UNIVERSITEIT
GENT

**FACULTEIT ECONOMIE
EN BEDRIJFSKUNDE**

WORKING PAPER

Gender Differences In Commitment To Change: Impacted By Gender?

Jana Deprez[1]

Herman Van den Broeck[2]

Eva Cools[3]

Dave Bouckenhoooghe[4]

February 2012

2012/775

[1] Jana Deprez, Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School
[2] Herman Van den Broeck, UGent
[3] Eva Cools, Vlerick Leuven Gent Management School
[4] Dave Bouckenooghe, Brock University
Corresponding author: Herman Van den Broeck, Ghent University, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Department of Management, Innovation and Entrepreneurship, Tweekerkenstraat 2, B- 9000 Ghent, Belgium, phone: +32 (0)9 264 34 96, e-mail: herman.vandenbroeck@ugent.be

Abstract

The successful implementation of change initiatives remains challenging, as a high number of change processes still fail due to 'human factor problems'. Following this challenge, our research aimed to investigate how individuals are differently affected by organizational change by looking at how gender has an impact on how employees perceive change process and context and feel commited towards a change initiative. With this inquiry, we hope to stimulate further understanding in the context of the contradictory results found in gender versus minority research respectively. Data were gathered with a survey in a Belgian automotive company (N = 77). Our research suggests that women in comparison to men generally experience more fairness and relational capital, hence lending more support to gender hypotheses in a change setting than to minority theories. Looking at commitment to change, differences were found between men and women for continuance commitment. Building on these preliminary findings, scholars within the change field and change agents alike can work further on a gender-balanced change approach and move away from a 'one-size-fits-all' approach.

Keywords: Commitment to change, organizational change, gender, individual differences

INTRODUCTION

Even though change is part of organizational life, its implementation remains challenging. Literature indicates that over 70 per cent of change projects fail (Beer & Nohria, 2000; Clegg & Walsh, 2004). From a change agent's perspective one of the most cited reasons for change failure is resistance and a lack of support from employees (Bouckenooghe, 2010; Ford, Ford, & D'Amelio, 2008; Piderit, 2000). Or as Schneider, Brief, and Guzzo nicely articulated (1996, p. 7): "If people don't change, there is no organizational change". A plethora of research indicated the negative consequences of employee resistance, including decreased employee morale, psychological well-being, satisfaction, and productivity, and increased turnover, absenteeism, and theft (Bordia, Hunt, Paulsen, Tourish, & DiFonzo, 2004; Eby, Adams, Russell, & Gaby, 2000; Miller, Johnson, & Grau, 1994; Osterman, 2000). Hence, successfully managing organizational change boils down to the successful management of human resources and more specifically managing individual attitudes toward change (Antila, 2006; Bouckenooghe, 2010). Due to the pivotal role of employees in the implementation of change projects, many scholars are calling for a shift towards a more person-centered focus in the analysis of change (Bray, 1994). This 'personalization trend' is gaining in importance as organizational behavior (OB) and human resources (HR) scholars started to explore employees' psychological reactions in determining the successfulness and effectiveness of organizational change implementation (e.g., Caldwell, Herold, & Fedor, 2004; Fedor, Caldwell, & Herold, 2006; Herold, Fedor, & Caldwell, 2007; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Meyer, Srinivas, Lal, & Topolnytsky, 2007).

Using Demography Theory (Pfeffer, 1983), the purpose of this study is to further extend our knowledge about this person-centered perspective by investigating demographic factors that may affect employees' commitment to change. Demography Theory is defined as "an important, causal variable that affects a number of intervening variables and processes, and through them, a number of organizational outcomes" (Pfeffer, 1983, p. 350). In past research, age, tenure, and educational background have been mostly studied in the context of individual change (e.g., Caldwell, Liu, Fedor, & Herold, 2009; Wiersema & Bantel, 1992). As it still remains unclear what effect gender differences have on change recipients' perceptions of change (Hebson & Cox, 2011), this inquiry will focus on gender, a demographic factor that has received little to no attention in change research so far.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Every individual experiences change in a unique way. For some it implies a source of joy, benefits, and advantages, whereas for others change refers to suffering, stress, and disadvantages. This diversity in perceptions and reactions is also reflected in the work of scholars using a variety of ways for conceptualizing people's reactions toward change (Bouckenooghe, 2010; Oreg, Vakola, & Armenakis, 2011). An attitude towards change that has received abundant attention is commitment to change (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). This focus is not surprising as already in the 1980s, Conner and Patterson (1982, p. 18) concluded that "the most prevalent factor contributing to failed change projects is a lack of commitment by people". However, despite the importance of commitment to change, and that of individual perspectives, little to no research has looked at the relationship between commitment to change, or its antecedents and gender. Furthermore, when studying gender, past research often used a minority perspective. By and large, research findings have shown that being a minority is especially disadvantageous for women, having a negative impact on their job attitudes, self-esteem and self-image (Cohen, Broschak, & Haveman, 1998; Jacobs, 1992; Powell, 1993; Ragins & Cotton, 1996). Yet, at times gender and minority research come to contradictory conclusions. In order to clarify some apparent contradictions, we selected a company undergoing a change in which women form a minority group. In this research, we aim to add to the existing change and gender research base by using both the general gender literature and research on minority groups to look at the differences in the perception of and commitment to change. More specifically, we investigate whether gender or minority explanations are more suited to explain individual differences in commitment to change and the perception of the process and context variables influencing this commitment. We will start by discussing gender differences in relation to the antecedents of commitment to change.

