

# The Psychology Of Change Management: Overcoming Resistance In Organizations

Dr. Basukinath Shambhunath Pandey<sup>1\*</sup>, Dr. Usman Mohideen K S<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Syeda Anjum Afreen<sup>3</sup>,  
Dr. K. I. Sivaprasad<sup>4</sup>, Ketki Bhatti<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>HOD, Department of Commerce and Accountancy, Sainath Education Trust's Rajiv Gandhi College of Arts, Commerce and Science, Vashi, Navi Mumbai, drbasukinathpandey@gmail.com

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies, Sri Sai Ram Engineering College, usman.mba@sairam.edu.in

<sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor, The Assam Royal Global University, Assam, India, Email ID: anjumafreen3@gmail.com

<sup>4</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Tourism Studies, Central University of Kerala, sivaprasad@cukerala.ac.in

<sup>5</sup>Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, KLE Society's Science and Commerce College, Kalamboli, Navi Mumbai, ketki\_sinha2001@yahoo.com

---

## Abstract

Organizational transformation is becoming a crucial aspect of companies in the present unstable economic climate. However, a lot of change initiatives fail to meet their objectives, frequently as a result of employee resistance. Conventional theoretical approaches to change frequently concentrate on structural change and consideration of psychological processes that affect employees' perceptions and reactions. The main objective of the study is to clarify the psychological foundations of resistance to change by investigating the relationships between personality traits, emotional reactions, and leadership trust. The study also aimed to offer a comprehensive framework for reducing resistance through psychologically informed management. The study employed a mixed-methods approach to achieve these goals. The Big Five personality characteristics and standardized measures of resistance to change were used to gather quantitative data from 250 workers across a range of sectors for the study. Utilizing SEM, the connection between the variables was assessed. Thematic analysis was used to give qualitative depth and triangulation, and 20 semi-structured interviews were conducted concurrently. According to analytical findings, emotional resistance was strongly predicted by neuroticism, although total resistance levels were inversely correlated with openness to experience. One of the key mediating factors was leadership trust. Five major themes emerged from the thematic analysis: leadership credibility, communication breakdown, perceived loss of control, fear of uncertainty, and past change trauma. The study demonstrates that psychological and emotional factors, rather than procedural ones, are the main causes of the resistance. To manage resistance, individualized interventions are needed to improve communication techniques, foster emotional safety, and increase trust. Based on this, the study will propose a human-based model as a foundation for the adoption of sustainable change.

**Keywords:** Leadership Trust, Resistance to change, Organizational psychology, Personality traits, Trust in leadership

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Organizations in the contemporary corporate environment are constantly changing. Businesses must constantly adapt to be relevant and viable, whether it's due to structural realignment, economic instability, competitive challenges, or digital revolution (Moran et al., 2000). Change management in this sense refers to a methodical strategy for guiding individuals, groups, and entire organizations from one state to a desired future state (Stouten et al., 2018). To minimize disturbance and accomplish strategic objectives, the paradigm calls for strategic planning, clear communication, targeted training, and laser-like leadership (Gutiérrez-Iñiguez et al., 2023).

Even if it is necessary, organizational reform frequently encounters opposition. Numerous empirical studies and managerial assessments agree that between 60 and 70 percent of large-scale initiatives fall short of their intended goals (Abbas et al., 2021). Employee resistance is frequently cited as the reason for this failure rather than any shortcomings in the strategy plan itself. This opposition might take the form of direct, one of the greatest and most costly obstacles to execution, is still resistance, or indirect opposition in the form of disengagement (Crouzet et al., 2014). Low morale, poor productivity, high turnover, and in severe situations, the failure of the transformation endeavour, are the ensuing repercussions (Chalari, 2013). Although operational and structural barriers are widely documented, little is known about the psychological underpinnings of resistance. To close this gap, the current research suggests a conversation that prioritizes the human experience of change over the procedural execution (Georgalis et al., 2015).

