

Change Resistance in Bureaucratic Organizations in Jordan: Causes and Implications for Future Trends of Administrative Reform and Development

Anis Khassawneh

*Professor, Public Administration Department,
Mutah University, Karak, Jordan*

(Received 16/10/1424H.; accepted for publication 12/8/1425H.)

Abstract. The major objective of this study is to investigate the main causes of employees' resistance to administrative change in bureaucratic organizations in Jordan. The impact of background variables on employees' assessment of change resistance causes is also examined. It has been found that the lack of employees' participation, inadequate incentives, distrust between employees and higher management, lack of clarity in the goals of change stand, in order, as the five highest causes of resistance to administrative change. Resistance causes pertaining only to employees' participation, incentives and distrust of higher management reported significant relationships with two or more of respondents' background variables. Based on the findings of this study short and long-term implications for future trends of administrative reform and development in Jordan are explicated.

Introduction

Change is one of the most widely used terms in Jordan. Politicians, academics, planners, reformers and citizens at large stress the need for change in various socioeconomic, political and administrative sectors. It is safe to say, however, that change constitutes the pivot around which all reform and development plans and programs revolve. To this it must be added that change is an action-oriented process whereby a movement from one state of affairs to another is not only necessary but also a requirement for change to take place. It is in this sense that one can distinguish between natural and planned change. Natural change is a spontaneous, instinctive, unmanipulated and evolutionary-type of development. In contrast, planned change is a deliberate, predictable, purposeful and goal-oriented course of action. For change to occur, it first and foremost needs to be accepted and supported by those for whom change programs are launched. Acceptance and support are nowhere more important than in the area of administrative reform and development. Administrative apparatus in bureaucratic organizations is not only a target of change but is a vehicle through which change is introduced and realized. To avoid

resistance, bureaucratic officials' conviction and commitment to change programs are indispensable. Resistance to administrative change has repeatedly been cited as a common feature characterizing bureaucratic organizations in developing countries and Jordan is no exception. Change resistance, however, exists in both developed and developing countries. Yet, the wide-scale of this phenomenon in the developing countries in conjunction with its calamitous impact on the overall capacity of administrative apparatus to achieve development goals necessitates special attention and careful examination.

This study seeks to investigate and identify the main causes of employees' resistance to administrative change in government bureaucratic organizations in Jordan. Eleven factors, which are conceived as being major causes of change resistance in bureaucratic agencies, will be examined. These factors are pertinent to: inadequate financial and non-financial incentives offered to government employees, lack of employees' participation and involvement in the change process, distrust between employees and higher management, expectation of more control and supervision from higher management, expectation of additional job demands and requirements, comfort with status quo, disruption of stable work standards and social relations, lack of goal clarity, lack of employees' conviction in the goals of change, fear of losing job and/or job prerogatives, and the sudden and confused manner in which change is introduced. The influence of employees' background characteristics on their assessments of change resistance causes will also be detected.

Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is twofold: First, its contribution to the literature of administrative change in the developing countries in general and Jordan in particular. Empirical studies related to employees' attitudes towards change resistance in bureaucratic organizations in Jordan are scarce. Although references to this subject are frequently made in most studies of administrative reform and development, these references are, for the most part, anecdotal in nature and accidental in treatment. Therefore, the findings of this study are expected to enrich our knowledge and fill-in the gap in the literature thereof. Second, on the practical side, this study would be of much benefit for experts of administrative change who evince interest in advancing measures to improve the functioning of bureaucratic performance.

Key Variables Defined

The major variables and terms included in this study are defined in the following pages:

Administrative change: refers to the purposeful, deliberate and planned alteration in the structural, functional and behavioral aspects of the organization. For the purpose of this study, administrative change is used to indicate both administrative reform and

development. While being aware of the terminological and technical differences between reform and development the author believes that both terms involve change and the boundary lines between them cut across each other.

Causes of change resistance: are pertinent to the eleven factors stated at the outset of this article.

Level of education: refers to the highest academic degree acquired by the public officials.

Seniority: refers to the number of years spent in public service.

Rank in organization: indicates the employee's superior/subordinate occupation in bureaucratic organization. Superior employees include those who presently occupy or have previously occupied leadership posts, which enable them to issue directives and orders to other employees. In contrast, subordinate employees pertain to employees who have never occupied superior posts.

The sample

To conduct this study a sample of 600 employees from 15 central ministries in the capital city of Amman was randomly selected. Suitability for the number of variables involved along with limitations in time and resources have made the sample size adequate for the purpose of this study. The proportion of ministries included in the sample amounts to 58% of the total number of ministries in Jordan.⁽¹⁾ A similar random sampling technique is used to select the ministries from which the employees sample is drawn.⁽²⁾ A fixed number of 40 employees has been randomly selected from each of the 15 ministries regardless of the size of its population. This fixed number of employees has been chosen for no particular reason except its expediency and appropriateness for the size of overall study sample.

The questionnaire

To collect the data needed for this study, a standardized close-ended questionnaire schedule has been developed by the author⁽³⁾ and administered by well-trained persons. The questionnaire text was read and reviewed by three colleagues whose expertise in questionnaire development is acknowledged. Their comments and suggestions were considered and necessary modifications were made.⁽⁴⁾ The questionnaire schedule is divided into two parts: the first includes seven items pertaining to background characteristics of respondents. The second comprises twenty Likert-type items related to the eleven causes of change resistance in bureaucratic organizations. Items 1 through 3 detect the extent to which inadequate financial and non-financial incentives offered to employees generates resistance to change. Items 4 through 7 investigate resistance

⁽¹⁾ The names of ministries from which the employees sample is drawn are shown in Appendix B.

⁽²⁾ More information about the sample characteristics is displayed in Appendix C.

⁽³⁾ The author has partially utilized few items implied in the questionnaire schedule used by Alaa' Abed Al Hussien Al Saedy. "Causes of Support and Resistance for Organizational Change; Field Study on Jordan Islamic Bank." *Aledary*, No. 66 (Sept 1996), 164-165. (Arabic Journal).