Factors shaping commitment to change

For the success of organizational change, three factors have been found to play a pivotal role (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999): content, context, and process. Content refers to the "what" or the type of change implemented. For instance, does it involve a fundamental episodic, transformational change or an incremental, continuous, small-scale change (Weick & Quinn, 1999)? Secondly, context refers to conditions that explain why a change initiative is successful or not (Johns, 2001, 2006;), consisting of pre-existing forces in an organization's environment, such as the organizational culture, that direct and motivate employee effort (Burke & Litwin, 1992; Chonko, Jones, Roberts, & Dubinsky, 2002; Eby et al., 2000). Finally, process factors pertain to the way change is implemented. As change often comes across as threatening and therefore might create uncertainty and fear (Callan, Terry, & Schweitzer, 1995), hence an underlying fair process is essential to ensure a better acceptance of change in organizations (Kotter, 1995; Wanberg & Banas, 2000).

As the content of organizational change is mainly a factor that extends beyond individual control, perception related to the type of change will be less likely to be subject to individual variation (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999). Therefore, we will focus solely on the individual perceptions of employees regarding the process and the context of change in this research.

The Change Process

It is generally acknowledged that employees' reactions toward change are shaped by the way in which a change process is implemented. Factors such as timely and accurate provision of information (Bouckenooghe, 2010; Johnson, Bernhagen, Miller, & Allen, 1996; Stanley, Meyer, & Topolnytsky, 2005) and opportunities for employee participation in decision making (Strauss, 1998; Wanberg & Banas, 2000) are found to be of great importance in change processes as they impact the perceived fairness of the change. Whether the organization is going through a major change, such as a merger or acquisition, or a minor alteration in organizational benefits, resources are inevitably redistributed. Organizational fairness thus offers a promising perspective regarding actions that organizational leaders should consider in planning and implementing organizational changes (e.g., Beugre, 1998; Folger & Skarlicki, 1999; Shapiro & Kirkman, 1999).

Over the last three decades, the notion of fairness has been the focus of numerous studies (e.g., Bernerth, Armenakis, Field, & Walker, 2007; Bies & Moag, 1986; Cropanzano & Ambrose, 2001; Greenberg, 1993). Initially, a two-factor model of organizational fairness, including procedural and distributive fairness, was proposed (Greenberg, 1990). Procedural fairness is linked to participation and voice during decision processes. Decision criteria should be consistent, correctible and ethical, and biases should be controlled (Leventhal, 1980). Distributive fairness refers to the extent that the allocation of an outcome is consistent with the goals (Deutsch, 1975). Next to this two-dimensional model, other authors suggested two additional types: informational and interactional fairness (Bies & Moag, 1986). Informational fairness is linked to justification (e.g., explaining the basis for decisions) and truthfulness (e.g., being candid, not deceiving), whereas interpersonal fairness refers to respect (e.g., being polite, not rude) and propriety (e.g., refraining from prejudicial statements and other improper remarks). This evolution resulted in Greenberg (1993) bringing all types together in a four factor model.

The effect of gender on fairness perceptions has received some attention in organizational research over the last decades (Caldwell et al., 2009), concluding that gender differences occur depending on the type of fairness. First, women have been found to score higher on two different types of fairness perceptions: distributive and interpersonal. For example, research on distributive fairness has shown that women are more satisfied with the distribution of pay and other benefits (Slonim & Roth, 1995; Varca, Shaffer, & McCauley, 1983). Similarly, researchers discovered that

women score higher on interpersonal and informational fairness (Jespen & Rodwell, 2010). Despite the lack of a change focus in these gender-related fairness studies of the past, we hypothesize that outcomes will be similar in change contexts. Secondly, men have been found to score higher on perceptions of general procedural fairness, which might be due to the fact that they are more likely to be engaged and invited to participate in the setup of procedures (Groysberg, 2008). These findings were also replicated in recent change research, where men judged procedural fairness associated with a specific change more positively than women (Caldwell et al., 2009).

Following these streams of gender research, we hypothesise that women will perceive a change situation as more fair on a distributive, interpersonal and informational level. In contrary, men will have a significantly higher score for procedural fairness.

Hypothesis 1a. Women will score significantly higher on distributive, interpersonal and informational fairness, while men will score higher on procedural fairness.

However, when focusing on research that has been conducted on minorities, different conclusions can be drawn. Due to their history of discrimination, minorities have often been kept out of key decision-making processes, leading to a lower perception of the different justice types (Sweeney & McFarlin, 1997). Following the reasoning of these authors, minorities are lesser able to participate in decision-making processes (procedural), thus receiving less information (informational) and feel as if they are being forced into a solution (distributive), in an impolite manner (interpersonal). These suggestions lead us to formulate the alternative hypothesis that minority groups perceive change processes as less fair on all fairness subtypes.