Historically, methodological guidance on implementing structural and strategic realignments has dominated the literature on organizational change management. Kurt Lewin's Three-Step Model is among the earliest operationalizing frameworks (1947). Three steps are identified by the model, which assumes that change is a linear process: unfreezing (getting ready for disruption), altering (putting the transformational initiative into action), and refreezing (creating the new equilibrium) (Cummings et al., 2016). Since Lewin demonstrated that organizational development necessitates the temporary interruption of long-standing patterns, his model has become a standard (Bakari et al., 2017). Critics contend that despite its economic form, it fails to capture the experience, emotional, and psychological dimensions of the ongoing changing processes of today (Appelbaum et al., 2012). Twenty years later, John Kotter's (1996) 8-Step Model expands on Lewin's ideas by giving particular focus to communication, leadership, and vision (Medley et al., 2008). The model's eight sequential elements, which include establishing the urgency of institutionalizing new habits, emphasize change as a behavioral and strategic endeavour. Although Kotter's focus on coalition building and employee empowerment shows that he is aware of organizational and social preparedness, the model still primarily depicts employees as reactive recipients rather than as proactive psychological actors.

Resistance is a complex interplay of structural, interpersonal, and individual elements that can manifest in various forms, such as overt defiance or subtle retreat (Santos et al., 2024). The academic literature has always made a distinction between aggressive resistance, which is characterized by verbal protest or sabotage, and passive resistance, which involves disengagement behaviors, retreat, and procrastination (Gündemir et al., 2024). Even though the two forms of resistance to organisational change initiatives are both a hindrance to the initiatives, they are usually caused by different psychological factors. The emotional responses have an important role in resistance formation (Van Dijk et al., 2009). Empirical studies often point to fear of competence, fear of the unknown, and anxiety about future responsibilities. These emotional situations are worsened by fast change rates, low levels of inclusion, and poor communication patterns. The change also overwhelms employees emotionally, and they cannot contribute to the initiative rationally or perceive its potential benefits (Van Dam et al., 2008).

Also, the effect of past experiences is vital. Previous experiences with unpleasant or unsuccessful change initiatives might leave psychological scar tissue, which promotes anticipatory defensiveness and skepticism (Oreg et al., 2011). A moderator that emerges is trust, especially in leadership. Leaders who are perceived as consistent, open, and sympathetic are likely to encounter less resistance. However, when credibility is poor, even well-thought-out reform initiatives encounter heightened cynicism (Caldwell et al., 2011). Personal characteristics like personality, cognitive flexibility, and resilience also affect how people view and respond to change (Shin et al., 2012). Even though organizational strategies often concentrate on systems and procedures, this study contends that the primary factor influencing the outcomes of change is personal psychology (Choi, 2011).

Although there is a wealth of literature on change management models and frameworks, such as Lewin's three-stage sequencing and Kotter's eight-step prescriptions, the literature on change management frequently avoids discussing the psychological aspects of change in favor of structural staging and operational mechanics (Kamarova et al., 2025). A growing amount of research demonstrates that resistance is deeply ingrained in emotional, cognitive, and personality-based phenomena, despite the literature's view of it as a behavioral or technological obstacle.

This disparity in analysis is significant. Despite offering valuable insights into motivation, mood, and individual differences, organizational psychology has not made a consistent contribution to the study of resistance. The mainstream research has not fully explored issues like how perceived leadership trust influences the emotional reactions to change or how personality features mitigate resistance. The importance of an integrated psychological lens is even more evident when the level of emotional strain and cognitive overload is high, as it often happens in the context of digital transformation or a major reorganization of the workforce. Because of this, the study of resistance through a psychological lens is not only a theoretical issue but a practical one as well. To design interventions that are not only effective and humane but also aimed at organizational objectives and individuals who have to implement them, a complex knowledge of the intrapersonal processes that influence the way employees react to change is needed.

The primary objective of the study is to examine psychological factors that lead to resistance to organizational change among employees. The paper examines the influence of such personality traits as neuroticism and openness on the way individuals react to change based on long-standing theories of personality and models of emotional response. The study attempts to provide insights that are both contextually rich and generalizable by combining quantitative and qualitative methodologies.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Research Design

This is mixed-method research that examines psychological aspects of organizational change resistance. By drawing upon both quantitative and qualitative methods, this study can attain the depth of the contextual understanding of the study and breadth of the statistical generalization of the study.. While qualitative interviews shed light on the emotional attitudes and life experiences of company staff members, quantitative approaches are used to analyse psychological traits of employees and assess resistance scores. Such a synthesis approach satisfies contemporary organizational psychology criteria while offering a comprehensive knowledge of the issue.