⁽⁴⁾ The English version of the questionnaire schedule is displayed for the reader's perusal in Appendix A. The questionnaire was translated from Arabic to English by the author.

produced by a climate of distrust between employees and higher management. Expectation of more control and supervision from higher management is explored via question 8, while expectation of additional job demands and requirements resulting from change is checked in question 9. Items 10 and 11 are geared towards revealing the magnitude to which the comfort with status quo brings change resistance. Disruption procreated by administrative change to the stable work standards and social relations is examined in items 12 and 13. Lack of clarity in the change objectives is pursued in item 14 whereas employees' weak conviction in these objectives is investigated in item 15. Items 16 through 18 are designated to relate resistance to fear of losing job and/or job privileges. Lack of employees' participation and involvement in the process of change is detected via item 19. Finally, item 20 is dedicated to expound the degree to which change resistance is elicited by the sudden and confused manner through which change is introduced. The questionnaire was distributed to the 600 employees included in the sample. Four hundred and sixty three employees responded to the questionnaire with a rate of return amounting to 77%. Because of improper handling, forty questionnaires were disqualified and therefore excluded from the study. To detect the reliability of the questionnaire, a correlation analysis was applied and a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.8277 was reported.

Methods and Statistics

To carry out this study, a descriptive analytical approach is used. Percentages and frequency distribution are utilized to uncover outstanding causes of change resistance. To disclose the degree to which each of the eleven factors entails resistance to administrative change, the mean average of response to all items pertinent to each factor is computed. Respondents' replies to causes of resistance are classified and fitted according to the following scale: responses with mean average ranging from 1-1.99 suggest that the factor resembles no cause of resistance at all; mean average of over 1.99-2.99 indicates low level cause of resistance; over 2.99-3.99 medium; and over 3.99-5 would be reflective of strong cause of resistance. The impact of background characteristics on respondents' assessment of causes of resistance is also studied. To that end, One way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) statistical technique is applied. Fisher's LSD multiple comparison with $\alpha = .05$ is used to explore the location of variation according to the background traits of respondents. Computer program Number Cruncher Statistical System (NCSS) did all computations and statistical analyses.

Literature Review

Students of administrative change, in their teaching and research, have customarily shown interest and concern with the study of causes of change resistance in bureaucratic organizations. Notwithstanding variation in the approach and unit of analysis used in the studies thereof, three types of causes of resistance were commonly cited by most scholars and experts who evinced interest in peddling across measures to overcome obstacles of administrative change. Resistance at organizational, group and individual levels have been identified and elaborated upon. Although the boundary lines between

these levels of resistance are to some extent blurred and indistinct, the individual resistance, which is the primary focus of this study, has triggered interest and concern among scholars. This concern emanated from the sizable impact of individuals' behavioral patterns on the overall functioning of organizations. Virtually, the whole performance of the organization hinges on the actions and behavioral conducts of the people working in it. In this context Hawamedeh and Heaty clearly indicate that a disregard of employees' feelings, perceptions and loyalties would adversely influence the performance of both employees and organization. This would, in turn, have negative impact on employees' responsiveness to the change process [1, p.55]. Moreover, individuals are not only the target of change but also the vehicle through which change is realized. It becomes apparent, therefore, that resisting change by employees would make it quite difficult to ameliorate organizational performance and alter the present patterns of individuals, the malady for which change programs are launched and introduced.

All in all, a review of relevant literature reveals that the vast majority of western studies have identified common causes of change resistance at individual level. Despite variations in the headings and categorizations used, these causes fall within certain aspects or areas such as: fear of unknown, climate of mistrust, disruption of stable work norms and relations, fear of losing job and job security, habit, misunderstanding of the purpose of change, lack of employees' participation, comfort with the status quo, group norms and threat of power and influence.⁽⁵⁾ While these causes have repeatedly been implied and cited in most organizational behavior text books and studies, they seem to be most reflective of organizations in western countries. More cross-cultural empirical studies are needed to determine the extent to which these causes can be generalized on bureaucratic organizations in different sociocultural contexts. In the developing countries the challenges encumbering administrative change are immense. Employees' resistance is said to be a common feature in these countries. The Bangladesh experience in that respect is a case in point. Within this context Khan succinctly states that:

Far-reaching administrative reform and reorganization efforts pertaining to the civil service have been resisted, partly from the desire on the part of the civil servants to preserve the status quo and partly because of lack of commitment on the part of successive political leaderships to bring about fundamental changes [2, p. 313].

The experience of seven Arab countries (Iraq, Jordan, Morocco, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syria and former North Yemen) in administrative reform indicates that resistance of staff and line personnel is among the common obstacles to administrative change in government bureaucracy in these countries. In this respect, Jreisat's remarks are quite relevant when he aptly states that:

⁽⁵⁾ For further information please see Umstot, Denis D. *Understanding Organizational Behavior*. New York and Los Angeles: West Publishing Company, 2nd ed., 1988, p. 451; Kreitner, Robert and Kinicki, Angelo. *Organizational Behavior*. Homewood and Boston: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1989, pp. 661-662; Steers, Richard M. and Black, J. Stewart, *Organizational Behavior*. New York: Harper Collins College Publishers, 5th ed., 1994, p. 669; and Northcraft, Gregory B. and Margaret, A. *Organizational Behavior: A Management Challenge*. Chicago and Fort Worth: The Dryden Press, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1990, pp. 719 – 720.

Many common obstacles to administrative reform come from within the bureaucracy itself. The list may include resistance of staff and line personnel to reform ideas, incompatibility with existing systems, lack of adequate commitment and support, inadequate skills and insufficient data. These obstacles contribute to the wide gap between proposed and executed administrative change [3, p. 94].

Jresiat goes even further to underlie the need for employees' participation and involvement in administrative reform. He explicitly describes the present approach to administrative reform in the seven Arab countries stated above as being elitist and rigid in nature and does not leave much room for employee to actively participate in or influence change [and that] employees are never told the reasons for change or the rationale for decisions [3, p. 95]. In a more recent study of change resistance in Saudi Arabia, it has been found that the most significant source of employees' resistance of administrative change is related to miscommunication and bad coordination between employees and higher management. The second important cause of resistance pertains to nebulous technical procedures describing how change should be executed, while fear of losing job and/or job prerogatives comes in the third rank of importance [4, p. 380].

As to the case of Jordan, no empirical published materials on change resistance per se in the public sector have been available to the author. Nonetheless, few relevant studies on organizational and administrative change in private and public sectors are worthwhile noting. In his study of employees attitudes towards organizational change in industrial corporations in Jordan, Abu Hamdie found that there is a relationship and an effect between the employees' habituation in work, good social relations between employees and information system in the organizational change process, on the employees' resistance to change. Moreover, superiors in these corporations were found to be the main resisters to organizational change [5, p. 128].

In another study conducted on the Jordanian Islamic Bank, it was revealed that the primary reasons for change resistance are: employees belief that change is unsuccessful and that it is better to preserve the status quo, and their expectation that change would disrupt existing social relations with colleagues and impose new ones [6, p. 156].

