Reflection on Work-related Tasks and their Influence on Change-Supportive Behaviour through Organisational Change

David Buddin-Pralow (s2082063)

Faculty of Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences (BMS)

Department of Human Resource Development (HRD/OWK)

University of Twente

PSY-B-18: Bachelor Thesis

Dr Mireille D. Hubers

June 30th, 2021

Abstract

In a fast-changing world, an organisation needs to identify factors that facilitate an employee's change-supportive behaviour. By finding facilitated factors it is more likely that employees engage in a planned or ongoing organisational change. Changing-supportive behaviour is the voluntary involvement of employees beyond their normal working routine. This is divided into three categories: Compliance with change, Cooperation with change, and Championing with change. One identified facilitated factor is reflection within the different dimensions of reflection on work tasks, context, and work task performance. Reflection in an organisational frame means that employees are able to think critically about different aspects of their work. Therefore, this study aimed to investigate if reflection has a direct influence on changing supportive behaviour. In addition, it was checked whether age moderates this relationship. In total, 33 employees from different Dutch companies participated in this study, by answering an online questionnaire. The conducted MANOVA indicated a significant prediction of championing with change by reflection on work task performance with F (5.81), and $p = .023$. Furthermore, there was a significant finding within the moderation effect of age on reflection on work tasks and championing with change, F (6.38), and $p = .017$. Additionally, the results showed a significant moderation effect of age on reflection on work task performance and compliance with change with F (4.37), and $p = .045$. Finally, there were significant correlation findings within the dimensions of reflection and within the change- supportive behaviour dimensions. With these findings, future organisations can clearly identify factors that could increase employees' engagement for future improvements. In addition, by engaging more employees, the likelihood of successfully implementing a change will increase. Recommendations for future research on this topic include using interviews and a focus group design, to give the researcher a better picture of what the participants determine their answer to be.

Contents

Reflection on Work-related Tasks and their Influence on Change-Supportive Behaviour
through Organisational Change

As we live in an ever-changing, fast-paced world, everybody is facing changes in their lives. The named characteristics do not only affect individual persons, but also the economy as a whole. Therefore, organisations need to focus on being faster, more valuable and unique, especially in the industrial sector (Autio, Mudambi & Yoo, 2020). These various challenges lead to a company's need to stay competitive and to survive in the fast-changing world. Thus, to remain competitive, organisations need to go through a change in their processing.

There is no widely used definition of organisational change (Ladrech, 2012), however, Rhydderch, Elwin, Marshall and Grol (2004) defined an organisational change in their article as a process to improve quality. Thus, by approaching change, an organisation needs to undergo steps that will increase their quality proactively. Quality improvement through organisational development, means that teams or individuals focus on upcoming obstacles that will occur in line with the company's transformation (Rhydderch et al., 2004). These transformations can occur in different aspects of an organisation, for example, tasks, assignments, technologies, or capital (human or financial) (Rhydderch et al., 2004). As an organisational change mainly involves human capital, namely employees, they must consequently be the actors that will implement these changes (Rhydderch et al., 2004). In addition, Yang, Choi and Lee (2018) mentioned that organisational changes in the past focused mainly on the macro level. This focus means that companies did not consider factors that belonged to the micro-level, for instance, the dynamics of an employee's behaviour towards an ongoing or planned change. Therefore, it is vital to improve the companies' quality through the involvement of employees and considering factors that belong to the macro and micro level.

To implement an organisational change successfully, it is important to consider factors that could facilitate an employee's involvement (Ning & Jing, 2012). It is necessary because many changes have failed in the past due to the undervaluing of an employee's important role during the change process (Brockner, Flynn, Dolan, Ostfield, Pace & Ziskin, 2006). They have since stated that by considering facilitated factors, the overall commitment of employees towards organisational change would increase. One aspect which shows the commitment of employees towards an organisational change has been mentioned by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) defining it as change-supportive behaviour. They characterise it as an employee's voluntary involvement in an ongoing or planned organisational change. Besides the given

definition, Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) have been able to distinguish between three change-supportive behaviours: compliance, cooperation, and championing with organisational change.

To better understand why employees behave supportively towards change, it is vital to identify factors that influence this behaviour. One factor could be self-reflection. Self-reflection is a part of self-development that influences an employee's behaviour (Nesbit, 2007). In addition Messman & Mulder (2015) indicated that reflection influences work innovative behaviour. Therefore, the assumption arises that self-reflection may also influence change-supportive behaviour. Høyrup defined self-reflection in an organisational context in general as the "immediate presentation of details of a task or problem" (2004, p. 444). Furthermore, he indicated that critical self-reflection focuses on the contextual aspects, such as social, cultural, or political and related them to current tasks or problems, for instance, the outbreak of COVID-19. For this reason, reflection is an integral part of the process of organisational change.