### 2.2 Sample and Participants

This inquiry includes medium-sized to large firms (>250 people) engaged in technical or structural transformation. To create a diverse sample of workers from different functional areas and organizational levels, the stratified purposive sampling approach is employed. There will be 250 participants in the quantitative portion, which is enough to have statistical power, and 20 semi-structured interviews in the qualitative portion, which will end when topic saturation is achieved.

### 2.3 Instruments and Data Collection

The Resistance to Change Scale (Oreg, 2003), which assesses emotional, routine, cognitive, and short-term resistance to change, and the Big Five Inventory (BFI-44), which gauges personality traits like neuroticism and openness that are known to influence adaptability, were the two validated scales used to collect the quantitative data. Both of the instruments were dependable in the corporate context and included Likert-scale responses. Personal experience narratives were gathered through semi-structured interviews for the qualitative component, which focused on feelings, perceived justice, and leadership communication. Before data collection, ethics approval was acquired, and participant anonymity was strictly adhered to.

### 2.4 Data Analysis

The present study has investigated psychological resistance to organizational change using both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. Quantitative data were analyzed using SPSS and AMOS; the study employed regression analysis to examine the impact of personality on resistance, and descriptive statistics to summarize the key traits and resistance scores. A conceptual model containing mediators such as emotional reaction and faith in leadership was then tested using structural equation modeling, or SEM. RMSEA, CFI, and SRMR are examples of goodness-of-fit indices that were used to validate the model. Inductive coding was employed to find patterns, such as skepticism, anxiety, and loss of control, after qualitative data that had been transcribed was subjected to thematic analysis using NVivo software.

## 3. RESULTS

### 3.1 Quantitative Findings

#### 3.1.1 Descriptive Statistics

Several psychological factors, including the Big Five Inventory (BFI) and the measures of resistance to change (RTC), exhibited a consistent pattern, according to descriptive analyses. According to the 6-point RTC scale, the population's general resistance to change is moderate, with an average score of 3.80 (SD = 0.76). The RTC aspects were rated as follows: routine seeking (M = 3.90), cognitive rigidity (M = 3.70), emotional reaction (M = 4.10, SD = 0.85), and short-term attention (M = 3.60). The mean neuroticism score for BFI was 4.00 (SD = 0.70), while the mean openness to experience score was 3.50 (SD = 0.67). These findings demonstrate the connection between resistance degree and emotional instability. All respondents gave conscientiousness high ratings, which is in line with the organization's expectations in a structured setting, whereas extraversion and agreeableness received fairly high ratings. The central tendency and variability of the major constructs are displayed in Table 1, which validates the sample's moderate to high levels of resistance and personality diversity.

**Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Key Variables (N = 250)**

Variable	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
RTC Total	3.80	0.76
Emotional Reaction	4.10	0.85
Routine Seeking	3.90	0.70
Cognitive Rigidity	3.70	0.64
Short-Term Focus	3.60	0.69
Openness to Experience	3.50	0.67

Conscientiousness	4.20	0.72
Extraversion	3.70	0.68
Agreeableness	3.80	0.65
Neuroticism	4.00	0.70

### 3.1.2 Correlation Analysis

Pearson correlation analysis was used to examine the connections between resistance measures and personality factors. People who were open to new experiences had a reduced emotional response to change, as evidenced by the negative association between emotional resistance and openness to experience ( $r = -0.43$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Overall resistance scores and neuroticism had a substantial positive correlation ( $r = 0.51$ ,  $p < .001$ ), with the largest correlations observed in the emotional and cognitive aspects. Conversely, conscientiousness and agreeableness exhibited minimal predictive value since they did not correlate well with resistance variables. Table 2 shows statistically significant relationships, especially between neuroticism and increased emotional reactivity and between openness and decreased resistance.