In a recent study of factors of change in three major companies in Jordan (Cement, Potash and Phosphate companies), researchers indicated that these companies should encourage the employees to accept the change, and give them the opportunity to participate in all plans of change, and encourage them to be creative [1, p. 44].

In the public sector where laws and rules regulating recruitment, promotion and salaries vary substantially from those in the private sector, different sets of problems and challenges to administrative change are subsequently expected. Efforts of administrative reform suffer from parochialism, uncoordinated implementation and lack of comprehensive and integrated planning [7, p. 50]. Jordanian public managers at middle managerial level have emphasized that weak research and planning and resistance by employees and citizens constitute major challenges to organizational change and development [8, p. 201]. Khadra and Faury have indicated that although middle managers hold enthusiastic and positive attitudes towards administrative development, they lack the abilities, skills and training needed to fulfill administrative development [9,

pp. 28-29]. In another study of the attitudes of managers towards administrative reform and development in the public sector, it has been revealed that reform and development efforts are obstructed most by inadequate salaries and low material and moral support to research [10, p. 343]. These findings were partly echoed by Khassawneh's recent study of obstacles of administrative reform and development in bureaucratic organizations in Jordan. The study revealed that the highest level of obstruction to reform and development programs is manifested, in order, by factors related to: weak competence and commitment of administrative leadership; wide-spread formalism; lack of effective training; lack of scientific base; inadequate financial and non-financial resources; and inadequate commitment and support rendered by public officials [11, pp. 34-35]. In studying the application of Total Quality Management in civil service organizations in Jordan, Lawisy found out that employees' resistance to the introduction of TQM was the least significant obstacle thereof. Nevertheless, the study reported "major obstacles facing the application of TQM such as lack of incentives, weakness in training and education, and difficulties in measuring performance results" [12, p. 152]. On the whole, none of the above cited studies was primarily geared towards investigating the causes of change resistance in bureaucratic institutions. Instead, they referred to these causes as only one factor hindering the pace of administrative change and marginalizing its achievement. While these studies do offer useful background and valuable information *vis-a-vis* the current state of administrative change in the country, they fall short of embarking on an in-depth analysis of factors engendering employees resistance of change. It is expected, therefore, that the undergoing investigations would explore this area and fill-in the gap in the literature therein.

Research Hypotheses

For the purpose of this study seven hypotheses are developed and empirically tested. These hypotheses are:

Hypothesis 1: The main causes of resistance to administrative change are related to: lack of employees' participation and involvement in the change process, inadequate financial and non-financial incentives, distrust between employees and higher management, lack of clarity in the goals of change and lack of employees' conviction in the objectives of administrative change.

Hypothesis 2: Main causes of change resistance vary significantly with respect to employees' age.

Hypothesis 3: Main causes of change resistance vary significantly with respect to employees' level of education.

Hypothesis 4: Main causes of change resistance vary significantly with respect to employees' rank in organization.

Hypothesis 5: Main causes of change resistance vary significantly with respect to employees' seniority in organization.

Hypothesis 6: Main causes of change resistance vary significantly with respect to the number of training programs attended by employees during their public service.

Hypothesis 7: Main causes of change resistance vary significantly with respect to the Ministries which employees work for.

The foregoing hypotheses are essentially based on natural observation and personal experience of the author as a former government employee. His previous public service in conjunction with his present involvement as a lecturer in a vast number of training programs carried out by the Institute of Public Administration and many other agencies have widened the author's familiarity with administrative change resistance in the public sector.

The analysis throughout this study and the conclusions that it will come up with will primarily be based on employees' assessments of the causes of change resistance in bureaucratic organizations. The author profoundly believes that the crucial role employees can play in advancing or stymieing change programs makes the investigation of their attitudes and assessments therein justifiable and useful.

The Findings

First: Main causes of employees' resistance to administrative change: an empirical testing of hypothesis number one

The findings of this study have rendered empirical support to the first research hypothesis. Table 1 sets forth the mean average of responses to each of the eleven suggested causes of change resistance along with strength level and ranking of these causes.

Table 1. Causes of administrative change resistance according to their level of strength and ranking

No	Causes of resistance	Mean response	Level of strength
1.	Lack of employees' participation and involvement in the change process	3.883	Medium
2.	Inadequate financial and non-financial incentives	3.778	Medium
3.	Climate of distrust between employees and higher management	3.616	Medium
4.	Lack of clarity of goals of administrative change	3.478	Medium
5.	Employees' weak conviction in the goals of change	3.426	Medium
6.	The sudden and confused manner in which change is introduced	3.360	Medium
7.	Expectation of more demands and job requirements	3.242	Medium
8.	Expectation of additional control and supervision from higher management	3.144	Medium
9.	Disruption of stable work standards and social relations	2.901	Low
10.	Fear of losing job and/or job prerogatives	2.876	Low
11.	Comfort with the status quo	2.585	Low

Note: The mean response for each of causes 2, 3, 9, 10 and 11 is reached by dividing the mean score given to all questions pertaining to the cause combined by the total number of these questions. Appendix D provides more information about the mean score and standard deviation for each of the eleven causes included in the study.

Table 1 clearly shows that a medium level of strength is provided for eight causes of change resistance, whereas the remaining three causes yielded low level of resistance. Noticeably, no high level resistance is manifested by any of the factors implied in this study. Lack of employees' participation, inadequate incentives, distrust between employees and higher management, lack of clarity in the goals of change, and employees' weak conviction in the objectives of change stand, in order, as the five

highest causes of resistance to administrative change. The mean response of medium causes ranged from as high as 3.883 in the case of employees' participation to as low as 3.144 in the case of employees' expectation of an increase in control and supervision from higher management. Inadequate incentives reported mean response of 3.778 followed, in order, by employees' distrust of higher management 3.616, ambiguity of change goals 3.478, employees' weak belief in the objectives of change 3.426, sudden and confused introduction of change 3.360, expectation of a rise in job demands and requirements 3.242, and in the eighth place, additional control from higher management 3.144. As to low-level causes, the disruption of work standards and social relations obtained a mean response of 2.901 whereas fear of losing job and/or job privileges and comfort with status quo reported mean response of 2.876 and 2.585, respectively.

