Resistance of Workers to Structural Change in Business Institutions

a comparative study between public and private institutions

Hadef Leila[1] ♦, Boughari Fatma Zohra[2]

[1] Bordj Bou Arréridj University(Algeria), leila.hadef@univ-bba.dz

[2] University of chlef (Algeria)   , f.boughari@univ-chlef.dz

. . . .

Abstract:
   The current study seeks to shed light on the process of structural change, which is one of the most important areas of organizational change and the extent to which the latter faces resistance by workers due to their lack of initial understanding and fear of the unknown or fear of losing some powers, where resistance is one of the important negative phenomena that contributes to the failure of any effort to transform the institutions for the better when it is difficult to control it, and for the purpose of investing the theoretical frameworks for this topic in the field, this study comes to know the relationship of structural change to the resistance of workers, as well as knowing the impact of demographic variables (gender, age, marital status, educational level, years of experience) on workers' resistance.

Keywords : Structural change, workers' resistance, public institutions, private institutions .

♦ **Corresponding author.**

I- Introduction:

Work organizations in the current era and in light of the trends of globalization are defined by new characteristics, the rapid and successive change in various social, economic, technological and political aspects, which has its impact on all organizations, whether public or private , created challenges for organizations that began looking for tools and mechanisms that enable them confronting it in creative and innovative ways. The organizational change was the mechanism that it adopted to improve its performance and move it to a stage where it is more effective, successful and appropriate to potential changes, and the change process here is not intended to happen automatically from sudden mutations that come as a result of certain circumstances, but rather a work that is planned in advance according to scientific bases in line with the possibilities available and within the limits of the general objectives of the institutions, so that the required change is not just an imitation of another organization or a goal in itself, but it remains a way to always reach the best. Where change can occur in any aspect of the organization, organizational structures are the most vulnerable areas to change, as most of the changes that occur in the organization are often followed by changes in its organizational structure. Also, among the factors that drive the institution to structural change are innovation, growth and emergence of structural problems.

Changing the organizational structure is not an easy process. There are difficulties, which are mainly represented in the resistance shown by the workers, unaware of the advantages that can be obtained from this change, and the non-compliance with the new decisions in order to preserve the current situation. Therefore, those concerned with change should try to explain the reasons for change and its goals to the workers, because the lack of understanding of the motives and goals is what creates the spirit of resistance to change, not the change itself. Thus, before starting to implement the required changes, all concerned must understand the reasons for the change, in order to ensure cooperation with the administration in achieving the required changes, or at least limiting resistance.

2. Study Hypotheses / Questions

The problem of the study emerges from the current reality of organizations and their changing environment, which obliges them to adopt change in various fields, especially changing their organizational structure which is the subject of our study, in order to raise their efficiency , effectiveness and to confront the challenges imposed by environmental changes, as well as controling and reducing the resistance of workers to these changes to achieve their desired goals.So , based on what was mentioned, we can pose the problem of the study as follows:

To what extent do workers resist structural changes in public and private institutions?

In order to answer the problem of the study, the following hypotheses were formulated:

(1) Institutions, whether public or private, face resistance when changing the) organizational structure.

(2) The second hypothesis: There is a statistically significant relationship between changing the organizational structure and the resistance of workers in public and private institutions.

(3) The third hypothesis: There is a statistically significant effect between the demographic variables (gender, age, marital status, years of experience) on workers' resistance to change in public and private institutions.

3. Study Importance and Objectives

The study gains its importance through the technological development that reached its peak in the late last century and entered all areas of life, especially behavioral and human knowledge, which led to a tremendous development in various aspects and this led to an increase in the speed of performance and production in response to the increasing demand for goods and services provided by the public and private sectors. Hence the importance of the study in addressing a vital topic that helps institutions to enhance their position, raise their value and control their various activities by changing the organizational structure that allows the continuity of life for institutions and achieves their goals of survival, growth and adaptation to environmental changes.

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between structural changes and workers' resistance to them, as well as the degree of influence of demographic variables on workers' resistance.