Hypothesis 1b. Women will score significantly lower on all fairness types than men.

The Change Context

Irrespective of what is being changed and how, contextual factors are crucial in explaining the reasons why change succeeds or fails (Johns, 2001). One of the most important context variables is the quality of the relationship between management and employees (Albrecht, 2002; Edmondson & Woolley, 1999; Oreg, 2006), or in other words: the relational capital of an organization.

Congruent with the definition of De Clercq and Sapienza (2006, p. 331), we define relational capital as "the extent to which exchange involves trust, social interaction, and shared norms or goals". These factors overlap with the components of the quality of a relationship between leaders and followers (Yli-Renko, Autio, & Sapienza, 2001). All three components serve as a substitute for

more formal, hard rewards in the work context, and tend to increase the amount and the quality of communication and interaction between parties (Cohen & Levinthal, 1990; Lane & Lubaktin, 1998).

The first factor – trust – has been defined as the confidence in the goodwill of the other party and its perceived predictability (Zaheer, McEvily, & Perrone, 1998). The existence of a climate of trust has been generally found to be of great importance for the success of change initiatives (Caldwell & Clapham, 2003; Kotter, 1995; Oreg, 2006). Its impact is vital for two reasons. First, in a trusting relationship, there will be a smaller need for monitoring mechanisms (Shepherd & Zacharakis, 2000), thus enabling extensive communication (Zaheer, et al., 1998). Second, not only will communication increase, also the nature of the communication will change. Yli-Renko et al. (2001), for example, observed a larger exchange of more personal and confidential information. In summary, increased mutual trust will enhance communication, yielding better change implementation results (Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). The second factor – social interaction – refers to the (informal) contact between parties that goes beyond mere instrumental reasons (De Clercq & Sapienza, 2006). A relationship characterised by high social interaction is expected to diminish distinctions between parties and encourage close cooperation (Tsai & Ghoshal, 1998), which will have the same positive effects on communication as indicated in relation to trust (Nonaka, 1994). Finally, the third component – goal congruence – refers to the extent of similarity of goals, either between an employee and its organization or between an employee and his or her supervisor, who often takes on the role of change agent (Giangreco & Peccei, 2005). When parties have high goal congruence, the level of interaction and contact is higher, which in turn increases the amount and quality of information exchanged (Larsson, Bengtsson, Henriksson, & Sparks, 1998).

A long history of gender studies suggests that men and women have different orientations oward interpersonal relationships. Already in the 1960s, Bakan (1966) characterized women as more communal than men. Later authors built on this conclusion, finding that women are more affiliative (Gilligan, 1982), and thus construe their self-image in relation to others (Cross & Madson, 1997). Women thus see themselves as being inherently connected or interdependent and are as such more sensitive to personal relations or relational capital (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Furthermore, some researchers discovered that women often have more informal relations on which they depend more heavily (Agrawal, 2000; Molyneux, 2002), and exhibit higher levels of trust (Feingold, 1994). More recently, these results were replicated, showing once again that women score significantly higher on relational capital than men (Curhan, Neale, Ross, & Rosencranz-Engelmann, 2008). We thus hypothesize that also when confronted with change women will score higher on relational capital, this is showing higher trust, more social interaction and higher goal congruence in relation to their changing employers than men.

Hypothesis 2a. Women will score significantly higher on all relational capital aspects than men.

However, congruent with the reasoning with regard to minority groups in change processes mentioned above, different conclusions can be drawn, suggesting that minority groups will score lower on relation capital. Minorities often perceive their work environment as less satisfying and supportive, leading them to show less relational capital behaviors in return (Burke & McKeen, 1995; Konrad, Winter, & Gutek, 1992; Niemann & Dovidio, 1998; Simpson, 2000). For example, studies have found that persons belonging to minority groups were less likely to believe that 'most people can be trusted', even when controlling for other demographic characteristics (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002; Glaeser, Laibson, Scheink- man, & Soutter, 2000). Following the above hypothesis from minority research, we formulate an alternative hypothesis, stating that women will score lower on trust, social interaction, and goal congruence.

Hypothesis 2b. Women will score significantly lower on all relational capital aspects than men.

Commitment to change as an outcome measure

Herscovitch and Meyer (2002, p. 475) defined commitment as "a force (mind-set) that binds an individual to a course of action of relevance to one or more targets". According to them commitment is crucial, as it makes employees cooperate with and contribute to the organizational change. Furthermore, these authors argued and provided evidence that commitment to change is a multifaceted concept, consisting of three sub-concepts: affective, continuance, and normative commitment. First, affective commitment refers to the employee's emotional attachment to the change, based on a belief in the inherent benefits of the change initiative. People who score high on affective commitment are likely to perform tasks to the best of their abilities and even put in extra effort to ensure a successful deliverance. Secondly, continuance commitment to change is linked with the costs amounted with failure to provide support for the change. People who score high on this form of commitment tend to support the change, because they perceive the costs of supporting the change less high than the costs of opposing the change. These individuals generally support the change, but do little more than what is required. Finally, normative commitment to change refers to a sense of obligation to support the change. These people support the change because of their sense of obligation or duty.