Drawing on the aforementioned findings, the author profoundly believes: First, further research is needed to unveil stronger factors, if there is any, engendering resistance to change in bureaucratic apparatus in Jordan. Added, research efforts ought not to be limited to resistance causes at employee or individual level but they may target causes at both group and organizational levels too. Second, all medium causes of resistance to programs of administrative change deserve a full-fledged investigation and analysis. It is fairly easy to say that many of these factors are, to a considerable extent, not socially motivated nor are they culturally driven. In a narrower sense, resistance emanating from these factors is not insurmountable. Most of these resistance sources fall within the domain or sphere of influence of bureaucratic organizations. Variables pertaining to employees' participation, incentives, trust of higher management, clarity of and belief in change goals, the manner of introducing change, and employees' expectation of a rise in job demands and managerial oversight are all considerably affected, albeit in various degrees, by bureaucratic structure, culture, scheme of incentives, rules and regulations and above all the type of organizational leadership. Simply stated, these variables, from an organizational vantage point, are manageable and manipulatable. This managerial and manipulative capacity is nowhere more patent than in the case of employees' incentives and participation in the process of change; factors which have reported the highest sources of resistance. These two factors are not important only for their own merit but for their salutary effect in reducing the intensity of the remaining six sources of resistance. Employees' participation promotes trust between superiors and subordinates and decreases prospects of ambiguous and vague objectives of change. It also lessens, if not eliminates, precipitated and confused introduction of change and provides more realistic and reasonable expectations of the additional job demands and managerial control inflicted by administrative change. More importantly, participation enhances employees' commitment and builds ownership of change.

In the same vein, inadequate incentives are very detrimental to administrative change. Underpaid officials, whose monthly salaries do not even meet their basic needs and requirements, would not attach a great value to their jobs nor would they be receptive to change programs. Furthermore, if change does not entail beneficial

outcomes for employees, they would, in all likelihood, be demoralized, disenchanted with change programs and less motivated to put them into effect. Unless employees feel that they have a stake and vested interests in proposed change, it becomes arduous to: improve atmosphere of trust with higher management; reinforce commitment to goals of change; and make employees responsive to a rise in job demands generated by change programs. Thus, the scheme of incentives should be reconsidered so as to augment the significance and value of public jobs in the eyes of their holders.

In short, political and bureaucratic leaders at the pinnacle of power ought to be aware of the need to revamp the current scheme of wages and salaries, and unleash employees' participation so as to make administrative change responsive to the needs and interests of both organization and individuals. Without such consideration, change will continue to be bemoaned, stymied and resisted by employees for whom change programs are launched.

Second: The impact of employees' background characteristics on their estimates of causes of change resistance in bureaucratic organizations.

To investigate the relationships between resistance causes and respondents' background characteristics as implied in hypotheses two through seven. One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and Fisher's Multiple Comparison with .05 level of significance are utilized. Tables 2-4 present a summary of ANOVA results for causes of resistance according to background traits.

Table 2. A summary of ANOVA results for causes of administrative change resistance according to respondent's ministry, age and level of education

No.	Causes of administrative change resistance	Ministry		Age		Level of education	
		F-Ratio	Prob.> F	F-Ratio	Prob.> F	F-Ratio	Prob.> F
1.	Lack of employees participation	1.50	0.1090	0.89	0.4481	1.07	0.3698
2.	Inadequate incentives	1.00	0.4475	6.52	0.0003*	2.45	0.0454*
3.	Distrust between employees and higher management	1.59	0.0787	3.04	0.0290*	0.90	0.4668
4.	Lack of clarity of goals of change	1.38	0.1600	1.98	0.1164	2.13	0.0762
5.	Employees' weak conviction in the goals of change	0.92	0.5353	0.96	0.4100	1.62	0.1694
6.	Sudden and confused manner in which change is introduced	1.00	0.4549	0.36	0.7805	1.16	0.3265
7.	Expectation of more demands and job requirements	1.06	0.3935	0.48	0.6940	2.93	0.0206*
8.	Expectation of additional control from higher management	1.15	0.3119	0.94	0.4220	0.26	0.9006
9.	Disruption of stable work standards and social relations	0.54	0.9121	2.11	0.0981	3.96	0.0037*
10.	Fear of losing job and/or job prerogatives	1.91	0.0236*	0.63	0.5945	5.67	0.0002*
11.	Comfort with the status quo	1.68	0.0562	0.75	0.5252	5.67	0.0002*

* Statistically significant at 0.05 level

Table 3. A summary of ANOVA results for causes of administrative change resistance according to seniority and number of training courses attended

No.	Causes of administrative change resistance	Seniority		Number of training courses attended	
		F-Ratio	Prob>F	F-Ratio	Prob>F
1.	Lack of employees participation	4.66	0.0011*	5.13	0.0017*
2.	Inadequate incentives	6.45	0.0000*	3.75	0.0113*
3.	Distrust between employees and higher management	4.07	0.0030*	7.60	0.0001*
4.	Lack of clarity of goals of change	2.14	0.0745	1.81	0.1442
5.	Employees' weak conviction in the goals of change	0.28	0.8926	1.96	0.1202
6.	Sudden and confused manner in which change is introduced	0.42	0.7943	1.79	0.1478
7.	Expectation of more demands and job requirements	0.31	0.8696	0.33	0.8010
8.	Expectation of additional control from higher management	0.41	0.7989	2.41	0.0662
9.	Disruption of stable work standards and social relations	3.26	0.0120*	0.75	0.5205
10.	Fear of losing job and/or job prerogatives	1.51	0.1990	1.99	0.1151
11.	Comfort with the status quo	1.01	0.4036	2.88	0.0358*

*Statistically significant at 0.05 level.

Table 4. A summary of ANOVA results for causes of administrative change resistance according to administrative rank in organization

No.	Causes of administrative change resistance	Administrative rank			
		F-Ratio	Prob>F	Superior mean	Subordinate mean
1.	Lack of employees participation	3.63	0.0568	3.795	3.989
2.	Inadequate incentives	14.79	0.0001*	10.931	11.768
3.	Distrust between employees and higher management	7.41	0.0065*	14.068	14.912
4.	Lack of clarity of goals of change	3.12	0.0772	3.397	3.584
5.	Employees' weak conviction in the goals of change	1.41	0.2343	3.369	3.492
6.	Sudden and confused manner in which change is introduced	0.01	0.9186	3.345	3.358
7.	Expectation of more demands and job requirements	0.02	0.8833	3.237	3.253
8.	Expectation of additional control from higher management	0.32	0.5700	3.118	3.181
9.	Disruption of stable work standards and social relations	14.54	0.0001*	5.474	6.166
10.	Fear of losing job and/or job prerogatives	3.97	0.0463*	8.408	8.874
11.	Comfort with the status quo	5.10	0.0239*	4.981	5.382

* Statistically significant at 0.05 level.