**Table 2. Pearson Correlation Matrix: RTC and Big Five Traits**

Variable	RTC Total	Emotional Reaction	Openness	Neuroticism
RTC Total	1.00	0.86**	-0.41**	0.51**
Emotional Reaction	1.03	1.00	-0.43**	0.57**
Openness to Experience	1.05	1.12	1.00	-0.35**
Neuroticism	1.08	1.16	1.00	1.00

### 3.1.3 Model Testing and Regression

Multiple regression analysis was used to examine the predictive effect of personality factors on overall resistance scores. The  $R^2$  was 0.29, and the model was significant ( $F(5, 244) = 18.27$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Neuroticism ( $\beta = 0.41$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and openness ( $\beta = -0.28$ ,  $p = .002$ ) were the most powerful predictors. At the 0.05 level, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extraversion were not significant predictors. Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was used to assess a suggested model that included emotional reaction and perceived leadership effectiveness as mediators. With CFI = 0.93, RMSEA = 0.06, and SRMR = 0.05, the model fit the data well. Effective leadership had a role in mediating the relationship between personality and resistance, especially for those individuals who scored highly on neuroticism, as shown in Table 3.

**Table 3. Multiple Regression Model: Predicting RTC**

Predictor	$\beta$	t	p-value
Openness	-0.28	-3.08	.002**
Neuroticism	0.41	4.65	.000**
Extraversion	0.09	1.14	.258
Agreeableness	-0.06	-0.79	.432
Conscientiousness	0.07	0.88	.381

## 3.2 Qualitative Findings

Thematic analysis of a corpus of 20 semi-structured interviews carried out in the same organizational setting as the quantitative research provided complementary information on the psychological reactions of participants. There were five major themes identified: fear of the unknown, loss of control, trust in the leadership, communication barriers, and previous trauma of change failure.

### 3.2.1 Uncertainty Fear

The most common issue mentioned by the participants was uncertainty about future roles, workload, and job security, which they referred to as an ambiguous and unsettling change process. One of the interviewees noted, "It is not that change is occurring, but that nobody knows what is going on. That silence is fertile ground for anxiety." This emotional atmosphere was in line with the increased emotional reaction scores that were acquired using the RTC scale.

### 3.2.2 Loss of Control

On many occasions, the employees felt that they were not part of the decision-making process, and this gave them a feeling of helplessness. A lot of respondents complained about top-down change strategies that position them

as the recipients of change and not partners. One of the senior analysts said, they did not consult us; they told us. I felt that I was not consulted in something that touches my day-to-day work.” These perceptions are consistent with the scores on cognitive rigidity that were noted and indicate that the resistance is not based on the rejection of change but on perceived disempowerment.

### **3.2.3 Leadership Trust**

Leadership trust became a very important moderating variable. Resistance was lower in teams whose leaders were open, communicative, and empathetic. Respondents emphasized the importance of emotional support and the same message to reduce fear. On the other hand, low trust led to speculation, resistance, and emotional withdrawal. This trend supports the SEM result that the effectiveness of leadership has a great impact on the resistance behavior.

### **3.2.4 Communication Gaps**

A common issue was a communication breakdown. Participants most frequently complained about unclear communications, inconsistent updates, and conflicting management signals. One respondent pointed out that although emails were sent, their meaning was not explained. Lack of direction led to more rumours and anxiety, which is why communication in leadership serves as a psychological barrier against resistance.

### **3.2.5 Heritage of Old Changes**

Those employees who had a negative experience of change before were more skeptical. Some of the participants mentioned broken promises in the past transitions, which left them with a feeling of betrayal. One project manager said, “The last time, they said there would be no layoffs, and in six months, half the team was gone.” That type of history does not simply go away.” This background substantiates the fact that neuroticism and high emotional memory can increase resistance, especially when past experiences are not resolved.

### **3.3 Integrated Interpretation**

The integrated study of both quantitative and qualitative data shows a notable convergence. Specifically, in follow-up interviews, individuals with high neuroticism scores also reported feeling more fearful and emotionally sensitive. However, those who were more receptive to change tended to view it as a challenge rather than a danger. It is crucial in the context of psychological safety and change acceptance since confidence in leadership was a consistent mediating element in both datasets. All these findings, when examined through the axis of trust, control, communication, and personal temperament, in general, suggest that resistance to change is not a phenomenon but rather a psychological evaluation of the occurrence. To reduce the emotional resistance and establish the long-term change within the organization, interventions focusing on these fields are necessary.