As this distinction between three factors has inspired many recent studies on the subject (Chen & Wang, 2007; Cunningham, 2006; Meyer, et al., 2007), we also use this framework in our inquiry.

Thus far, to the best of our knowledge, only one study directly investigated gender differences in relation to commitment to change (Armstrong-Stassen, 1998). However, as this study did not differentiate between the three different commitment types, we will use empirical evidence related to organizational commitment, a closely related concept (Meyer & Allen, 1991), to build our hypotheses. Previous studies show mixed results. Some authors reveal no significant gender differences with regard to organizational commitment (Aryee, Luk, & Stone, 1998; Spreitzer & Mishra, 2002), while others find that men (Hornung & Rousseau, 2007) or women score higher on commitment (Madsen, Miller, & John, 2005). When we look at the three different commitment types, preliminary results reveal no significant gender difference on affective commitment (Kaldenberg, Becker, & Zvonkovic, 1995) and normative commitment (Labatmediene, Endriulaitiene, & Gustainiene, 2007). Similarly, Karrasch (2003) also found no significant gender differences on affective and normative commitment. However, in his study on army captains, men scored slightly higher on continuance commitment than women. Following this literature, it thus seems impossible to formulate a congruent hypothesis. However, the specific predictions about the antecedents we made in the previous part, allow us to predict the relationship with this outcome variable.

Previous research has shown that both fairness and relational capital (Conway & Monks, 2007) have a positive relationship with commitment to change. The gender inspired hypothesses suggest that women score higher on all but one antecedent, and should thus also score higher on change commitment. This is congruent with the fact that women are found to be more cooperative, or more willing to follow when given an instruction (Eckel & Grossman, 1998). We thus hypothesize that women will score higher on all commitment types than men, as they score higher on all antecedents.

Hypothesis 3a. Women will score higher on all commitment types than men.

Following the expected lower scores of women on all antecedents, as predicted by minority theory, our hypothesis is as follows:

Hypothesis 3b. Women will score lower on all commitment types than men.

METHODOLOGY

Sample and procedure

In December 2010, we collected data in a Belgian automotive company through administering a digital self-report questionnaire. This organization was selected because it was subject to a major restructuring process. Furthermore, the automotive sector was chosen because women employees are usually a minority group. In total, 77 participants took part in this research, which represents a 71 per cent response rate. The mean age was 42.5, ranging from 25 to 64 (SD = 9.15). Tenure follows a similar trend with a mean of 16.5 years, ranging from 3 to 47 years (SD = 10.88). As expected, gender was unequally distributed with 87 per cent male and 13 per cent female participants. All participants were white collar employees who had a computer in their workplace. Participants were explained that the survey was for research purposes only and that their participation was on a voluntary base. As an incentive, the organization received a feedback report on the general trends in their organization and trends across different departments

Measures

Multi-item scales were used to measure each of the concepts. The response format of the scales was a five-point likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

***Change fairness*.** The general measure of Colquitt (2001) was used to assess the level of fairness, consisting of four subscales: distributive fairness (5 items; α = .94; e.g., 'I have been fairly rewarded, considering the responsibilities I had during the change'), procedural fairness (7 items; α = .82; e.g., 'To what extent have change procedures been applied consistently'), interpersonal fairness (4 items; α = .91; e.g., 'To what extent has your supervisor treated you with respect'), and informational fairness (5 items; α = .92; e.g., 'To what extent has your supervisor communicated details in a timely manner').

***Relational capital*.** This variable was measured with a scale of De Clercq and Sapienza (2006), consisting of three subscales: trust (5 items; α = .91; e.g., 'My supervisor can always be trusted to do what is right for me'), social interaction (4 items; α = .71; e.g., 'I maintain close social relationships with my supervisor'), and goal congruence (4 items; α = .85; e.g., 'My supervisor's work-related goals are fully aligned with mine').

Commitment to change. People's commitment to change is measured by the three subscales developed by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002): affective commitment (6 items; α = .91; e.g., 'I believe in the value of this change'), continuance commitment (6 items; α = .72; e.g., 'It would be too costly for me to resist this change.'), and normative commitment (6 items, α = .66, e.g., 'I would feel guilty about opposing this change').

Analyses

We conducted independent sample *t*-tests and calculated effect sizes to unravel potential gender differences pertaining the perceived change context and change process variables, and commitment to change. None of scales had variances that were significantly different across both groups, so we used the *t*-test results for equality of means with assumed equal variances. For the effect sizes, we categorize effects according to the operational definition suggested by Cohen (1987), with effects as small, d = .2, medium, d = .5, and large, d = .8.

RESULTS

Means, standard deviations, *t*-tests, and effect sizes for each scale are reported in Table 1.