Additionally, reflection refers to the ability on how one can reflect on different events, situations, or experiences in one's life (Høyrup, 2004). It gives a clear and detailed understanding, resulting in a specific mindset, behaviour, or action (Ploderer, Reitberger, Oinas-Kukkonen & van Germert-Pijnen, 2014). Therefore, an individual's ability to reflect is highly relevant for organisational change. It allows the individual to identify necessary adjustments, improvements, or occurring problems that need to be solved (Messmann & Mulder, 2015). Associated with this line of reasoning, Messmann and Mulder (2015) indicated three dimensions of work-related reflections, which are necessary to consider when evaluating an individual's ability to reflect on an organisational context. These three dimensions are reflection on the work tasks, reflection on the work contexts, and a reflection on the work performance. To conclude, reflection could be a part of an organisational change and it is therefore an essential aspect to consider.

Besides the ability to reflect and change upon supportive behaviour, this study expects that the employees' age will also play a role in an organisational change. As society grows older, age becomes more critical (Feldmann & Ng, 2008). Therefore, it is vital to look at the age alongside the increasing age of society, the average age of employees increases. As employees get older, they realise that their present abilities and conducted behaviours do not meet the required changes (Niessen, Swarowsky & Leiz, 2010). The authors mentioned that it is more likely that older employees do not support the change or behave against the planned

change. In addition, older individuals need more time to gain new knowledge and alter his/her behaviour to the new circumstances (Niessen, Swarowsky & Leiz, 2010). Therefore, age needs to be considered as a factor that influences change-supportive behaviour.

Considering the points previously mentioned, this study will determine whether the ability to reflect influences change-supportive behaviour. It will also investigate whether reflection affects all three change-supportive behaviours (compliance, cooperation, and championing) equally. Finally, this study investigates whether age moderates the relationship between reflection and change-supportive behaviour. The resulting knowledge could help companies increase their chances to implement a change successfully. They could use the findings of this study to identify factors that facilitate a change. Besides the practical relevance, this thesis provides scientific value by investigating how age moderates the relationship between reflection and change-supportive behaviour. The findings might help future researchers to understand organisational change better on a micro-level which would help implement an organisational change more successfully as mentioned by Yang et al, (2018). Therefore, to better understand the prospective connections between the different factors, namely, change-supportive behaviour, age and reflection, it is necessary to understand the theoretical framework.

Theoretical Framework

The following part contains a more detailed explanation about the different concepts' reflection on work-related tasks, change-supportive behaviour, and age. Additionally, it will elaborate on the different relationships between the concepts and finish with the two main research questions this thesis focus on.

Concept of Critical Reflection

There are three types of work-related reflection. The first type reflects on work tasks that contain the analytical investigation of any factor related to work tasks (Messmann & Mulder, 2015). It includes the connection between the assignment and the environment in which it appears. Furthermore, it considers the investigational approach to successfully distinguishing between different processes and actions to finish the given work task successfully. The second type is reflection on the context. It involves investigating the synergy between the employees' behaviour and their social and cultural work environment (Messmann & Mulder, 2015). Reflection on context identifies problems in work-related communication, project-related realisation, and acknowledges the patterns and benefits of the social work environment (Messmann & Mulder, 2015). Finally, reflection on task

performance focuses mainly on the current outcome of work assignments and includes investigating the connection between actions and their results. Reflection on task performance is also about identifying causes for errors and accomplishments, which are necessary to improve one's performance and behaviour (Messmann & Mulder, 2015). These three different types of reflections are essential because reflection on work behaviour influences an organisation's development positively (van Woerkom, 2004).

Change-Supportive Behaviour

To better understand how an employee could behave to support a change, Herscovitch and Meyer (2012) distinguished between three different types of change-supportive behaviours. The first change in supportive behaviour is compliance with change itself. Compliance with change was defined as minimal encouragement towards a scheduled or ongoing organisational change (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2012). A type of behaviour for compliance with change could be, for example, conducting only the minimal requirements to implement the change. Secondly, cooperation with change implies the striving to endeavour one's competences to establish the change's success rate. An example would be that an employee visits advanced vocational training to improve their competencies to support the ongoing change. Finally, championing with change is defined as assistance on the highest level to ensure that the change will indeed succeed. Also, employees motivate others to participate (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2012). For instance, an employee works extra hours to make everything possible to succeed in the change, in addition, they also encourage change during meetings or during working hours towards other colleagues, to attract them to comply with the change or to even support it. Differentiating between these three behaviours allows companies to identify employees whose encouragement is above the minimum.

The Underlying Relationship Between Reflection and Change-Supportive Behaviour

After explaining the concept of critical reflection and change-supportive behaviour, it is necessary to take a deeper look into their relationship. Van Woerkom (2004) stated that reflecting on work behaviour enables individuals to deepen their skills and abilities. By doing so, they have the opportunity to connect their organisational environment to their individual improvement. For example, the employees who realise that their personal goals enhance specific abilities are directly related to the new or old work environment. It gives employees the chance to improve their critical thinking and organisational change involvement. Critical thinking and realising the connection between work environment and personal improvement influence an employee's final decision, even if they are going with or against a change (Messmann & Mulder, 2015). On the other hand, if an employee realises that there is no

improvement within the new organisational environment, which occurs through organisational change, the chance that he/she behaves less supportive towards a change will increase. On another note, an employee who realises that there is a connection between personal development and the new work environment, will behave more supportively (Messmann & Mulder, 2015).