## **4. DISCUSSION**

The empirical data presented by the given study explain the psychological roots of the organizational resistance to change (Laumer et al., 2016). The results substantiate the notion that the nature of resistance is primarily attributable to the personality and the emotional status of an individual as opposed to being a behavioral stress response (Sverdlik et al., 2023). It was found that the key predictors of change-related behavior are neuroticism and openness to experience, which is consistent with the relevant study findings, in particular, the multidimensional model of change resistance developed by Oreg and the Big Five model (Oreg et al., 2011).

There was a positive relationship between emotional resistance and neuroticism, and this was consistent with other studies, implying that it is a temperamental disposition that correlates with sensitivity to stress and predisposition to ambiguity. Just as it would be in the personality-based theories of affect regulation, high neuroticism participants experienced more anxiety, dread, and distrust during the occurrence of change (Michel et al., 2013). On the other hand, the relationship between the level of resistance and openness to experience was negative. High scores in this dimension made people more prone to change and expressed an interest in new organizational practices, and these people were less intolerant of uncertainty (Turgut et al., 2016). However, in combination, these quantitative findings contribute to the already existing body of information and provide a more realistic view since they show how personality characteristics can be used in practice in a real organizational setting (Fugate et al., 2018). The qualitative part of the study contributed to the quantitative results by proving that the perceptions of the employees regarding the level of control, trust, and clarity of communication played a pivotal role in their disposition to embrace change. In some cases, especially where the use of leadership communication was unclear and ambiguous, very resistant people depicted their emotional feelings of being abandoned, lost, or deceived. But in the sample of those who were more likely to experience worrying, emotional resistance lowered as they felt part of it, and the information was clear (Hon et al., 2014). This mutual relationship

between environmental and dispositional cues points out the need to apply psychologically based change management methods.

The implications of the study are huge in practice. Most importantly, the results underline that individually tailored change intervention, taking into consideration the psychological variability of the workforce, is necessary (Crouzet et al., 2014). Organizations can use proven evaluation tools to identify employee profiles and then use these profiles to inform training and communication strategies, rather than viewing resistance as a uniform occurrence. In particular, neuroticism can be helpful in the early phases of engagement, reassurance, and open feedback loops that reduce perceived uncertainty, while openness to change can be helpful in these same phases (Rafferty et al., 2013). Trust in the leadership emerged as a significant mediating element. In addition to being strategic, leaders should communicate consistently, sympathetically, and authentically to establish credibility. When trust is broken, especially due to incomplete information or prior failures, resistance becomes emotionally ingrained and more challenging to overcome (Ruiz-Palomino et al., 2025). As a result, leadership development programs should emphasize interpersonal skills, emotional intelligence, and conflict resolution during changes in addition to technical abilities.

Organizations should engage in communication planning as part of their transition strategy. The findings from the two data streams show that a lack of information or a misunderstanding leads to apprehension and conjecture, which in turn trigger protective actions (Torppa et al., 2011). A proactive, open, and continuous communication strategy that is coordinated across all leadership levels and delivered through a variety of media can serve as a psychological barrier to opposition. It may be possible to create coaching and training programs that help staff members become adaptable (Christensen, 2014). Employees can be better prepared to handle changes by participating in training on collaborative problem solving, adaptive thinking, and emotional coping (Vakola, 2013). A more change-ready culture may be achieved by providing these tools early in the process rather than after the fact. There are some theoretical contributions in the text. By combining two previously separate topics, it enhances personality psychology's relevance to the literature on organizational transformation. Although the psychological determinants of resistance are founded on measurable individual differences, the present research offers empirical evidence to support the literature that the topic of resistance is a behavioral or even a strategic problem, irrespective of the prior literature on the same matter. Besides, the study hypothesizes the integrative framework, within which the environmental factors, including the quality of communication and trust in leadership, individual traits of personality, and emotional reactions, can interact dynamically and influence the outcomes of resistance (Nadim et al., 2019). This approach involves co-construction with external and internal forces and is more systems-oriented than linear in its cause-and-effect threads. It is a more precise and detailed view of the process of resistance formation and development in the process of organizational change that is given by this approach to thinking. The proposed model is consistent with modern perspectives of organizational behavior that give importance to individual agency, emotionality, and complexity. It could be used as a basis for more theoretical work, and other dimensions such as cognitive flexibility, change fatigue, and psychological safety may be added. Despite its merits, the study has many drawbacks. First of all, only workers from mid-to-large companies in a select few industries are included in the sample. The results cannot be applied to small businesses or public sector organizations since the processes of change may differ for structural or cultural reasons, even with stratified sampling that aims for variety. Psychological reaction is measured at one stage of the transformation process in this cross-sectional study design. However, resistance is a temporal phenomenon that can evolve with initiatives. To better understand the temporal variability and long-term adjustment, future research might benefit from a longitudinal study that would enable the tracking of psychological responses to change events both before and after, as well as during them. Self-report measurements are subject to bias even with rigorous methodology and verified tools. To validate subjective findings, future research may integrate physiological indicators, such as stress biomarkers, behavioral measures, or peer evaluations. While individual and relationship factors are taken into account in the current model, team-level and organizational culture dynamics, which may potentially lessen resistance, are not explicitly taken into account. Examining these multilevel connections would advance the theoretical framework and increase its applicability.