Table 1 – Means, standard deviations, *t*-tests, and effect sizes

	Overall (n = 77)		Male (n = 67)		Female (n = 10)			
Variable	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	T	d
Outcomes								
Commitment to Change								
Affective Commitment	3.56	0.74	3.61	0.75	3.54	0.92	0.29	0.08
Continuance Commitment	3.22	0.61	3.27	0.63	2.98	0.60	1.71†	0.45
Normative Commitment	3.51	0.65	3.52	0.70	3.56	0.34	-0.12	-0.08
Process								
Change Fairness								
Procedureal Fairness	2.68	0.74	2.72	0.74	2.59	0.62	0.78	0.20
Distributive Fairness	3.09	1.01	3.08	0.99	3.53	0.98	-1.25	-0.45
Interpersonal Fairness	3.69	0.89	3.61	0.87	4.57	0.48	-2.88**	-1.36
Informational Fairness	3.25	0.96	3.14	0.95	3.98	0.94	-2.41*	-0.89
Context								
Relational Capital								
Trust	3.59	0.84	3.51	0.85	4.34	0.56	-2.65**	-1.13
Social Interaction	2.49	0.70	2.52	0.66	2.61	0.87	-0.52	-0.12
Goal Congruence	3.47	0.84	3.44	0.84	3.95	0.87	-1.66†	-0.59

† $p < .1$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

As can be seen in Table 1, we only found significant differences for interpersonal fairness ($t(66)$ = -2.88, p < .000, d = -1.36) and informational fairness ($t(66)$ = -2.41, p = .02, d = -.89). However, effect sizes also show a small effect for procedural and distributive fairness (d = 0.20; d = -0.45). We can thus conclude that there is an effect of gender on the perception of fairness. Furthermore, we see that the results lie more in line with the hypothesis based on the gender literature, 1a, as we see a higher perception of fairness for women except for procedural fairness.

For the change context, women generally have a higher score than men on the different relational capital scales. However, only in the case of trust ($t(66)$ = -2.65, p = .01, d = -1.13) and goal congruence ($t(66)$ = -1.66, p = .09, d = -.59) there is a significant effect. As no significant differences between men and women were found for social interaction, none of the hypotheses can be fully supported. However, given the fact that women have higher relational capital scores, we find partial support for the hypothesis based on the gender literature, 2a.

Last, we look at the outcome measure, commitment to change. Our data show that women score higher on normative commitment than men. On the contrary, men score higher on affective and continuance commitment, with only the latter being significant ($t(66)$ = 1.71, p = .09, d = .45). Even though these results only partially follow one of the hypotheses, they seem to point in the direction of minority research, where men, being the majority group, show higher commitment.

DISCUSSION

The aim of our research was to investigate the role of gender differences in the perception of and commitment towards change. This way, we hoped to contribute to existing research in two ways. Firstly, demographic differences have often been neglected in past change research. In this research we thus focussed on gender, as an important individual difference that has received little to no attention too. Secondly, given the contradictory conclusions in gender and minority literature, we aimed to provide more clarity about which theory proves to be more valuable in the context of change. We selected a company where women form a minority group to identify whether during an organizational change women behave as predicted by gender research or by the fact that they are a minority.

Our results show that men and women have a different perception of the process and the context of change. In general, we see that women evaluate both the process and the context of change more positively than men. As predicted by the gender hypothesis, women feel that they have been treated fairly during the change, implying that they received sufficient information on the change (informational), have been treated politely (interpersonal), and that they have gotten their fair share (distributive). However, as predicted by gender research as well, they feel that they have not been part of the decision-making process as much as men have (procedural). Furthermore, women have more trust in their employer and feel that they share the same goals (goal congruence) than men. Likewise, our results suggests that women have higher social interaction in the workplace, however, this effect was not significant. In general, we can conclude that for both the antecedents, the gender hypotheses were more accurate. Women thus seem to experience the change process and context as being more positive than men. This finding is particularly important, as previous research often saw women as being more risk averse, and thus more apprehensive towards change (Collins, 2005).

However, when it comes to our outcome measure, commitment to change, we see different tendencies. Our data show that men have a significantly higher score on continuance commitment. Furthermore, they also score slightly higher on normative commitment. Our data thus seem to suggest that for the change antecedents women have a higher score, but this does not show in their change commitment. In the process and context factors, women thus seem to be eager to change, but this does not show in their eventual commitment.

CONCLUSION

We recognize that this study has a few limitations, and hence opportunities for future exploration remain. First, our sample is rather limited. We only investigated 77 employees of one company, in one sector. Follow-up research is needed to validate our results in a bigger population, over companies and sectors. This further research can strengthen our findings, as this is only a small first step towards enhanced understanding about the impact of gender differences in the context of organizational change perceptions. Second, for convenience reasons, we gathered cross-sectional quantitative data. However, previous research has pointed out that this type of data gathering leads to less robust and generalizable findings, urging researchers to use mixed methods research (Bachiochi & Weiner, 2002). Qualitative research, for example might be interesting in identifying the gap women experience between the change antecedents and their actual commitment to change. It is clear that men and women experience change differently, however, up to now it still remains unclear why exactly. Narrative research, which emphasizes the importance of stories in understanding human phenomena such as change (Nygren, 2010), for example, could prove interesting. Last, we would like to urge change scholars to also study other individual differences next to gender. Up to date, the limited research that has investigated for example hierarchical differences, age, tenure, etc. makes it impossible to create appropriate change processes and procedures that facilitate change commitment for all employees.