Furthermore, Messmann and Mulder (2015) indicated that there are different types of reflection when working together as facilitators to overcome unforeseen occurring obstacles, which could appear during an organisational change. In addition, they stated in particular that employees who reflect on work tasks and task performance are more motivated to work in unexpected situations. To conclude, the ability to reflect influences individual and organisational development. Additionally, Herscovitch and Meyer (2012) indicated that the change in supportive behaviour positively correlates with organisational change. Thus, to investigate whether reflection influences change-supportive behaviour, the following first research question is formulated:

R1. *"To what extent does critical reflection on work tasks, social context and work performance influence change-supportive behaviour, namely compliance, cooperation and championing?"*

Age as a Moderator in Reflection on Work Tasks, Social Contexts and Work Performance

This study assumes that age also plays a role for the relationship between reflection on work-related tasks and changing supportive behaviour. Kirk (2015) stated a negative correlation moderation between increased age and the ability to reflect. Kirk (2015) indicated a reason that with increasing age, people's insight will also increase, and this leads to a decrease in self-reflection. This means, in detail, that people who are getting older are more aware of their abilities, strengths and weaknesses. Therefore the need to reflect on their own behaviour decreases as they have a good insight (Kirk, 2015). In addition, Heim and Sardar-Drenda (2020) mentioned that employees with increased age are less willing to support organisational change. They stated three further reasons as to why older people are more resistant towards change. Firstly, employees who worked for an organisation for a longer time period have faced several changes throughout their work life and are aware of the pros and cons that come from the change management (Heim & Serdar-Drenda, 2020). Secondly, elderly workers prefer work convenience and job satisfaction (Heim & Serdar-Drenda, 2020). Thirdly, employees, especially above 55, are concerned about their unemployment (Heim & Serdar-Drenda, 2020). Based on aspects mentioned from Kirk, Heim

and Sardar-Drenda, the following assumption arises that increased age could also negatively moderate reflection on work-related tasks and influence change-supportive behaviour. To investigate this assumption, the following question has been formulated:

R2. *"To what extent does age moderate the relationship between critical reflection on work-related tasks, social context and work performance and its influence on change-supportive behaviour, namely compliance, cooperation and championing?"*

Methods

Participants/Design

For this quantitative study, 33 participants who faced a certain organisational change filled in an online questionnaire. To avoid a confounding variable through culture differences, the focus was on Dutch employees and, therefore, exclusively on companies in the Netherlands. The participants' age varied between 20 and 56 (M = 37.9, SD = 12.2). Additionally, the gender of the participants was almost equally divided, with 18 being female and 16 being male. Furthermore, on average, the participants had an educational level of a HBO, the lowest, a bachelor's degree or the highest degree of a PhD. Finally, most of the participants, with a share of 18.8%, worked in the educational sector. Participants worked also in the communication and information, retail trade, energy and transport and storage sector.

For the data analysis several variables were defined. The three dimensions of change-supportive behaviour namely: compliance with change, cooperation with change and championing with change were determined separately as dependent variables. Reflection on work tasks, reflection on context and reflection on work performance were designated as independent variables. Finally, age was assigned as a moderator.

Materials

To measure these various factors, an online questionnaire was performed on the platform Qualtrics. A principal axis factoring analysis with an oblique rotation was conducted to test whether the subscales of reflection and change-supportive behaviour, measured as intended. The results of the factor analysis cannot be presented due to the confidentiality of the instrument. In total, it was found that eight underlying factors had an eigenvalue above 1. In addition, these eight factors explained a total variance of 78.92% of the two subscales. These findings were unexpected as the chosen scales were based on literature, initially to measure six factors. Taking a deeper look into the extraction sums of square loadings, it became clear that factors seven and eight were below 1. Extracting these factors lead to an explained variance of 70.44%, which was still high enough to work with (Hair, Black, Babin,

& Anderson, 2019). For this reason, the decision was made to continue with those six factors.

The whole survey consisted of 49 questions and was divided into six different parts, which measured various aspects of the study. This thesis has focused only on three parts of the survey which contained 32 questions in total. The first part consisted of different demographic questions to analyse background characteristics. These are gender, age, years of work experience, educational degree, and work sector.