According to the aforementioned three tables, four medium causes of resistance (causes 4, 5, 6 and 8) entailed no empirical support whatsoever to hypotheses two through seven. Four other medium causes have reported significant variation with regard to one or more background characteristics. A summary of Fisher's LSD Multiple Comparison which displays the locations of these variations is provided in Tables 5-9 in Appendix E. Although variations in responses related to low level causes are reported in these tables, the upcoming presentation and analyses would be limited to medium causes of resistance to administrative change. A brief presentation of these findings is now in order:

1. Lack of employees' participation in the change process

Assessments of this factor have divided significantly with respect to seniority in organization and number of training programs attended by employees. Relationships with other background variables have not been indicated. As to seniority, employees who spend five years or less have been more emphatic and stressful of resistance emanating from lack of participation in the change process than their counterparts whose years of service ranged from 6-10 years, 11-15 years and 16-20 years. Particularly worthy of attention is that this group of officials who served five years or less in government organizations is actually the largest seniority group comprising 133 respondents or 32% of the sample. Needless to say that these officials mostly perform executive and professional tasks and contribute largely to the overall functioning of the bureaucratic organizations.

On a different plane, employees who have never taken part in any training program accentuated the lack of involvement as a cause of change resistance than their colleagues who attended 6 or more training programs. This clearly signifies the vibrant role training programs play in influencing employees' attitudes towards administrative change. In effect, training makes employees feel a sense of involvement not only by acquiring knowledge, skills and attitudes, but also by bringing in and integrating their experiences with the contents of training programs. To take the analysis a step further, training, if performed properly, lessens employees' distrust of higher management. Through training, employees become more aware and cognizant of the needs and intents of change programs proposed by higher management, a step which is deemed indispensable for administrative change to be accepted by employees. This view has been fortified by the findings of this study. As can be seen in Table 7 in Appendix E, respondents who did not participate in any training programs placed stronger emphasis on distrust of higher management as a cause of change resistance than employees who took part in one or more training programs.

2. Inadequate incentives for employees

Inadequate incentives have been significantly related to five of background characteristics of respondents. Seniority, administrative rank, number of training programs attended, age and level of education impinged bearing on assessments of the extent to which lack of incentives generated change resistance. Respondents who

reported more emphasis on this source of resistance were found to be younger, less senior, less involved in training programs, mostly subordinates, and community college graduates. These findings can partly be attributed to the seniority-based code of civil service in which salaries are primarily tailored to length of service and level of education.

3. Distrust between employees and higher management

This climate of distrust is also cited by the employees' sample as a source of resistance to administrative change. Yet, respondents' estimates of this factor have significantly varied with respect to age, rank, seniority and number of training programs attended. Investigation has disclosed that employees who have been more assertive of resistance sparked by such distrust atmosphere are younger in age, holding subordinates occupations, maintaining less seniority in organization and lower participation and involvement in training programs

4. Expectation of more demands and job requirements

Employees' expectations of more job demands produced by administrative change have not been one of the main causes of resistance as hypothesized in this study. Nonetheless, the medium resistance yielded by this factor along with the fact that it is the only medium resistance factor (other than the five main factors of resistance) which reported significant relationships with background variables makes it appropriate to shed some light on it. Variations in the assessment of this resistance source, however, have interacted only with the level of education. Officials who did not attain high school certificate accentuated resistance produced by expectations of a rise in job requirements more than those holding an M.A. or Ph.D. degrees. Similarly, officials with intermediate diploma were more stressful of this source of resistance than colleagues who hold B.A., and M.A. or Ph.D. degrees. Employees whose level of education is less than high school mostly perform simple and manual routine jobs thus making them less aware of the needs and intents of change. Subsequently, their expectations of extra demands and requirements would be heightened. In short, non-university educated employees, particularly those holding intermediate diploma, were trained to purely perform technical and executive type of jobs, jobs which are mostly targeted and hardly hit by administrative change. Thereupon, if this group of employees, is not informed about, and involved in the change process from its rudimentary stages, their concerns and expectations of additional burdens and requirements will persist.

In sum, the foregoing presentation indicates that none of the six hypothetical assumptions (hypotheses two through seven) has been fully fortified and supported by the empirical findings of this study. Virtually, assessments of each of the eight medium causes of resistance have at best been significantly related to five background variables as is the case with employees' incentives; four in the case of distrust between employees and higher management; two for employees' participation in the change process; and one for employees' expectation of additional job demands and requirements. The other four medium causes of resistance which pertain to lack of clarity in the goals of change,

employees' weak conviction in these goals, the sudden and confused introduction of change, and expectation of an increase in managerial control and supervision are found to be unresponsive to any background variables under scrutiny. Having elucidated the major findings of this investigation, the focus of the next section will shift from description and presentation to implication and connotation for future trends in administrative reform and development.

Conclusion

Implications for future trends in administrative reform and development

Giving in to the urge of predicting future trends of administrative change in Third World countries is a common phenomenon among researchers and students of administrative change. Yet, they do so with greater or lesser success in the eyes of their critics. Due to the immense number of socioeconomic, administrative and political factors impinging on the course and direction of administrative change in the developing countries, and Jordan is no exception, foreseeing future routes and patterns of change becomes an uneasy endeavor. Nonetheless, predicting future prospects of administrative change is still deemed to be fruitful and indispensable for upgrading performance and minimizing opposition to change programs. Drawing on the findings of this study and based on the socioeconomic and political developments that are taking place in Jordan, twofold implications for future trends of administrative reform and development are in place: First, and probably foremost, resistance to administrative change will persist and linger on for many years to come. Employees' participation and involvement in diagnosing authentic administrative problems and carving out measures to encounter them are not expected to witness substantial rise in the near future. Individualistic, non-participative attitudes and patterns are ingrained in administrative culture in general and administrative decision-making in particular. Although awareness of, and perhaps calls for, employees' participation and involvement in decision-making are on the rise, these awareness and calls have not yet gone beyond rhetoric.

The overwhelming prevalence of non-participative attitudes among top-level bureaucrats makes it arduous for them to assume vibrant leadership role in buttressing and promoting patterns of sharing and participation in government apparatus. Sacrosanct patterns of leadership and attachment to past experience in conjunction with the lack of devotion and conviction in the essence and philosophy of participation will presumably limit their abilities to usher in and steer a course of a new participation-based managerial leadership. Another factor contributing to short-term persistence of employees' resistance to administrative change is inadequate incentives. The enormous economic and financial challenges on top of which are a high rate of unemployment and a huge financial debt to foreign governments and international lending agencies will make it quite onerous for the country's budget to consider reasonable and meaningful raise in employee's salaries. It is important to note that government bureaucracy, which is already overstaffed, constitutes the largest employer in the country, thus, making it difficult to increase public spending on salaries and incentives. Having said that, the

basic structure and level of wages and incentives, would be maintained and no major alteration is expected to take place in the near future. In the absence of sufficient wages and incentives, moralistic and non-financial incentives would not have significant positive impact on employees' motivation and enchantment with programs of administrative change. Conviction in, and devotion to administrative change cannot be achieved if employees attach no importance and significance to their jobs or feel that they have a stake and vested interest in the outcomes of change.