Concluding, women in a minority setting do not seem to behave differently during a change process than they would in a evenly distributed gender setting. Regardless of the setting, women thus are more positive towards the change context and process, but show less change commitment. Opening this 'black box' might be of particular value to policy makers to work further on a gender-balanced change approach and move away from a 'one-size-fits-all' approach

REFERENCES

Agrawal, B. (2000). Conceptualising environmental collective action: Why gender matters. *Cambridge Journal of Economics 24*, 283-310.

Albrecht, S. (2002). Perceptions of integrity, competence and trust in senior management as determinants of cynicism toward change. *Public Administration and Management, 7*, 320-343.

Alesina, A., & La Ferrara, E. (2002). Who trusts others? *Journal of Public Economics, 85*(2), 207-234.

Antila, E. (2006). The role of HR managers in international mergers and acquisitions: a multiple case study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 17*, 999-1020.

Armenakis, A., & Bedeian, A. (1999). Organizational change: a review of theory and research in the 1990s. *Journal of Management, 25*, 293-315.

Armstrong-Stassen, M. (1998). The effect of gender and organizational level on how survivors appraise and cope with organizational downsizing. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 34*, 125-142.

Aryee, S., Luk, V., & Stone, R. (1998). Family responsive variables and retention-relevant outcomes among employed parents. *Human Relations, 51*(73-87).

Bachiochi, P. D., & Weiner, S. P. (2002). Qualitative data collection and analysis. In S. G. Rogelberg (Ed.), Handbook of research methods in industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 161–183). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Beer, M., & Nohria, N. (2000). Cracking the code of change. *Harvard Business Review, 78*, 133-141.

Bernerth, J. B., Armenakis, A., Field, H. S., & Walker, H. J. (2007). Justice, cynicism, and commitment: A study of important organizational change variables. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 43*, 303-326.

Beugre, C. D. (1998). *Managing fairness in organizations*: Greenwood Publishing Group.

Bies, R., & Moag, J. (1986). Interactional fairness: communication criteria of fairness. In R. Lewicki & M. Bazerman (Eds.), *Research on negotiations in organisations* (pp. 43-55). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Bordia, P., Hunt, E., Paulsen, N., Tourish, D., & DiFonzo, N. (2004). Uncertainty during organizational change: Is it all about control? *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 13*, 345-365.

Bouckenooghe, D. (2010). Positioning Change Recipients' Attitudes Toward Change in the Organizational Change Literature. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 46*, 500-531.

Bray, D. (1994). Personnel-centered organizational diagnosis. In A. Howard (Ed.), *Diagnosis for Organizational Change* (pp. 152-171). New York: Guilford Press.

Burke, R., & McKeen, C. (1995). Work experiences, career development, and career success of managerial and professional women. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 10*, 81-96.

Burke, W. W., & Litwin, G. H. (1992). A causal model of organizational performance and change. *Journal of Management, 18*(3), 523-545.

Caldwell, C., & Clapham, S. (2003). Organizational trustworthiness: An international perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 47*, 349-364.

Caldwell, C., Liu, Y., Fedor, D., & Herold, D. (2009). Why Are Perceptions of Change in the "Eye of the Beholder"? The Role of Age, Sex, and Tenure in Procedural Justice Judgments. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science 45*(3), 437-459.

Caldwell, S., Herold, D., & Fedor, D. (2004). Toward an Understanding of the Relationships Among Organizational Change, Individual Differences, and Changes in Person–Environment Fit: A Cross-Level Study. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 868-882.

Callan, V., Terry, D., & Schweitzer, R. (1995). Coping resources, coping strategies and adjustment to organizational change: Direct or buffering effects. *Work and Stress, 8*, 372-383.

Chen, J., & Wang, L. (2007). Locus of control and the three components of commitment to change. *Personality and individual differences, 42*, 503–512.

Chonko, L., Jones, E., Roberts, J., & Dubinsky, A. (2002). The role of environmental turbulence, readiness for change, and salesperson learning in the success of sales force change. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, 22*, 227-245.

Clegg, C., & Walsh, S. (2004). Change management: Time for a change. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 13*(217-239).

Cohen, J. (1987). *Statistical Power Analysis for Behavioral Sciences*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Erlbaum.

Cohen, L., Broschak, J., & Haveman, H. (1998). And then there were more? The effects of organizational sex composition on the hiring and promotion of managers. *American Sociological Review, 63*, 711-727.

Cohen, W., & Levinthal, D. (1990). Absorptive capacity: a new perspective on learning and innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 35*, 128-152.

Collins, G. (2005). The gendered nature of mergers. *Gender, Work an Organization, 12*(3), 270-290.

Colquitt, J. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational fairness: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 386-400.

Conner, D., & Patterson, R. (1982). Building commitment to organizational change. *Training and Development Journal*, 18-30.

Conway, E., & Monks, K. (2007). HR practices and commitment to change: an employee-level analysis. *Human Resource Management Journal, 18*(1), 72-89.