There was a section about work-related reflection which contained 18 questions about different constructs of self-reflection and was developed by Messmann and Mulder (2015). Each construct contained six questions and included a 5-point scale ranging from *never* (1) to *often* (5). The first construct measured reflection on work tasks, a sample item was "Which past experiences could be of some use for a current work task?" with Cronbach's alpha = .78. Reflection on work context was the next construct with sample items like "Which circumstances allow me to successfully accomplish a work task?" with a Cronbach's alpha =.80. Finally, the constructive reflection on work task performance entailed items like "To what extent do I have the knowledge and skills required for different work tasks?" with Cronbach's alpha = .82.

The final part consisted of nine questions to measure the different dimensions of Change-supportive behaviour. To measure this behaviour, items developed by Yang et al., (2018) were used with a statement on a 5-mark Likert Scale from *totally disagree* (1) to *totally agree* (5). The first construct was intended to measure compliance with change, contained items like "This person has adjusted the way he/she does his/her job as required by this change." with Cronbach's alpha = .76. Furthermore, the second part measured cooperation with change, and it entailed items like "I tried to remain optimistic about the change, even in the face of adversity." with Cronbach's alpha = .72. To measure the final construct championing change, items like "This person has encouraged the participation of others in the change." were used with Cronbach's alpha = .75.

Procedure

The researchers approached companies via e-mail and placed advertisements on different platforms such as LinkedIn, Instagram, and Facebook, including the link to the questionnaire and a short explanation about the study, asking for participation. A few participants were acquired by the researchers individually.

Before the participants approached the questionnaire, the following link was received, they had to first read through the informed consent and agree to participate voluntarily. The informed consent informed the attendee about the confidentiality of the collected data and the

purpose of the study. After the participant signed the informed consent, they proceeded with the questionnaire. When the participant finished the entire questionnaire by answering all of the questions, the data was saved on the platform, Qualtrics.

Data Analysis

To answer the first research question: "To what extent does critical reflection on work tasks, social context and work performance influence change-supportive behaviour, namely compliance, cooperation and championing?", second research question "To what extent does age moderate the relationship between critical reflection on work-related tasks, social context and work performance and its influence on change-supportive behaviour, namely compliance, cooperation and championing?" The researcher conducted a multivariate linear regression analysis.

Results

Firstly, the descriptive statistics are presented. The subsequent part contains the results regarding the first research question whether reflection influences change-supportive behaviour. The final part includes the findings to answer the second research question which was investigated to see if age moderates the relationship between reflection and change-supportive behaviour.

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics of the studied variables are presented in Table 1. The mean for each reflection scale is displayed and indicated that the employees' average tends to reflect on these three dimensions (reflection on work tasks, reflection on work task performance, and reflection on context). Looking at the individual numbers it became clear that the average number of participants reflected on their work tasks followed by reflection on work task performance and reflection on context. In addition, the average of the change-supportive behaviour results indicated that the majority of the participants tend to agree to and behave supportive towards a change. Inspection upon the individual numbers showed that the average indicated a cooperative supportive behaviour towards an organisational change, followed by compliance with change and championing with change.

The correlation matrix (Table 1) displayed no significant correlation between any reflection dimension or the change-supportive behaviour dimension. There is a significant positive correlation between all three reflection dimensions. This correlation showed that if a person engages in one type of reflection, the were also likely to engage in another kind of

reflection. Moreover, there was a significant positive correlation between all three constructs of change-supportive behaviour. This finding means that an employee who champions the change was also likely to participate in other change-supportive behaviours. Finally, there was a significant negative correlation between age and compliance with change. This result indicated that an employee's involvement in compliance with change decreases with an increase in age.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations for Study Variables

	N	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Age	33	37.9	12.2	-						
2. Reflection on Work Tasks	33	3.67	0.80	-.23	-					
3. Reflection on Context	33	3.19	0.90	.04	.49*	-				
4. Reflection on Work Task Performance	33	3.47	0.91	-.20	.51*	.63*	-			
5. Compliance with Change	33	4.04	0.79	-.40*	.11	-.06	-.15	-		
6. Cooperation with Change	33	4.18	0.62	-.08	.26	.02	-.10	.66*	-	
7. Championing with Change	33	3.94	0.84	.28	.13	-.10	-.31	.12	.67*	-

*$p < 0.05$

The Influence of Reflection on Change-Supportive Behaviour

To determine to what extent does reflection influence change-supportive behaviour, a multivariate analysis of variance was conducted. The results (Table 2) illustrated that the overall model was significant, and that reflection predicts change-supportive behaviour, Wilks Lambda = .20, F (3,29), and $p < .001$. Inspection of the individual parameters indicated that reflection on work task performance negatively predicted championing with change, with F (5.81), and $p = .023$. This significant finding means that, on average, people who reflect on their work task performance were less likely to engage in championing change-supportive behaviour.