## 5. CONCLUSION

This study offers empirical proof that resistance to organizational change is a deeply rooted psychological phenomenon rather than a behavioral barrier at the surface level. Neuroticism and openness to experience play an important role in shaping employee perceptions and reactions to organizational change in terms of a mixed

design consisting of quantitative and qualitative interviews. The most conspicuous feature of resistance was emotional objection, otherwise known as dread, uncertainty, and a feeling of being out of control. This could be exacerbated by a lack of effective communication or loss of confidence in the leadership at times. This equates with the importance articulated in the findings of a psychologically informed change management approach. Even though structural frameworks can be effective, they do not go far enough to solve the complex internal processes of resistance. Procedural approaches cannot be used alone to dictate successful long-term change, but they must be observed and managed through an understanding and perception that captures the emotions and cognitive existence of employees. Thus, the reasoning is backed by the fact that to adhere to the trend of human-based approaches, the focus should be on proactive communication with a focus on psychological diversity, inclusive leadership, and fostership of trust. Leaders need to get out of compliance-based strategies and establish environments that do not create an element of uncertainty, foster participation, and focus on emotional safety. The further organizational evolution will demand stronger connections between the strategic imperatives and the psychological well-being of employees. The capacity to relate with individuals at a human level would be increasingly important in ascertaining the success of the organization, rather than the capacity to be creative or effective. This publication supports this goal by making psychological subtlety leading toward sustainable change by offering an interconnected paradigm.