Speaking of long-term implications, the author believes that employees' participation and incentives and their concomitant impact on the clarity of change goals, commitment to change process and goals, and mutual trust between employees and higher management will undergo authentic and sizable transformation. On the one hand, the rapid democratization and political developments which have been taking place in Jordan since the late 80s are expected to strengthen a culture of participation by which employees and employers and the whole administrative culture would be affected. Under such circumstances, top-down hierarchical administrative decisions will presumably give way to more participatory-type of decisions. Moreover, current political developments in Jordan are expected to augment administrative accountability thereby making bureaucrats, particularly those at the pinnacle of power, more interested in employees' participation with the aim of reaching sound and defensible decisions. On the other hand, long-term changes in the system of wages and incentives are likely to emerge. The undergoing government efforts of privatizing public-owned economic utilities and services along with providing legal, economic and administrative facilities conducive to private sector investment will in all likelihood result in invigorating economy and downsizing bureaucratic apparatus. Consequently, the overall government bill on salaries and wages would be reduced and adequate financial incentives for public employees can be afforded.

Second, efforts and programs of administrative reform and development in Jordan are impeded by employees' resistance to change as well as by other, and perhaps more important, factors. Change resistance constitutes only one sphere of obstruction to reform and development programs. Evidently, none of the eleven factors examined in this study proved to be a high level source of resistance to administrative change. Although the medium level of resistance revealed by the findings of this study inflicts serious damage and hindrance to administrative change, the influence of other challenges and hurdles should not be underestimated or overlooked. The areas which may be looked at and considered are related to political support to administrative reform and development and government's policy of administrative reform and development including policy problems and intents around which the entire policy revolves or supposed to revolve. Other important areas that can be considered pertain to the scientific database upon which programs of administrative change are set up and founded, and the competence of administrative leadership and its commitment to the ethos and goals of reform and development. A thorough investigation and analyses of these crucial aspects would hopefully provide politicians and administrators with

guidelines and criteria of relevance to focus current and future efforts of administrative reform and development. The heavy cost of reform and development programs in association with the calamitous impact of administrative change impediments on the performance of bureaucratic machinery makes it necessary to clamor for more inquiry and investigation.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

Dear official:

This questionnaire is part of a study aiming to investigating the views and attitudes of civil servants towards causes of change resistance in bureaucratic organizations in Jordan. The questions included in the schedule are precisely constructed and designed. Please read them carefully and give your conscious opinions. The information you are about to give will solely be used for academic purposes. The names of respondents will not appear in the study nor are they required to be stated in the first place.

Thank you for your cooperation

Researcher

Professor Anis S. Khassawneh

Part One

1- Gender:

a- Male

b- Female

2- Name of the ministry in which you are working:

3- Your age ----- years.

4- The highest academic degree you have acquired until the present time:

<input type="checkbox"/>	A- Less than General Secondary High School Certificate (Tawjehi).
<input type="checkbox"/>	B- General Secondary High School Certificate (Tawjehi).
<input type="checkbox"/>	C- Diploma from Community College or Vocational Institute.
<input type="checkbox"/>	D- Bachelor degree.
<input type="checkbox"/>	F- Master degree or higher.

5- Overall years of service in government institutions ----- years.

6- Are you currently occupying or have you previously occupied supervisory or leadership posts (as being a superior or a boss for other employees)?

a- Yes

b- No

7- Number of training courses attended during your public service -----.

Part Two

The following suggested factors might impede efforts and programs of administrative and organizational change in your department. Beside each of these factors five optional answers are provided. The first option indicates that you "strongly agree" with the content of the factor while "agree", "neutral", "disagree" and "strongly disagree" are provided by the second, third, fourth and fifth options respectively. Please mark () the option you feel is most reflective of your opinion.

Factor No.	Content of the Factor	Strongly agree (5)	Agree (4)	Neutral (3)	Disagree (2)	Strongly disagree (1)
1	Low salaries and low incentives for employees weaken their conviction in and commitment to change.					
2	Change outcomes are not positively reflected on materialistic incentives offered to employees.					
3	Outcomes of change do not contribute to reinforcing employee's prospects for growth and career advancement.					
4	Change does not work because of distrust between higher management and employees.					
5	Lack of seriousness and support from higher management to change.					
6	Employee's weak confidence in the expertise and skills of those responsible for the introduction of change.					
7	Change is mostly used to achieve personal, not public, interests for those in charge of the process of change.					
8	Change increases management supervision over employees.					
9	Change involves an increase in the efforts, burdens and job requirements.					
10	Change does not bring forth good results.					
11	It is better to preserve the status quo and there is no need for change.					
12	Change results in a loss of some social relations with colleges and imposes undesired new relations.					
13	Change disrupts stable work traditions and standards, which makes it hard to support and implement this change.					
14	Goals of change are unclear to employees.					
15	Employee's weak conviction in the objectives of change.					
16	Change results in a loss of job gains and prerogatives.					
17	Change reduces the employee's possibility of utilizing his/her past experiences.					
18	Change may lead to be loss of my job.					
19	Employees do not participate in diagnosing current problems faced by the organization and proposing measures to deal with them.					
20	Change is introduced in a sudden and confused manner.					

Thank you for your time and efforts

APPENDIX B

The names of the ministries which the civil servants included in the sample work for.

No.	NAME OF MINISTRY	No.	NAME OF MINISTRY
1.	Ministry of Finance	8.	Ministry of Industry & Trade
2.	Ministry of Public Works & Housing	9.	Ministry of Social Development
3.	Ministry of Agriculture	10.	Ministry of Information
4.	Ministry of Supplies	11.	Ministry of Education
5.	Ministry of Planning	12.	Ministry of Waqf & Islamic Affairs
6.	Ministry of Justice	13.	Ministry of Municipal & Rural Affairs
7.	Ministry of Administrative Development	14.	Ministry of Energy
		15.	Ministry of Telecommunication

APPENDIX C

SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

Table 1. Sample breakdown by respondent's gender and age

Respondent's gender	Respondents age				Total
	21-30 years	31-40 years	41-50 years	51 years and more	
Male	26.5%	49.7%	17.5%	6.3%	100% (N=302)
Female	36.2%	56.0%	6.9%	0.9%	100% (N=116)

Note: Five respondents have not reported their gender and/or age.