Table 2

Summary of Multivariate Analysis of Subscales of Reflection on Change-Supportive Behaviour

Predictor	Dependent variables	b	t-Value	F	p
Reflection on Work Tasks	Compliance with Change	.25	1.19	1.42	.243
	Cooperation with Change	.31	1.94	3.76	.062
	Championing with Change	.39	1.88	3.55	.070
Reflection on Context	Compliance with Change	-.02	-.09	.01	.930
	Cooperation with Change	.01	.09	.01	.930
	Championing with Change	.05	.24	.06	.812
Reflection on Work Task Performance	Compliance with Change	-.24	-1.13	1.27	.268
	Cooperation with Change	-.22	-1.38	1.90	.178
	Championing with Change	-.49	-2.41	5.81	.023*

*p < 0.05

The Moderation of Age on the Relationship Between Reflection and Change-Supportive Behaviour

A multivariate linear regression analysis was conducted to determine if age moderates the relationship between reflection and change-supportive behaviour. The results illustrated that the overall model was significant, Wilks Lambda = .12, F (6,26), and p < .001. Inspection of the individual parameters indicated that age significantly moderated the relationship between reflection on work tasks and championing with change with F (6.38), and p = .017. This means that, on average, younger employees who engage in reflection on work tasks are more likely to champion a change. Moreover, individual parameters indicated that age significantly moderated the relationship between reflection on work task performance and compliance with change with F (4.37), and p = .045. This shows that, on average younger participants who reflected on their work task performance are less likely to engage in compliance with change. In conclusion, the results indicated that age moderates the prediction of reflection towards change-supportive behaviour.

Table 3

Summary of Multivariate Analysis of the Moderator Effect of Age on the Relationship of Reflection on Change-Supportive Behaviour

Predictor	Dependent variables	b	t-Value	F	p
Reflection on Work Tasks	Compliance with Change	.19	.33	.11	.742
	Cooperation with Change	.73	1.58	2.49	.126
	Championing with Change	.35	.64	.41	.525
Reflection on Context	Compliance with Change	-.44	-.63	.39	.537
	Cooperation with Change	.18	.31	.10	.756
	Championing with Change	1.02	1.51	2.28	.143
Reflection on Work Task Performance	Compliance with Change	.44	.78	.61	.441
	Cooperation with Change	-.82	-1.78	3.16	.087
	Championing with Change	-1.52	-2.81	7.89	.009*
Age	Compliance with Change	-.03	-1.70	2.89	.100
	Cooperation with Change	-.01	-.67	.45	.506
	Championing with Change	.02	.98	.97	.333
Reflection on Work Tasks * Age	Compliance with Change	-.00	-.06	.14	.715
	Cooperation with Change	-.01	-.98	1.17	.289
	Championing with Change	.35	.23	6.38	.017*
Reflection on Context * Age	Compliance with Change	.02	.86	.39	.533
	Cooperation with Change	-.01	-.29	.04	.839
	Championing with Change	-.03	-1.69	.35	.557
Reflection on Work Task Performance * Age	Compliance with Change	-.02	-1.46	4.37	.045*
	Cooperation with Change	.02	1.32	.73	.400
	Championing with Change	.03	2.19	1.21	.280

*$p < 0.05$

Discussion

The overall goal of this study was to investigate whether reflection on work tasks, context, and work task performance predict compliance, cooperation or championing supportive behaviour with change. Additionally, age and its moderation effect on the relationship between reflection and change-supportive behaviour was tested.

Reflection as a Predictor of Change-Supportive Behaviour

The initial research questions were aimed to check whether the direct influence of the

three reflection dimensions on the three change-supportive behaviour dimensions. Findings indicated that only the dimension reflection on work task performance predicted a change-supportive behaviour, namely championing supportive behaviour. All other relationships between the different dimensions of reflection and change-supportive behaviour showed non-significant results. Due to the negative prediction of reflection on work task performance on championing a change, it indicated that employees who reflect on their work task performance are less likely to engage in championing behaviour.

These results are supported by the current literature. In her article, Van Woerkom (2004) mentioned that critical self-reflection leads to a positive effect on the organisation and the employee themselves. She further discussed that critical reflection leads to a change in routine work practices and enables them to change an organisation from a traditional one to a more modern innovative company. Furthermore, Messmann and Mulder (2015) stated that reflective behaviour on current work routines enables employees to stay on track longer if something new or obstacle like appears. Meanwhile, the current found no other significant relationship between either reflection on work tasks nor on reflection on context and their prediction of one of the three dimensions of change-supportive behaviour. These results were unexpected because after reviewing the literature, the assumption arose that reflection is part of an individual's development, (Messmann & Mulder, 2015) this would increase the overall commitment towards an organisational change. In addition, Sackmann, Eggenhofer-Rehart and Friesl (2009) indicated that critical self-reflection is an important prerequisite to implement a change successfully. They argued that, with the ability to reflect, employees were able to consider the different aspects of an organisational change that were necessary to enforce on an organisational change.

