And change ownership can be secured through providing organisational members with opportunities to get involved and participate in decision-making regarding change management.

The above assertion is further corroborated by the fact that although 55.7% of correctional official respondents claimed that the DCS transformational change was understood by most correctional officials, 44.3% of the correctional official respondents believed that the DCS transformational change was not understood by most correctional officials. The situation around lack of understanding of the DCS transformational change process is also aggravated by the fact that the majority of correctional official and offender respondents (65% and 70.8%, as opposed to 35% and 29.1% respectively) alluded to the fact that correctional officials and offenders had no control over the DCS transformational change process situation. The majority of offender respondents (54.9%) also pointed out that the DCS transformational change was not understood by most offenders, including those that are on parole, as opposed to 45% of offender respondents who revealed that the DCS transformational change was understood by most offenders. On the side of the offenders, the situation is also made worse by the fact that 54.7% of offender respondent, as opposed to 45.3%, believed that the DCS transformational change was not being realised through offender collaboration and participation. The issue of a lack of all-inclusive, consultative and collaborative approach in the management of the DCS transformational change is a serious shortcoming that the South African Department of Correctional Services needs to address quite urgently as part of its agenda to move the transformation of the Department forward.

There are serious challenges regarding the identity of the Department of Correctional Services as an organisation in terms of Table 5 below, particularly regarding the issue of human relations. The issue of human relations as a point of concern that impacts negatively on the management of the DCS transformational change initiative is substantiated by the finding that the DCS transformational change implementation process was characterised by substantial conflict, as indicated by 53.6% and 50.4% of correctional official and offender respondents respectively. The negative organisational identity of the Department of Correctional Services can also be attributed to the issue of the interpersonal and intrapersonal impact of the DCS transformational change, as well as the issue of relations between managers and correctional officials as employees of the Department. The finding that 64.7% of the correctional official respondents indicated that correctional officials were experiencing a partial or complete loss of faith in senior management is quite worrying. 72.5% and 70% revealed that correctional officials were experiencing strained relationships at work and increasing conflict and disagreements respectively. Furthermore, 66.8% indicated that there was generally an increase in distrust of top management of Correctional Services and other officials driving the transformational change process.

These findings do not augur well for the required effective management of the transformational change process. They suggest that if managers do not involve employees in the change management process at both the planning and implementation levels, employees will lose trust and faith in them. And this counts against managers in terms of promoting effective implementation of transformational change.

Table 4. Frequency Percentages: Management of the DCS Transformational Change Process

Statement	Frequency Percentage For		Frequency Percentage Against	
	Officials	Offenders	Officials	Offenders
Complete understanding of the transformational change process.	47.0	32.8	53.0	67.3
Have control over the transformational change process situation.	35.0	29.1	65.0	70.8
Transformational change is creating confusion and uncertainty.	58.0	65.6	14.3	34.5
Transformational change is embraced enthusiastically.	63.2	67.7	36.8	32.3
Full implementation is taking longer than expected.	61.9	74.2	38.1	25.7
Top management is leading the introduction and implementation of the transformational change process.	67.5	N/A	32.5	N/A
Transformational change is imposed on offenders.	N/A	54.8	N/A	45.2
Transformational change is realized through offender collaboration and participation.	N/A	45.3	N/A	54.7
Transformational change is supported by all major stakeholders.	70.9	63.6	29.1	36.5
Transformational change is understood by most employees.	55.7	N/A	44.3	N/A
Transformational change is understood by most offenders/parolees.	N/A	45.0	N/A	54.9
Transformational change enjoys support from all.	59.9	52.8	40.0	47.2
Transformational change team is knowledgeable on transformation.	63.5	N/A	36.5	N/A
Transformational change enjoys the support of the majority of security officials (custodial staff).	65.6	6.8	34.4	43.0
Transformational change enjoys the support of the majority of offenders.	N/A	66.0	N/A	33.9
The desired results were spelt out at the commencement of the transformational change process.	68.9	61.8	31.1	38.3
The transformational change process was well and clearly communicated.	61.1	50.8	38.8	49.2
Transformational change was facilitated by the internal staff.	55.0	N/A	45.0	N/A
Employees were prepared for the transformational change.	62.2	N/A	37.8	N/A
Transformational change has clearly articulated goals and objectives.	70.1	N/A	29.8	N/A
Transformational change process is too fast/rapid.	48.0	38.9	52.0	61.0
Transformational change assumed a step-by-step process.	65.9	68.3	34.0	31.7
Managers are held accountable for the outcomes of transformational change.	68.5	N/A	31.4	N/A
The transformational change process is transparent.	66.7	53.7	33.2	46.2
The transformational change process is characterised by substantial conflict.	53.6	50.4	46.4	49.7