Table 2. Sample breakdown by respondent's administrative rank and seniority in organization

Respondent's rank	Seniority in organization					Total
	5 years or less	6-10 years	11-15 years	16-20 years	21 years or more	
Superior	21.4%	18.6%	29.5%	18.2%	12.3%	100% (220)
Subordinate	43.4%	24.7%	22.7%	7.6%	1.5%	100% (198)

Note: Five respondents have not indicated their rank and/or seniority.

Table 3. Sample breakdown by respondent's administrative rank and level of education

Respondent's rank	Respondent's level of education					Total
	Less than high school	High school	Intermediate diploma	B.A.	M.A. or higher	
Superior	0.9%	14.1%	19.1%	53.2%	12.7%	100% (N=220)
Subordinate	5.0%	20.6%	25.6%	38.2%	10.6%	100% (N=199)

Note: Four respondents have not reported their rank and/or level of education.

APPENDIX D

No.	Causes of resistance	Mean	No. of items	Descriptive statistics			
				Standard deviation	No. of cases	Mini-mum	Maximum
1.	Lack of employees' participation in the change process	3.883886	1	1.04678	422	1	5
2.	Inadequate financial and non-financial incentives	11.3357	3	2.277195	423	4	15
3.	Climate of distrust between employees and higher management	14.46763	4	3.178887	417	5	20
4.	Lack of clarity of goals of administrative change	3.478469	1	1.079908	418	1	5
5.	Employees' weak conviction in the goals of change	3.42654	1	1.05121	422	1	5
6.	The sudden and confused manner in which change is introduced	3.36019	1	1.305253	422	1	5
7.	Expectation of more demands and job requirements	3.242857	1	1.130219	420	1	5
8.	Expectation of additional control from higher management	3.144893	1	1.129856	421	1	5
9.	Disruption of stable work standards and social relations	5.80285	2	1.873777	421	2	10
10.	Fear of losing job and/or job prerogatives	8.629454	3	2.388562	421	3	15
11.	Comfort with the status quo	5.171084	2	1.813032	415	2	10

APPENDIX E

Table 5. A Summary of Fisher's LSD Multiple Comparison between means of employees responses to causes of resistance according to number of training programs attended

Cause	Mean	No. of training programs attended	No. programs attended	1-5	6-10	Over 10 programs
Lack of employees' participation	4,130	No. programs attended	-	NS**	S*	S*
	3,913	1-5	-	-	NS**	S*
	3,68	6-10	-	-	-	NS**
	3,238	Over 10 programs	-	-	-	-
Inadequate incentives	11,604	No. programs attended	-	NS**	NS**	S*
	11,010	1-5	-	-	NS**	S*
	10,92	6-10	-	-	-	NS**
	10,047	Over 10 programs	-	-	-	-
Employees' distrust of higher management	10,437	No. programs attended	-	S*	S*	S*
	14,429	1-5	-	-	NS**	S*
	13,98	6-10	-	-	-	S*
	11,904	Over 10 programs	-	-	-	-
Comfort with status quo	0,164	No. programs attended	-	NS**	NS**	S*
	0,298	1-5	-	-	NS**	S*
	0,04	6-10	-	-	-	S*
	4,090	Over 10 programs	-	-	-	-

*S: Statistically significant at .05 level

**NS: Statistically insignificant

Table 6. A Summary of Fisher's LSD Multiple Comparisons between means of employees responses to causes of resistance according to seniority in organization

Cause	Mean	Years of service	5 Years or less	6-10	11-15	16-20	years and more
Employees' participation	4.127	5 years or less	-	S*	S*	S*	NS**
	3.836	6-10	-	-	NS**	S*	NS**
	3.785	11-15	-	-	-	NS**	NS**
	3.462	16-20	-	-	-	-	S*
	4.066	21 years and more	-	-	-	-	-
Inadequate incentives	11.917	5 years or less	-	NS**	S*	S*	S*
	11.467	6-10	-	-	NS**	NS**	S*
	11.223	11-15	-	-	-	NS**	S*
	10.727	16-20	-	-	-	-	NS**
	9.933	21 Year and more	-	-	-	-	-
Employees' distrust of higher management	15.0916	5 years or less	-	NS**	NS**	S*	S*
	14.380	6-10	-	-	NS**	NS**	S*
	14.645	11-15	-	-	-	S*	S*
	13.566	16-20	-	-	-	-	NS**
	13.033	21 years and more	-	-	-	-	-
Disruption of work standards and relations	6.037	5 years or less	-	NS**	NS**	NS**	S*
	5.857	6-10	-	-	NS**	NS**	S*
	5.830	11-15	-	-	-	NS**	S*
	5.654	16-20	-	-	-	-	S*
	4.689	21 years and more	-	-	-	-	-

*S: Statistically significant at .05 level

**NS: Statistically insignificant

Table 7. A summary of Fishers LSD Multiple Comparisons between means of employees responses to causes of resistance according respondents' age

Cause	Mean	Group years	21-30	31-40	41-50	51 years and more
Inadequate incentives	11.811	21-30	-	NS**	-	-
	11.383	31-40	-	-	-	-
	10.688	41-50	S*	S*	-	NS**
	9.85	51 years or more	S*	S*	-	-
Distrust between employees and higher management	14.816	21-30	-	NS**	-	NS**
	14.641	31-40	-	-	-	NS**
	13.573	41-50	S*	S*	-	NS**
	13.45	51 years or more	-	-	-	-

*S: Statistically significant at .05 level

**NS: Statistically insignificant

Note: Two respondents in the 21-30 year age group are less than 20 years old.