## REFERENCES

1. Abbas, A., Ekowati, D., & Suhariadi, F. (2021). Individual psychological distance: A leadership task to assess and cope with invisible change. *Journal of Management Development*, 40(3), 168-189.
2. Appelbaum, S. H., Habashy, S., Malo, J. L., & Shafiq, H. (2012). Back to the future: revisiting Kotter's 1996 change model. *Journal of Management Development*, 31(8), 764-782.
3. Bakari, H., Hunjra, A. I., & Niazi, G. S. K. (2017). How does authentic leadership influence planned organizational change? The role of employees' perceptions: Integration of the theory of planned behavior and Lewin's three-step model. *Journal of change management*, 17(2), 155-187.
4. Caldwell, S. D., & Liu, Y. (2011). Further investigating the influence of personality in employee response to organisational change: The moderating role of change-related factors. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 21(1), 74-89.
5. Chalari, A. (2013). The causal impact of resistance: Mediating between resistance and internal conversation about resistance. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 43(1), 66-86.
6. Choi, M. (2011). Employees' attitudes toward organizational change: A literature review. *Human resource management*, 50(4), 479-500.
7. Christensen, M. (2014). Communication as a strategic tool in change processes. *International journal of business communication*, 51(4), 359-385.
8. Crouzet, B., W. Parker, D., & Pathak, R. (2014). Preparing for productivity intervention initiatives. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(7), 946-959.
9. Cummings, S., Bridgman, T., & Brown, K. G. (2016). Unfreezing change as three steps: Rethinking Kurt Lewin's legacy for change management. *Human relations*, 69(1), 33-60.
10. Fugate, M., & Soenen, G. (2018). Predictors and processes related to employees' change-related compliance and championing. *Personnel Psychology*, 71(1), 109-132.
11. Georgalis, J., Samaratunge, R., Kimberley, N., & Lu, Y. (2015). Change process characteristics and resistance to organisational change: The role of employee perceptions of justice. *Australian Journal of Management*, 40(1), 89-113.
12. Gündemir, S., Kanitz, R., Rink, F., Hoever, I. J., & Slepian, M. L. (2024). Beneath the surface: Resistance to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) initiatives in organizations. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 101922.
13. Gutiérrez-Iñiguez, Á., Collado-Agudo, J., & Rialp-Criado, J. (2023). The role of managers in corporate change management: A bibliometric review. *Sustainability*, 15(14), 10811.
14. Hon, A. H., Bloom, M., & Crant, J. M. (2014). Overcoming resistance to change and enhancing creative performance. *Journal of Management*, 40(3), 919-941.
15. Kamarova, S., Gagné, M., Holtrop, D., & Dunlop, P. D. (2025). Integrating behavior and organizational change literatures to uncover crucial psychological mechanisms underlying the adoption and maintenance of organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 46(2), 263-287.
16. Laumer, S., Maier, C., Eckhardt, A., & Weitzel, T. (2016). User personality and resistance to mandatory information systems in organizations: A theoretical model and empirical test of dispositional resistance to change. *Journal of Information Technology*, 31(1), 67-82.
17. Medley, B. C., & Akan, O. H. (2008). Creating positive change in community organizations: A case for rediscovering Lewin. *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*, 18(4), 485-496.
18. Michel, A., Todnem By, R., & Burnes, B. (2013). The limitations of dispositional resistance to organizational change. *Management Decision*, 51(4), 761-780.
19. Moran, J. W., & Brightman, B. K. (2000). Leading organizational change. *Journal of workplace learning*, 12(2), 66-74.
20. Nadim, A., & Singh, P. (2019). Leading change for success: embracing resistance. *European Business Review*, 31(4), 512-523.
21. Oreg, S., & Berson, Y. (2011). LEADERSHIP AND REACTIONS TO CHANGE: THE ROLE OF PERSONAL ATTRIBUTES AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP STYLE. *Personnel psychology*, 64(3), 627-659.

22. Rafferty, A. E., Jimmieson, N. L., & Armenakis, A. A. (2013). Change readiness: A multilevel review. *Journal of Management*, 39(1), 110-135.
23. Ruiz-Palomino, P., Yanez-Araque, B., Gutiérrez-Broncano, S., & Jiménez Estévez, P. (2025). Unlocking organizational change: servant leadership, change resistance, and the mediating role of emotional intelligence. *Management Decision*.
24. Santos de Souza, F. D. O., & Chimenti, P. (2024). Emotions in organizational change: An integrative review. *Journal of Change Management*, 24(2), 137-176.
25. Shin, J., Taylor, M. S., & Seo, M. G. (2012). Resources for change: The relationships of organizational inducements and psychological resilience to employees' attitudes and behaviors toward organizational change. *Academy of Management journal*, 55(3), 727-748.
26. Stouten, J., Rousseau, D. M., & De Cremer, D. (2018). Successful organizational change: Integrating the management practice and scholarly literature. *Academy of Management Annals*, 12(2), 752-788.
27. Sverdlik, N., & Oreg, S. (2023). Beyond the individual-level conceptualization of dispositional resistance to change: Multilevel effects on the response to organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 44(7), 1066-1077.
28. Torppa, C. B., & Smith, K. L. (2011). Organizational change management: A test of the effectiveness of a communication plan. *Communication Research Reports*, 28(1), 62-73.
29. Turgut, S., Michel, A., Rothenhöfer, L. M., & Sonntag, K. (2016). Dispositional resistance to change and emotional exhaustion: moderating effects at the work-unit level. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 25(5), 735-750.
30. Vakola, M. (2013). Multilevel readiness to organizational change: A conceptual approach. *Journal of change management*, 13(1), 96-109.
31. Van Dam, K., Oreg, S., & Schyns, B. (2008). Daily work contexts and resistance to organisational change: The role of leader-member exchange, development climate, and change process characteristics. *Applied psychology*, 57(2), 313-334.
32. Van Dijk, R., & Van Dick, R. (2009). Navigating organizational change: Change leaders, employee resistance, and work-based identities. *Journal of Change Management*, 9(2), 143-163.