Source: Authors' Fieldwork

Given the empirical findings on the identity of Correctional Services as captured in Table 5 below, one can argue that the foregoing findings on social relations within the work environment have contributed to the shaping of the DCS organisational identity as depicted in terms of the findings highlighted in Table 5. From Table 5 below, it is significant to note that the majority of correctional

officials indicated that the Department of Correctional Services currently lacks a sense of unity and solidarity. Without a strong sense of organisational unity, organisational solidarity, and organisational harmony, no organisation can ensure effective facilitation of transformational change management processes. The situation becomes more acute when one considers that there is a finding that the Department of Correctional Services has not succeeded in unifying its workforce. Unifying organisational members and attaining organisational unity, organisational solidarity, and organisational harmony become a challenge when an organisation has a mixture of different personalities, as it is the case with the Department of Correctional Services. They also believe that the Department of Correctional Services is an organisation characterised by confusion, fragmentation and conflict. Further evidence is obtained from Table 4 wherein both correctional official and offender respondents (58% and 65.6%, as opposed to 14.3% and 34.5%, respectively) believed that the DCS transformational change was creating confusion and uncertainty.

The findings on organisational identity demonstrate that managers of the Department of Correctional Services neglected managing the identity of the Department during the process of fundamental culture change. According to McCuddy (2003), Lawler and Worley (2006), Mullins (2010), and Ackerman (2010), organisational identity exerts an influence on many factors that account for the success of organisations, including the change phenomenon in terms of its management. For Ackerman (2000), the notion of organisational identity is a catalyst for change. For this reason, no organisation can afford to have multiple identities (Ackerman, 2000), as this would impact negatively on transformational change efforts designed to enhance organisational performance in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. Other studies have found that a positive organisational identity is critical in promoting co-operation (Tyler, 1999), commitment (Golden-Biddle & Rao, 1997), and identification with the organisation (Elsbach & Bhatlacharya, 2001). This view is further strengthened by the assertion that perceptions of organisational identity have an influence on how organizational members interpret and adapt to organisational change (Corley & Gioia, 2004; Beech & Johnson, 2005). It should be remembered that trust involves faith and confidence in the intentions and behaviours of fellow organisational members. The issue of trust as a catalyst or stimulus for facilitating change is also emphasised by Tanner (2010) and Adenle (2011) who argue that meaningful organisational change does not occur within an organisational climate of mistrust. Without an organisational climate of mutual trust but mistrust, organisational change efforts would be doomed to failure.