Table 8. A Summary of Fisher's LSD Multiple Comparisons between means of employees responses to causes of resistance according to level of education

Cause	Mean	Level of education	Less than high school	High school	Inter-mediate	Bachelor degree	Master or Ph.D. degree
Inadequate incentives	11.555	Less than high school	-	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**
		High school	-	-	NS**	NS**	NS**
		Intermediate diploma	-	-	-	S*	S*
		Bachelor degree	-	-	-	-	NS**
		Master or Ph.D.	-	-	-	-	-
Expectation of more job demands		Less than high school	-	NS**	NS**	NS**	S*
		High school	-	-	NS**	NS**	NS**
		Intermediate diploma	-	-	-	S*	S*
		Bachelor degree	-	-	-	-	NS**
		Master or Ph.D.	-	-	-	-	-
Disruption of work standards and social relations		Less than high school	-	NS**	NS**	NS**	S*
		High school	-	-	NS**	S*	S*
		Intermediate diploma	-	-	-	NS**	S*
		Bachelor degree	-	-	-	-	NS**
		Master or Ph.D.	-	-	-	-	-
Fear of losing job or job prerogatives		Less than high school	-	NS**	NS**	NS**	S*
		High school	-	-	NS**	S*	S*
		Intermediate diploma	-	-	-	NS**	S*
		Bachelor degree	-	-	-	-	NS**
		Master or Ph.D.	-	-	-	-	-
Comfort with status quo		Less than high school	-	NS**	NS**	NS**	S*
		High school	-	-	NS**	S*	S*
		Intermediate diploma	-	-	-	NS**	S*
		Bachelor degree	-	-	-	-	S*
		Master or Ph.D.	-	-	-	-	-

*S: Statistically significant at .05 level

**NS: Statistically insignificant

Table 9. A Summary of Fisher's LSD Multiple Comparisons between means of employees responses to causes of resistance according to ministry

Cause	Mean	Ministry	Administrative Develop	Education	Islamic Affairs	Communications	Municipalities	Trade and Industry	Information	Justice	Agriculture	Supply	Energy	Social Develop	Finance	Planning	Housing and Public Works
Fear of losing job and / or job prerogatives	8.45	Administrative Development	-	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**
	7.512	Education	-	-	NS**	S*	S*	NS**	NS**	S*	NS**	S*	S*	NS**	NS**	NS**	S*
	8.384	Islamic Affairs	-	-	-	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	S*	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**
	9.363	Communications	-	-	-	-	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	-	NS**	NS**	NS**
	9.133	Municipalities	-	-	-	-	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	-	NS**	NS**	NS**
	8.8	Trade and Industry	-	-	-	-	-	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	-	NS**	NS**	NS**
	8.8	Information	-	-	-	-	-	-	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**
	8.851	Justice	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**
	8.424	Agriculture	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	NS**	S*	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**
	8.666	Supply	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**	NS**
9.620	Energy	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	NS**	NS**	
7.722	Social Development	-	-	-	S*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S*	NS**	NS**	S*	
8.184	Finance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	S*	-	NS**	S*	
8.285	Planning	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
9.388	Housing and Public Works	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

*S: Statistically significant at .05 level

**S: Statistically insignificant

References

- [1] Hawamedeh, Nidal and Heaty. "Factors of Change and Their Relationship with Perception Level of the Change Process and Its Results: Empirical Study in the Cement, Potash and Phosphate Companies". *Mu'tah Journal for Research and Studies: Humanities and Social Sciences Series*, 19, No. 2 (2004). (Arabic Journal).
- [2] Khan, Mohammad Mohabbat. "Resistance to Administrative Reform in Bangladesh 1972-1987". *Public Administration and Development*, 9, No. 3 (1989).
- [3] Jreisat, Jamil E. "Administrative Reform in Developing Countries: A Comparative Perspective." *Public Administration and Development*, 8, No. 1 (1988).
- [4] Al-Amery, Ahmed Salem and Al-Fawzan, Nasser Muhammad. "Employees' Resistance to Change in Government Apparatuses in Saudi Arabia: Causes and Remedies." *Public Administration*, 37, No. 3 (1997). (Arabic Journal).
- [5] Abu Hamdie, Ayman Hamdi. *Employees' Attitudes Towards Organizational Change in the Industrial Corporations in Jordan*. Master Thesis, Jordan University, 1994. (Arabic Source).
- [6] Al-Saedy, Alaa' and Al-Hussien, Abed. "Causes of Support and Resistance for Organizational Change: Field Study on Jordan Islamic Bank". *Aledary*, No. 66 (1996). (Arabic Journal).
- [7] Adwan, M. Yaser and Ellayan, Abdulla. "Jordan's Experience in Administrative Reform." *Asian Affairs*, 8, No. 1 (1988).
- [8] Awamleh, Nail. "Change and Organization Development in Public Administration in Jordan: Field Study." *Yarmouk Research Journal-Humanities and Social Sciences Series*, 8, No. 2 (1992). (Arabic Journal).
- [9] Khadra, Bashir and Faury, Rifa't. "Attitudes of Government Middle Managers in Jordan Towards Administrative Development." Center of Jordanian Studies, Yarmouk University, Irbid, 1994. (Arabic Source).
- [10] Al-Henati, Mohammad. "Attitudes of Managers Towards Administrative Development and Reform in Public Sector Organizations in Jordan." *Yarmouk Research Journal-Humanities and Social Sciences Series*, 10, No. 2 (1994). (Arabic Journal).
- [11] Khassawneh, Anis S. "Obstacles to Administrative Reform and Development in Central Government Organizations in Jordan: Civil Servants' View." *Mu'tah Journal for Research and Studies: Humanities and Social Sciences Series*, 14, No. 3 (1999). (Arabic Journal).
- [12] Lawisy, Mousa Salameh. "Total Quality Management in the Jordanian Civil Service Institutions." *Mu'tah Journal for Research and Studies: Humanities and Social Sciences Series*, 18, No. 4 (2003). (Arabic Journal).

:

أستاذ، قسم الإدارة العامة
جامعة مؤتية، الكرك، الأردن

(قدم للنشر في ١٦/١٠/١٤٢٤هـ؛ وقبل للنشر في ١٢/٨/١٤٢٥هـ)

ملخص البحث. يهدف هذا البحث إلى دراسة الأسباب الرئيسية لمقاومة الموظفين للتغيير الإداري في المنظمات البيروقراطية الحكومية في الأردن. تناولت الدراسة أيضا تأثير خصائص المحوئين على تقديراتهم لأسباب مقاومة التغيير الإداري. بينت نتائج الدراسة أن العوامل المتعلقة بعدم كفاية مشاركة الموظفين في القرارات المتصلة بالتغيير الإداري، وضعف الحوافز المقدمة لهم، وغياب الثقة بين الموظفين والإدارة العليا، وغموض أهداف التغيير، وضعف إيمان الموظفين بأهداف هذا التغيير تشكل وترتيب تنازلي حسب الأهمية أسبابا لمقاومة التغيير الإداري في المنظمات الحكومية. وقد أشارت نتائج هذه الدراسة إلى أن ثلاثة من الأسباب الرئيسية لمقاومة التغيير الإداري ترتبط بعلاقات ذات دلالات إحصائية مع بعض المتغيرات المتصلة بمخلفياتهم الاجتماعية والوظيفية. وأخيرا فقد تم مناقشة مدلولات ومضامين نتائج هذه الدراسة للاتجاهات المستقبلية لجهود وبرامج الإصلاح والتطوير الإداري في الأردن.