4. The theoretical framework of the study.

The process of organizational change remains one of the most important challenges facing administrative leaders in various contemporary organizations, due to their environmental nature, which is characterized by movement and speed of change in all fields. Writers and specialists in the field of management in general and organizational behavior in particular, have realized the importance of the change process and its positive role in the life and development of organizations and intensified their efforts towards defining its characteristics and nature by defining concepts they formulated in line with their intellectual orientations Geralds, J, Skiblins, 1994,p43).   (Porras & Robertson 1992) defined organizational change as applying strategies from behavioral sciences that aim to change organizational work to improve organizational performance by modifying the behavior of individuals (Salaman, G,2003, p.3)[1], and organizational change includes "transition from the current state of the organization to a new, more efficient state as well as changes in the institutions 's culture and structure and the introduction of new technologies (Beal III, et al, p.02).

Through the previous definitions, it can be said that organizational change includes making modifications or transformations in the goals and policies of the organization or in any element of the organizational work such as the organizational structure or technology....etc, in order to target the suitability of the organization's conditions or to create new organizational conditions for it. Thus, organizational change has become inevitable in the work and behavior of contemporary organizations so that they can grow, continue and face strong competition in light of the continuous change of the elements of their internal and external environment, by making changes in several areas, one of the most important areas of which is structural change (Salaman, G. 2003, p.3). It is linked to changing the organization's shape, a number of administrative levels, and the nature and number of jobs. In recent years, organizations, whether public or private, have sought to urge flexibility in the organizational structure, and the organizational structure can be

defined as "a framework that includes roles, responsibilities, and communication relationships that is deliberately designed to accomplish the organization's tasks and achieve its goals (Agbim, K. C. 2013, p57). The organizational structure consists of the positioning of work, the relationships of workers with each other, the responsibilities and the structure that directs the competence of work and coordination between senior management and subordinates for the flow of plans and objectives (Tran, Q., et al. 2013, p. 231).

This type of change is attributed to the introduction of modifications in the organizational structure, authority and responsibility relationships, and decision-making systems. From the perspective of organizational change, structural change refers to administrative actions that aim to improve performance by changing the structure of formal relationships such as positions of authority and responsibility. It includes the organizational structure of the organization as well as the structures of sub-departments and distribution of jobs as well as decision-making sources (Brilman, J., et al, p363). The process of structural change is related to the redistribution of competencies, grouping of jobs, redesigning lines of communication and channels of power and responsibility flow, and also includes the creation of organizational units and the exclusion of others (Griffin, R. W. 2021.p.392). . Structural change arises as a result of growth, new leaders or to respond to internal or external changes as well as to face strong competition (Gabriel, J. M. O., et al, 2013, p139).

The natural reaction to any change in most cases is to resist it in the beginning with force. Man by nature tends to resist what it may cause confusion, inconvenience, anxiety and fear, which requires managers to be careful and deal with the matter so that they can implement the change successfully and effectively, no matter how many perceptions that confuse what they were accustomed to (behaviors, actions and activities). Zaltman and Duncan (1977) defined resistance as " a behavior that maintains the status quo in the face of existing change and therefore resistance in an organizational setting is an expression of reservation that usually arises as a reaction or any action seen as an attempt to halt or delay change (Waddell, D.," 1998, p.543). Thus, resistance to change is an important aspect to consider when analyzing critical success factors for change management (Fritzenschaft, T. 2013, p.29). Hultman (1995) argued that resistance can be positive or negative, where the positive side is the selective use of facts and verification of the effectiveness of the change, and the negative side includes the failure to implement the change, procrastination, and withholding information (Kumar, S ,2014, p. 19).

Resistance to change is defined as any attitude or behavior that indicates unwillingness to support change. They are defending something important which shows the threat from the attempt to change (Uhl-Bien ,2020, p. 64), and resistance to change takes many forms and it can be obvious (Hellriegel, D. 2010, p. 520). such as feigning illness , increased number of absences, increased tendency towards union and labor union activities or organizing and participating in a strike, it can also be implicit such as falling motivation to work, the use of loud voice and hand gestures, as well as withholding information and delaying its arrival (Hendrickson, S , 2012 ,p. 54). As for the reasons that push workers to resist change, there are many different ones, including:

- Comfort with the familiar and fear of the unknown**:** individuals usually like to maintain familiar things because they feel content and comfortable and fear change because of new unfamiliar situations (Robbins, S.et al, 2017, p. 198).
- Not feeling the need to change and maintain the status quo (Schermerhorn Jr, 1991, p. 500).
- The material and human resources are insufficient.
- Previous failure of change efforts.