Table 5. Frequency Table: The Organisational Identity of the Department of Correctional Services

Statement	Frequency Percentages					
	No. Valid	No. Missing	For	No. Valid	No. Missing	Against
The DCS currently lacks a sense of unity and solidarity.	691	22	57.3	691	22	**33.0**
The DCS is a confused organisation.	696	17	45.5	696	17	**43.9**
The DCS is a conflicted organisation.	687	26	45.3	687	26	**41.5**
The DCS is a fragmented organisation.	663	50	37.7	663	50	**34.1**
The DCS has many personalities.	683	30	79.2	683	30	**10.1**
The DCS has not succeeded in unifying the entire workforce.	684	29	35.8	684	29	**45.7**
At this moment in time the DCS is integrating different personalities.	677	36	69.8	677	36	**15.8**
The DCS is a mixture of different personalities.	**690**	**23**	**83.8**	**690**	**23**	**8.9**

Source: Authors' Fieldwork

Therefore, in the light of all the above, it becomes important for the management of Correctional Services at different levels of the organisational hierarchy, as well as managers in organisations across the public and private sectors to take note of the above-mentioned weaknesses in the transformational change management process of the Department of Correctional Services.

5. Recommendations

Managers should develop the abilities necessary to implement transformational changes effectively and successfully by gaining a broader understanding and knowledge of the elements and dynamics of transformational change dealt with in this study. In addition, managers contemplating to introduce transformational change efforts need to first create a dynamic, productive and effectual organisational climate and culture with shared values geared towards

creating a sense of pride, a sense of belonging and a sense of ownership among employees. Managers need to harness the culture of their organisations before and during the implementation of transformational change initiatives. A productive organisational culture is known for influencing employees positively towards transformational change efforts, while an unproductive and ineffectual culture influences employees negatively towards transformational change interventions. Moreover, managers need to give people time to internalise the idea of transformational change before it is initiated and implemented. People need to be motivated to not only to internalise the change, but also to accept the change. Without motivation of, and internalisation of the change by, employees, no successful change will be realised. Managers should develop organisational capacity for change implementation and management at individual employee level, managerial level, and organisational level. This is necessary in order to ensure that both managerial and non-managerial employees have the required competencies for managing change at individual and organisational levels. Managers need to be empowered to identify and deal with the negative perceptions.

More than that, managers should ensure that employees' organisational commitment levels are maintained at high levels before, during and after the implementation of organisational change efforts. Organisations should develop the ability and capacity of managers to manage organisational change efforts through a comprehensive change management development programme. Leaders should be identified and capacitated at every level of the organisation for purpose of utilising them to cascade the change and the responsibility for managing its implementation down to the lowest levels of the organisation. This is what Jones, Aguirre and Calderone (2013) call the "cascading leadership" change management methodology. Making a formal case for change is important in order to reach out to people in terms of convincing them why change is needed and how important it is for them to support the change.

As a response to the finding that the DCS change process was not managed well effectively, managers of the Department of Correctional Services should come up with structural arrangements at different levels of the organisational hierarchy as a way of promoting an all-inclusive, collective and collaborative approach in the management of the DCS change. This will assist in striking a balance between a top-down approach and a collaborative approach in the management of the DCS change. Furthermore, the managers must, as a matter of extreme urgency, develop and distribute a communications plan as a remedial measure to the serious finding relating to the lack of information flow between managerial and non-managerial employees regarding the implementation of the DCS

change. Finally, as response to the finding that the DCS transformational change implementation process was characterised by substantial conflict, the management should commit to undertaking an exercise of overhauling and harnessing the organisational culture, organisational climate, and organisational identity of the Department. This will assist in ensuring that the culture, climate and identity of the Department as an organisation does support an environment that is conducive to the facilitation of transformational change implementation.

6. Conclusion

The findings presented in this paper on the management of the transformational change process within the South African Department of Correctional Services indicate that there are serious shortcomings that need to be seriously addressed if effectiveness and efficiency in transformational change implementation is to be attained. This is based on the fact that some of the negative emotional reactions to the DCS transformational change have been brought about by the adoption of the non-inclusive approach. Unfortunately, the neglect of the all-inclusive approach has strained the relations between management at strategic and implementation levels and general employees who are seen as both change implementers and change recipients, thereby impacting negatively on the identity of the Department of Correctional Services. Therefore, there is an urgent need for the Department to re-oil its transformational change management wheels through ensuring that all the gaps identified in their transformational change management process are urgently and adequately addressed. This is necessary in order to ensure that the Department of Correctional Services' transformational change agenda is taken by all to its logical conclusion in line with the change management methodology highlighted herein.