Cropanzano, R., & Ambrose, M. (2001). Procedural and distributive fairness are more similar than you think: A monistic perspective and a research agenda. In J. Greenberg & R. Cropanzano (Eds.), *Advances in organizational fairness* (pp. 119-151). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Cross, S. E., & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. *Psychological Bulletin, 122*, 5-37.

Cunningham, G. B. (2006). The relationships among commitment to change, coping with change, and turnover intentions. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15*, 29-45.

Curhan, J. R., Neale, M. A., Ross, L., & Rosencranz-Engelmann, J. (2008). Relational accommodation in negotiation: Effects of egalitarianism

and gender on economic efficiency and relational capital. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 107*, 192–205.

De Clercq, D., & Sapienza, H. (2006). Effects of relational capital and commitment on venture capitalists' perception of portfolio company performance. *Journal of Business Venturing, 21*, 326-347.

Deutsch, M. (1975). Equity, equality, and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis of distributive fairness? *Journal of Social Issues, 31*, 137-149.

Eby, L., Adams, D., Russell, J., & Gaby, S. (2000). Perceptions of organizational readiness for change: Factor related to employee's reactions to the implementation of team-based selling. *Human Relations, 53*, 419-442.

Eckel, C. C., & Grossman, P. J. (1998). Are women less selfish than men: Evidence from dictator experiments. *Economic Journal, 108*, 726–735.

Edmondson, A., & Woolley, A. (1999). *It's not the seed, it's the soil: Social psychological influences on outcomes of organizational change programs*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management, Chicago.

Fedor, D., Caldwell, S., & Herold, D. (2006). The effects of organizational changes on employee commitment: A multilevel investigation. *Personnel Psychology, 59*, 1-29.

Feingold, A. (1994). Gender differences in personality: A meta-analysis. . *Psychological Bulletin, 116*(3), 429-456.

Folger, R., & Skarlicki, D. P. (1999). Unfairness and resistance to change: Hardship as mistreatment. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 12*, 35-50.

Ford, J. D., Ford, L. W., & D'Amelio, A. (2008). Resistance to Change: The Rest of the Story. *The Academy of Management Review, 33*(2), 326-377.

Giangreco, A., & Peccei, R. (2005). The nature and antecedents of middle manager resistance to change: evidence from an Italian context. *The international Journal of Human Resource Management, 16*, 1812-1829.

Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Glaeser, E. L., Laibson, D. I., Scheink- man, J. A., & Soutter, C. L. (2000). Measuring Trust. *Quarterly Journal of Economics,, 115*(3), 811- 846.

Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational fairness: Yesterday, today and tomorrow. *Journal of Management, 16*, 399-432.

Greenberg, J. (1993). The social side of fairness: Interpersonal and informational classes of organizational fairness. In R. Cropanzano (Ed.), *Fairness in the workplace: Approaching fairness in human resource management* (pp. 79-103). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Groysberg, B. (2008). How star women build portable skills. *Harvard Business Review 86*(2), 74–81.

Hebson, G., & Cox, A. (2011). The gendered implications of coporate value change. *Gender, Work an Organization, 18*(2), 182-201.

Herold, D., Fedor, D., & Caldwell, S. (2007). Beyond change management: A multilevel investigation of contextual and personal influences on employees' commitment to change. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 942-951.

Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 474-487.

Hornung, S., & Rousseau, D. M. (2007). Active on the job—proactive in change: How autonomy at work contributes to employee support for organizational change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 43*, 401–426.

Jacobs, J. (1992). Women's entry into management: Trends in earnings, authority, and values among salaried managers. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 37*, 282-301.

Jespen, D., & Rodwell, J. (2010). Female perceptions of organizational justice. *Gender, Work an Organization*. doi: 10.1111 / j.1468-0432.2010.00538.x

Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behaviour. *Academy of Management Review, 31*, 396-408.

Johns, J. (2001). In praise of context. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour, 22*, 31-42.

Johnson, J., Bernhagen, M., Miller, V., & Allen, M. (1996). The role of communication in managing reductions in work force. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 24*, 285-308.

Kaldenberg, D. O., Becker, B. W., & Zvonkovic, A. (1995). Work and Commitment Among Young Professionals: A Study of Male and Female Dentists. *Human Relations, 48*(11), 1355-1377.

Karrasch, A. (2003). Antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment. *Military Psychology, 15*, 225-236.

Konrad, A., Winter, S., & Gutek, B. (1992). Diversity in work group sex composition: implications for majority and minority workers. *Res. Sociol. Organ, 10*, 115-140.

Kotter, J. (1995). Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail. *Harvard Business Review, 72*, 59-67.

Labatmediene, L., Endriulaitiene, A., & Gustainiene, L. (2007). Individual correlates of organizational commitment and intention to leave the organization. *Baltic Journal of Management, 2*(2), 196 - 212.

Lane, P., & Lubaktin, M. (1998). Relative absorptive capacity and interorganizational learning. *Strategic Management Journal, 19*, 461-477.