These contractionary findings were aligned amongst another study conducted by van Woerkom, Nijhof and Nieuwenhuis (2002). They stated in their article that besides reflection itself, other factors like asking for feedback, vision sharing, challenging group thinking experimentation and awareness of employability influence the reflection on work behaviour. In addition, they indicated that people need a lot of courage and discipline to be reflective and to implement this into an organisational change against pressure from others (van Woerkom, Nijhof & Nieuwenhuis, 2002), like work colleagues or supervisors. These circumstances lead to less encouragement from employees to engage in an organisational change.

Despite other factors which could influence change-supportive behaviour, the atmosphere of a workplace is important so that reflection can occur. (Lee, Yoo, Lee, Park & Yoon, 2019). Lee et al (2019) mentioned that an error-avoidance environment at work could

hinder employees to reflect on their work tasks. Error-avoidance was explained as a climate in which employees try to avoid making errors during their work by avoiding experimentation or any violation of the working routine (Nikolova, Van Ruysseveldt, Van Dam & De Witte, 2016). Therefore the findings indicated that the employees and the researcher being approached were working under an error-avoidance atmosphere. This factor was not considered during this study. In conclusion, the above findings indicated that there were literature which supported findings of the current study and also literature which illustrated the contractionary of the findings in thesis.

Age as a Moderator on the Relationship Between Reflection and Change-Supportive Behaviour

The second research question were concerning the moderation effect of the relationship between reflection and change-supportive behaviour. The results showed that only age moderated the relationship between reflection on work tasks and championing with change and the relationship between reflection on work task performance and compliance with change. The results concerning the moderation of age on reflection on work tasks and its prediction of championing with change were supported by Cheetham and Graham's article (2000). They indicated that younger people reflect more on their professionalism when compared to elderly people. This is explained by the article from Kuijpers, Schyns, and Scheerens, (2006) which mentioned that younger employees indicated a higher self-reflection competency. In addition, his study indicated that especially younger employees scored high in self-reflection competence and conducting self-reflection (Kuijpers et al., 2006). Furthermore, they stated that these employees were more motivated for work experimentation and looking for new career options. Therefore, it can be concluded that younger employees are more motivated to encourage others to support a change and try to use the organisational change to develop new career opportunities.

Additionally, Heim and Sardar-Drenda (2020) stated that the willingness to adapt or to accept a change decreases with age. Further they indicated three arguments why older people are more resistant towards a change. The first thing to mention is that employees who worked for an organisation for a longer time period were already confronted with a lot of changes throughout their work experience. Therefore, they are familiar with the advantages and disadvantages of their supervisors change handling (Heim & Serdar-Drenda, 2020). Next, elderly workers appreciate work contentment and job satisfaction (Heim & Serdar-Drenda, 2020). Lastly, employees who are especially above 55, are feared of losing their job (Heim & Serdar-Drenda, 2020). As the dataset of this thesis contained quite a young average of

employees (M = 37.9), it can be concluded that younger employees who reflect on their work tasks are more likely to encourage other employees to support an ongoing or planned organisational change.

Unlike other research carried out in this area, this thesis found a negative moderation effect of age upon reflection on work task performance and compliance with change. This finding is not supported by the current literature as mentioned above. Current literature explains that younger employees are more willing to reflect and are more open to adapt to new circumstances (Kuijper et al., 2006; Heim & Serdar-Drenda, 2020). Therefore, this result should be treated with a considerable amount of caution.

Implications

The study's implications have contributed to the organisational change in practice and to the academic world theory about organisational change. These findings have indicated that supervisors need to encourage employees to reflect on their work task performance. In addition, by increasing the reflection skill, they increase the chance of engaging such employees in the future or ongoing changes. Subsequently, considering the moderation effect of age on reflection on work tasks and championing with change, the findings could help identify why an organisational change worked out in the past or which factors needed to be considered to implement an organisational change successfully.

In addition, due to the findings of this thesis indicating that there are strong positive correlations within the reflection dimensions and within the change supportive behaviour dimensions. This will help to make it clear for supervisors why it is essential to encourage employees to reflect on their work. Therefore, by encouraging employees to behave towards an organisational change, they are more likely to engage in one of the other three supportive behaviours with the same effort.

To sum up, these results have implicated that reflection and age plays a crucial role in the process of organisational change. In addition, human resource managers can use these findings to better plan future changes and increase the chance to implement it successfully. Finally, the academic world can build up on these results to look for additional factors which could influence an organisational change and an employee's engagement towards it.

Strengths and Limitations

One strength of this study was the combination of the strong construct used by Yang et al, (2018) which was the reflection on the construct to measure change supportive behaviour by Messmann and Mulder (2015). Within this methodological approach, the reliability was still high, but the factor analysis showed more underlying factors that explained the whole

variance of this study. This finding is in line with the following limitation, the small sample size. Costello and Osborne (2005) indicated in their article that a ratio of two participants per one item leads to a factor construction which is only 10% successful. With a dataset of 33 participants and a questionnaire which contained 27 questions the ratio has now been fulfilled. This proportion has led to the findings that the factor analysis measured eight instead of six factors. As a result, this quote has led to a misclassification of 1.93 items to the wrong factor (Costello & Osborne, 2005). This means that an item which was intended to measure reflection on work tasks was misclassified and now measures reflection on work performance.