References

1. Agboola, A.A. & Salawu, R.O. (2011). Managing deviant behaviour and resistance to change. *International Journal of Business and Management.* 6(1), 235-242.
2. Aiken, C. & Keller, S. (2009). The irrational side of change management. *Organization Practice.* Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 24 April 2012.
3. Alvesson, M. & Svenningsson, S. (2008). *Forundringnarbete I organisationer, Libes.* Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 16 July 2011.
4. Armenakis, A. & Harris, S. (2009). Reflections: Our journey in organizational change research and practice. *Journal of Change Management*, 9 (2), 127-142.
5. Balogun, J. & Hope Hailey, V. (2004). Exploring strategic change. 2nd ed. London: Prentice Hall.
6. Bareil, C., Savoie, A., & Meunier, S. (2007). Patterns of discomfort with organisational change. *Journal of Change Management,* 7(1), 13.

7. Bellou, V. (2007). "Identifying employees' perceptions on organizational obligations: A comparison between the Greek public and private sector", *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 20(7), 608 – 621.

8. Bhengu Baloyi, L.N. (2012). *Change beyond form*. Durban: The African Midwife Institute.

9. Boonstra, J. Organizational and Transformational Change.

10. Bregman, P. (2009). *How to counter resistance to change*. Harvard Business Press. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 08 August 2012.

11. Brinier, R.B. & Kiefer, T. (2005). Research into the Experience of Emotion at Work: Definitely Older, But are we any Wiser? In N.M. Ashkanasy, C. Hartel, & W. Zerbe (Eds.), *The effect of Affect in Organizational Settings - Research on Emotion in Organizations,* Vol. 1, Oxford, UK: Elsevier/JAI Press.

12. Burnes, B. (2004). *Managing change: A strategic approach to organisational dynamics.* 4th ed. Harlow: Prentice Hall.

13. Carr, D.K., Hand, H.J. & Trahant, W.J. (2006). *Managing the change process: A field book for change consultants, team leaders and reengineering managers.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

14. Choi, M., & Ruona, W. (2011). Individual readiness for organizational change and its implications for human resource and organization development. *Human Resource Development Review,* 10 (1): 46-73.

15. Coetzee, C.J.H. & Stanz, K.J. (2007). "Barriers-to-change" in a governmental service delivery type organisation. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 33 (2), 76-82.

16. Dahl, M.S. (2010). *Organizational change and employee stress*. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com. on 06 July 2010.

17. Decker, D., Wheeler, G.E., Johnson, J., & Parsons, R.J. (2001). Effect of organisational change on the individual employee. *The Health Care Manager,* 19(4), 1.

18. Devos, G., Beulens, M., & Bouckenooghe, D. (2007). "Contribution of Content, and Process to Understanding Openness to Organisational Change: Two Experimental Simulation Studies", The Journal of Social Psychology, 147 (6), 607-629.

19. Evans, J. (2012). Leading strategic Transformation: The three "I"s / "Eyes" of change. *Method Frameworks*. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 25 June 2012.

20. Ferres, N., Connell, J. & Travaglione, A. (2005). The effect of future redeployment on organizational trust. *Strategic Change*, 14(2), 77-91.

21. Flash, G. (2007). *Organization change and its impact. Managing organization change. Satisfying motivational needs and achieve meaningful work.* Retrieved from: http://www.diypc.wordpress.com on 09 February 2011.

22. Gilmore, A. (2009). *Managing change more effectively*. 27/10/2009. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 23 April 2011.

23. Haffar, M., Al-Karaghouli, W. & Ghoneim, A. (2014). An empirical investigation of the influence of organizational culture on individual readiness for change in Syrian manufacturing organizations. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 27 (1), pp. 5-22.

24. Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R.L. & Black, W. C. (2003). *Multivariate Data Analysis* (5th ed.), India: Pearson Education.

25. Hair, J.F., Anderson, R.E., Tatham, R.L. & Black, W.C. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis.* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

26. Herold, D.M. & Fedor, D.B. (2008). *Change the way you lead change: Leadership strategies that really work.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

27. Imberman, M.D. (2009). Organizational change and organizational justice: Assessing the impact on organizational commitment, change-oriented organizational citizenship behaviour, and attitude toward future change. PhD Dissertation. *ProQuest Dissertations and Theses,* 2011/09/08, Alliant International University, Los Angeles, California.

28. Ingersoll, G.L., Kirsch, J.C. & Lightfoot, J. (2000). Relationship of organizational culture and readiness for change to employee commitment to the organization. J Nurs Adm. 30 (1), 11-30.

29. Johnston, G. (2008). *Change management – Solutions to the high failure rate. Change scares people.* Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 09 May 2012.

30. Joiner, B. (2001). *Fourth generation management*. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 30 May 2010.

31. Jones, J., Aguirre, D. & Calderone, M. (2013). 10 *Principles of Change Management Tools and techniques to help companies transform quickly*. Booz and Company Inc.

32. Kaiser, H.F. (1970). A second generation Little Jiffy. Psychometrika, 35, 401-415.

33. Kandt, R.K. (2002) *Organizational Change Management Principles and Practices*. Pasadena, CA: Jet Propulsion Laboratory.

34. Kanter, M.R. (2005). Organisational change: Understanding the pattern and the dynamics. *Management Today,* 21(5), 14-15.

35. Kerlinger, F. (1992). *Foundations of behavioural research*. Florida: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.

36. Kohurt, A.M. (2010). *Significant workplace change: Perspectives of survivors.* D.Ed Dissertation. Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, Illinois.

37. Lawson, E. (2003). The psychology of change management. *McKinsey Quarterly,* 2, 1-8.

38. Lawson, E. (2010). The psychology of change management: A review. *The McKinsey Quarterly*. London: McKinsey Company.

39. Lefkoe, M. (2010). *What is the relationship between personal and organizational transformation*? Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 23 July 2009.

40. Lew, C. & Eekhout, N. (2004). Managing change from the inside out. *Management Today*, March, 20(2), 30-31.

41. Liu, Y. (2010). *When change leadership impacts commitment to change and when it does n't. A multi-dimensional investigation.* PhD Dissertation. Georgia Institute of Technology.

42. Lorenzi, N.M. & Riley, R.T. (2000). Managing change: An overview. *American Medical Informatics Association*, 7 (2), 116-124.

43. Lotich, P. (2011). *Why do organizational change efforts often fail*? Thriving Small Business. Retrieved from http://www.project-management-

com.info/douglas-mcgregor-human-side-of-enterprise/ on 23 September 2011.

44. Maltz, M. (2008). *Managing resistance to change.* TRIAD Consulting Group LLC. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 10 October 2011.

45. Martins, L. (2008). Organisational development and change. Manuscript prepared for S. Zedeck (ed). *APA Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol III.

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

47. Mourier, P. & Smith, M. (2001). *Conquering organisational change: How to succeed where most companies fail*. Atlanta: CEP Press.

48. Nickols, F. (2010). Four change management strategies. *Distance Consulting LLC*. 11/05/2010.

49. Panao, A. (2010). Mastering the deadly art of change. *The Japan HR Society.* Retrieved from: http://www.japanic.com/japan-inc-blog on 16 June 2012.

50. Paton, R.A. & McCalman, J. (2008). *Change management: A guide to effective implementation*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles: SAGE Publications.