Larsson, R., Bengtsson, L., Henriksson, K., & Sparks, J. (1998). The interorganizational learning dilemma: collective knowledge development in strategic alliances. *9*(285-305).

Leventhal, G. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg & R. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum Press.

Madsen, S. R., Miller, D., & John, C. R. (2005). Readiness for organizational change: Do organizational commitment and social relationships in the workplace make a difference? *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 16*(2), 213-233.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognitions, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.

Mayer, R., Davis, J., & Schoorman, F. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review, 20*, 709-734.

Meyer, J., & Allen, N. (1991). A three-component conceptualization of organizational commitment. *Human Resource Management Review, 1*, 61-89.

Meyer, J., Srinivas, E., Lal, J., & Topolnytsky, L. (2007). Employee commitment and support for an organizational change: Test of the three-component model in two culture. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 80*, 185-211.

Miller, V., Johnson, J., & Grau, J. (1994). Antecedents to willingness to participate in a planned organizational change. *Journal of Applied Communication Research, 11*, 365-386.

Molyneux, M. (2002). Gender and the silence of social capital: Lessons from Latin America. *Development and Change, 33*(2), 167-188.

Niemann, Y., & Dovidio, J. (1998). Relationship of solo status, academic rank, and perceived distinctiveness to job satisfaction of racial/ethnic minorities. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 83*, 55-71.

Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science, 5*, 14-37.

Nygren, K. G. (2010). Narratives of ICT and Organizational Change in Public Administration. *Gender, Work an Organization*. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0432.2010.00531.x

Oreg, S. (2006). Personality, context and resistance to organizational change. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 15*, 73-101.

Oreg, S., Vakola, M., & Armenakis, A. (2011). Change Recipients' Reactions to Organizational Change: A 60-Year Review of Quantitative Studies. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 47*(4), 461-524.

Osterman, P. (2000). Work reorganization in an era of restructuring: trends in diffusion and effects on employee welfare. *Industrial and Labour Relations Review, 53*, 179-198.

Pfeffer, J. (1983). Organizational demography. In L. Cummings & B. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behaviour* (Vol. 5, pp. 299-357). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Piderit, S. (2000). Rethinking resistance and recognizing ambivalence: A multidimensional view of attitude toward an organizational change. *Academy of Management Review, 25*, 783-794.

Powell, G. (1993). *Women and men in management* (2nd ed ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ragins, B., & Cotton, J. (1996). Jumping the hurdles: barriers to mentoring for women in organizations. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal, 17*, 37-41.

Schneider, B., Brief, A., & Guzzo, R. (1996). Creating a climate and culture for organizational change. *Organizational Dynamics, 24*, 6-9.

Shapiro, D. L., & Kirkman, B. L. (1999). Employees'reaction to the change to work teams: The influence of "anticipatory" injustice. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 12*, 51-66.

Shepherd, D., & Zacharakis, A. (2000). The venture capitalist–entrepreneur relationship: control, trust and confidence in cooperative behaviour. In R. D. Hisrich & E. Hackner (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Entrepreneurial Finance Workshop.* (pp. 23-246). Jonkoping, Sweden: Jonkoping International Business School.

Simpson, R. (2000). Gender mix and organizational fit: how gender imbalance at different levels of the organization impacts on women managers. *Women in Management Review, 15*, 5-20.

Slonim, R., & Roth, A. E. (1995). *Financial Incentives and Learning in Ultimatum Games*. Working Paper. State University of New York at Stony Brook.

Spreitzer, G. M., & Mishra, A. K. (2002). To stay or to go: Voluntary survivor turnover following an organizational downsizing. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*, 707–729.

Stanley, D., Meyer, J., & Topolnytsky, L. (2005). Employee cynicism and resistance to organizational change. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 19*, 429-459.

Strauss, G. (1998). Participation works—if the conditions are appropriate. In F. Heller, E. Pusic, G. Strauss & B. Wilpert (Eds.), *Organizational participation: Myth and reality* (pp. 190-219). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sweeney, P. D., & McFarlin, D. B. (1997). Process and outcome: Gender differences in the assessment of justice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 18*, 83-98.

Tsai, W., & Ghoshal, S. (1998). Social capital and value creation: the role of intrafirm networks. *Academy of Management Journal, 41*, 464-476.

Varca, P. E., Shaffer, G. S., & McCauley, C. D. (1983). Sex differences in job satisfaction revisited. *Academy of Management Journal, 26*, 348-353.

Wanberg, C., & Banas, J. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 132-142.

Weick, K., & Quinn, R. (1999). Organizational change and development. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50*, 361-386.

Wiersema, M., & Bantel, K. (1992). Top Management Team Demography and Corporate Strategic Change. *Academy of Management Journal, 35*, 91-121.

Yli-Renko, H., Autio, E., & Sapienza, H. (2001). Social capital, knowledge acquisition and knowledge exploitation in young technology-based firms. *Strategic Management Journal, 22*, 587-614.

Zaheer, A., McEvily, B., & Perrone, V. (1998). Does trust matter? Exploring the effects of interorganizational and interpersonal trust on performance. *Organization Science, 9*, 141-159.