Another limitation was the collecting of self-reported data. This data collection method is quite common for university studies (Gonyea, 2005). Gonyea mentioned that if self-reported data is collected, external data is necessary to validate the collected data. For example, through an interview. This thesis did not have any external data to validate the collected ones to, it underlined the limitation for this study. In addition, to measure behaviour, it is helpful to use direct observation, in particular focus groups (Gonyea, 2005). This approach would help understand what participants mean with their answers. In addition, it could clarify to the participant what the researcher wants to know about particular questions..

Recommendations

Further research should only focus on one company. This concept would benefit the study, as there would be an opportunity to conduct interviews and a focus group design. Gonyea (2005) indicated these instruments could help researchers make more concise statements about the results. In addition, it is more likely to reach more participants by approaching only one company due to personal contact between the researcher/researching team and the management level of the company. This approach would threaten the generalizability of the results but would give a good indication about the construct tested through this report. By reaching a ratio of 20 participants per questionnaire item, the correct factor structure would increase up to 70% (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Within this approach, the construct used in this report can be tested with a larger sample size. Based on these results, follow-up research could collect data from different companies as was tried within this research.

Besides the construct of self-reflection, reflection on a team level influences the success of an organisation in a changing environment (Schippers, Den Hartog & Koopman, 2007). Schippers et al. (2007) stated further that reflection on a team level distinguishes between three-time points when reflection occurs before, during, or after an event. Additionally, the depth of reflection needs to be taken into account by measuring team

reflection. Considering these additional factors on a team level, it would be interesting to investigate whether reflection on work tasks, work task performance and context on a team level influences change-supportive behaviour. With this knowledge, organisations could elaborate about their structure for the employees for future organisational changes in a new manner.

Despite the two given recommendations, the encouragement of self-reflection during an organisational change could be an area of interest. Phum, Sim, Dennis and Graeme (2012) indicated that training programmes and facilitation of personal development increase an organisation's effectiveness. Future human resource managers could make use of this new gained knowledge to facilitate an employee's reflection ability. In addition, it could be tested whether the facilitation of reflection`s ability influences employees change-supportive behaviour.

Concluding, with a better understanding of what encourages employees to participate in a change, the chances of implement an organisational change successfully would increase even more. Concurrently, involving the employees more in future processes would be an enhancing factor that employees' overall satisfaction would increase, which leads to a higher chance of implementing an organisational change more successfully (Norwood, 2018). All these recommendations taken together would help companies to plan organisational change better in the future.

References

Autio, E., Mudambi, R., & Yoo, Y. (2021). Digitalisation and globalisation in a turbulent world: Centrifugal and centripetal forces. *Global Strategy Journal*, (December), 3–16. https://doi.org/10.1002/gsj.1396

Brockner, J., Flynn, F. J., Dolan, R. J., Ostfield, A., Pace, D., & Ziskin, I. V. (2006). Commentary on "radical HRM innovation and competitive advantage: The Moneyball story." *Human Resource Management*, *45*(1), 127–145. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm

Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research and Evaluation*, *10*(7). https://doi.org/10.7275/jyj1-4868

Cheetham, G., & Chivers, G. (2000). A new look at competent professional practice. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, *24*(7), 374–383. https://doi.org/10.1108/03090590010349827

Elgohary, E., & Abdelazyz, R. (2020). The impact of employees' resistance to change on implementing e-government systems: An empirical study in Egypt. *Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, *86*(6), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1002/isd2.12139

Gonyea, R. M. (2005). Self-reported data in institutional research: Review and recommendations. *New Directions for Institutional Research*, *2005*(127), 73–89. https://doi.org/10.1002/ir.156

Gratton, L., & Ghoshal, S. (2003). Managing personal human capital: New ethos for the "volunteer" employee. *European Management Journal*, *21*(1), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0263-2373(02)00149-4

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis*. Cengage Learning EMEA.

Hatton, N., & Smith, D. (1995). Reflection in teacher education: Towards definition and implementation. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *11*(1), 33–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/0742-051X(94)00012-U

Heim, I., & Sardar-Drenda, N. (2020). Assessment of employees' attitudes toward ongoing organisational transformations. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *34*(2), 327–349. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-04-2019-0119

Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organisational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(3), 474–487. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.474

Hetzner, S., Heid, H., & Gruber, H. (2012). Change at work and professional learning: How readiness to change, self-determination and personal initiative affect individual learning through reflection. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, *27*(4), 539–555. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10212-011-0094-1

Høyrup, S. (2004). Reflection as a core process in organisational learning. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, *16*(8), 442–454. https://doi.org/10.1108/13665620410566414