51. Pettigrew, A. & Whipp, R. (1991). *Managing change for competitive success.* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

52. Pierce, J.L., Gardner, D.G. & Dunham, R.B. (2002). Managing organizational change and development. *Management and Organizational Behaviour: An Integrated Perspective*. Chapter 18, pp. 627-654: South-Western College Publishing.

53. Plant, R. (1987). *Managing change and making it stick.* Aldershot: Gower Publishing Co.

54. Rodda, J. (2007). A multilevel examination of employee reactions to organizational change. *PhD Dissertation*. DePaul University, Chicago.

55. Scandura, T.A. (2011). "Leadership and organizational change". *Management Faculty Articles and Papers. Paper 12*. Retrieved from: http://scholarlyrepository. miami.ed/management_articles on 23 June 2011.

56. Schabracq, M.K., Winnubst, J.A.M., & Cooper, C.L. (2003). *Handbook of health psychology*. Baffis Lane: John Wiley & Sons, 127-146.

57. Schein, E.A. (1992). *Organisational culture and leadership.* 2nd ed. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

58. Schneider, B. & Rentsch, J. (1998). "Managing climate and cultures: A future perspectives" in Futures of organizations, J. Hage, ed. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 181-200.

59. Sergiovanni, T.J. (1994). *Building community in schools.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

60. Sloyan, R.M. (2009). Trust, sensemaking and individual responses to organizational change. *Doctoral Dissertation*. Benedictine University.

61. Smith, J.W. (2009). The human side of change: Towards a pragmatic, evolutionary conception of cognition and emotion in organizational change. *PhD Dissertation*. Virginia Commonwealth University.

62. Social Media Directory. (2011). *Managing change in the public sector*. London. Dated 29 March 2011.

63. Tabachnick, B. & Fidell, L. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*. (5th ed). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

64. Tanner, R. (2010). Ornaizational change management: Four truths leaders should know about organizational change. *Business Consulting Solutions LLC*. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 23 August 2012.

65. Tanner, R. (2011). *Leading change (step 7) – Consolidate gains and implement more change*. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 23 August 2012.

66. Tichy, N. & Devanna, M. (1990). Creating the competitive organisation of the 21st Century: the boundaryless corporation. *Human Resource Management* 29(4), 455-471.

67. Todnem, R. (2007). Ready or not … *Journal of Change Management,* 7(1), 3-11.

68. Turner, D. (2011). *The paradox of change management.* Turner Change Management Inc. Dated 30 July 2011. Retrieved from: http://www.google.com on 16 July 2011.

69. Turner, D-M., Hallencreutz, J. & Haley, H. (2009). Leveraging the value of an organizational change management methodology. 9th International Conference on Knowledge, Culture and Change in Boston. *The International Journal of Knowledge, Culture and Change Management*, 9 (9), 1-34.

70. Van Tonder, C.L. (2004a). *Organisational change: Theory and practice*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.

71. Van Tonder, C.L. (2004b). Organisational Development – Purposefully engaging change, Part I. Management Today, 20(10)/Yearbook 2005, 51-53, 57.

72. Van Tonder, C.L. (2004c). The march of time and the "evolution" of change. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 30 (3), 41-52.

73. Van Tonder, C.L. (2006). Change risk and ignorance: Attempting to cross chasms in small steps. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 4 (3), 1-11.

74. Wharton Executive Education. (2011). Harnessing fire: Managing emotions for successful organizational change. Wharton@work. *E-Newsletter for the Aresty Institute of Executive Education*.

75. Weeks, W.A., Roberts, J., Chonko, L.B. & Jones, I.E. (2004). Organizational readiness for change, individual fear of change, and sales manager performance: An empirical investigation. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management,* XXIV (1), 7-17.

76. Worrall, L. & Cooper, C.L. (2004). Managers, hierarchies and attitudes: A study of UK managers. *Journal of Management Psychology*, 19 (1), 41-68.

77. Zolno, S. (2010). *Personal change management.* Retrieved from: http://www.proactiona(2010) sociates.com on 28 June 2012