Kirk, R. M. (2016). Age differences in identity processing styles and self-consciousness: A moderation analysis and examination of ageism. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences*, *76*(11-A(E)). Retrieved 2021, March 09, from https://etd.ohiolink.edu/apexprod/rws_olink/r/1501/10?clear=10&p10_accession_num=bgsu1428926536#abstract-files

Kuijpers, M. A. C. T., Schyns, B., & Scheerens, J. (2006). Career competencies for career success. *The Career Development Quarterly*, *55*(2), 168–178. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-0045.2006.tb00011.x

Kwahk, K. Y. (2006). ERP acceptance: Organisational change perspective. *Proceedings of the Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, *8*(C), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2006.159

Lee, J. Y., Yoo, S., Lee, Y., Park, S., & Yoon, S. W. (2019). Individual and Organisational Factors Affecting Knowledge Workers' Perceptions of the Effectiveness of Informal Learning: a Multilevel Analysis. *Vocations and Learning*, *12*(1), 155–177. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12186-019-09218-z

Marsick, V. J. (1988). Learning in the Workplace: The Case for Reflectivity and Critical Reflectivity. *Adult Education Quarterly*, *38*(4), 187–198. https://doi.org/10.1177/0001848188038004001

Messmann, G., & Mulder, R. H. (2015). Reflection as a facilitator of teachers' innovative work behaviour. *International Journal of Training and Development*, *19*(2), 125–137. https://doi.org/10.1111/ijtd.12052

Nikolova, I., Van Ruysseveldt, J., Van Dam, K., & De Witte, H. (2016). Learning climate and workplace learning: Does work restructuring make a difference?. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 15*(2), 66–75. https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000151

Nesbit, P. (2007). Self-awareness, self-reflection and self-regulation: an integrated model of managerial self-development. Retrieved 2021, June 24, https://www.anzam.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf-manager/1947_NESBITPAUL_144.PDF

Ng, T. W. H. & Feldman, D. C. (2008). The relationship of age to ten dimensions of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 93*(2), 392–423. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.93.2.392

Ning, J. and Jing, R. (2012). Commitment to change: its role in the relationship between expectation of change outcome and emotional exhaustion. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *23*(4), pp. 461-485. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21149

Niessen, C., Swarowsky, C., & Leiz, M. (2010). Age and adaptation to changes in the workplace. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *25*(4), 356–383. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683941011035287

Norwood, J. M. (2018). *Psychological Uncertainty, Stress, Frustration and their Relationship with Counterproductive Workplace Behavior*. Retrieved 2021, April 09, from https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations/5761

Phum Thol, Sim Chankiriroth, Dennis Barbian & Graeme Storer (2012). Learning for capacity development: a holistic approach to sustained organisational change. *Development in Practice, 22*(7), 909–920. https://10.1080/09614524.2012.696581

Ploderer, B., Reitberger, W., Oinas-Kukkonen, H. & van Germert-Pijnen, J. (2014). Social interaction and reflection for behaviour change. *Pers Ubiquit Comput, 18*, 1667–1676. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00779-014-0779-y

Rafferty, A. E., Allanah, E., & Griffin M. A. (2006). Perceptions of organisational change: A stress and coping perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91*(5). 1154–1162. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.91.5.1154

Reynolds, M. (1998). Reflection and Critical Reflection in Management Learning. *Management Learning*, *29*(2), 183–200. https://10.1177/1350507698292004

Rhydderch M, Elwyn G, Marshall M, Grol R (2004). Organisational change theory and the use of indicators in general practice. *Qual Saf Health Care*, 13(3), 213–7. https://doi.org/10.1136/qhc.13.3.213

Robert, L. (2012) Party Change and Europeanisation: Elements of an Integrated Approach. *West European Politics*, *35*(3), 574-588. https://doi.org/10.1080/01402382.2012.665741

Rosenbaum, David & Taksa, Lucy & More, Elizabeth. (2019). The Role of Reflection in Planned Organizational Change. Change Management: *An International Journal*. 18. 1–22. 10.18848/2327-798X/CGP/v18i02/1-22.

Sackmann, S. A., Eggenhofer-Rehart, P. M., & Friesl, M. (2009). Sustainable change: Long-term efforts toward developing a learning organisation. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 45*(4), 521–549. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886309346001

Schippers, M. C., Den Hartog, D. N., & Koopman, P. L. (2007). Reflexivity in teams: A measure and correlates. *Applied Psychology*, *56*(2), 189–211. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2006.00250.x

Van Woerkom, M., Nijhof, W. J., & Nieuwenhuis, L. F. M. (2002). Critical reflective working behaviour: a survey research. *Journal of European Industrial Training, 26*(8), 375–383. doi:10.1108/03090590210444955

Van Woerkom, M. (2004). The Concept of Critical Reflection and Its Implications for Human Resource Development. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *6*(2), 178–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/1523422304263328

Yang, Y., Choi, J. N., & Lee, K. (2018). Theory of planned behavior and different forms of organisational change behavior. *Social Behavior and Personality*, *46*(10), 1657–1671. https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.6832