There are well-known and commonly used strategies to overcome resistance to change, including:

- **Teaching and communicating:** This method relates to the quality of workers (before the change is made) and discussing the ideas and issues raised frankly and clearly so that employees realize the justifications for change and the need for it. Through direct discussions, memos, reports or group presentation, and one of the most prominent advantages of this strategy is that when workers are convinced of this information, they will contribute to the process of implementing change, but this strategy takes a long time, especially when the number of those concerned with change is large (Johnson, G.2000, P. 647).
- **Participation:** resistance to change can be overcome if some workers are allowed to participate in the planning and implementation of change, and new ideas and methods can arise. The danger here is that participants may present an inappropriate design, as it may take a long time (Robbins, S. 2017, p201).
- **Facilitation and Support**: a simple yet effective method of overcoming resistance can be done by providing moral support, listening to what others have to say, or providing training opportunities for individuals to hone their skills.
- **Negotiation and agreement**: when employees or managers have the argument and the information that the change will harm them, the organization needs to negotiate with them, which means that some compromises must be made in order to seek agreement with them. This is done by providing incentives, benefits, and services (Strebel, P. 1994. P. 48). In some cases, this method may be appropriate and an easy way to avoid violent resistance and among its downsides is that it is very expensive ((Robbins, S. 2017, p201) .
- **Maneuvering and attracting**: In certain situations, managers may resort to using hidden methods to influence selectively, pre-program activities, or assign key roles in planning or implementing change to certain individuals or groups. However, it has some negative results as employees feel that the organization is maneuvering (Strebel, P. 1994. P.646).
- **Explicit and implicit intimidation**: Managers may resort to threatening employees with losing their jobs, reducing the opportunity for promotion, or making job changes in order to keep pace with change efforts. One of its advantages is that it is a quick method and may overcome resistance (Johnson, G., 2000, p.646).

5. The practical side of the study :
5.1. the study methodology.
 5.1.1   Study and sample population :

The study population consists of all employees at the higher administrative levels (high and ordinary) that included 19 institutions in the public sector and 19 institutions in the private sector, where the researcher chose the non-probability quota sample from the study community, and the numbers of interviewed managers in public institutions were 112, while private institutions were 68, and managers were chosen because they are the most closely related and aware of the processes of existing structural change as well as forms of resistance.

5.1.2 Study tool :

- **Field visits:** The researcher visited a group of institutions both public and private, and approval was obtained to conduct a field visit in some institutions where structural change and resistance were found.

- **Questionnaire:** The researcher used a questionnaire as a tool for this study. It was formulated with reference to literature reviews and the results of previous studies related to the subject. The questionnaire consisted of three main parts. The first part is concerned with data and information related to the personal characteristics of the study sample members. It included: gender, age, educational level, marital status and years of experience. The second part included the structural changes carried out by the institutions, based on the five-point Likert scale of strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree, while the third part included the forms of resistance that workers take in resisting the existing changes.

- **The validity of the study tool :** the researcher made sure of the apparent validity of the questionnaire by presenting it to a group of professors with experience in several disciplines to ensure that it covered the basic aspects of the topic, clarity, soundness of its formulation and contents, then it was modified based on their observations in deleting some phrases, modifying and adding new phrases to become clearer and more understandable to the sample members and more honest in the scale of the subject of this study

- **The Stability of the study tool :**

The stability coefficient was extracted according to the **Cronbach alpha test** for the internal consistency of the paragraphs of the questionnaire, and the following table shows the stability coefficient of Cronbach's alpha for the study tool aspects:

Table (1) : Distribution of research sample members by gender variable

The First aspect	Change in the organizational structure of institutions	0,92
The Second aspect	Forms of workers resistance to change	0,90

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.

 Study Methodology : the researcher used the descriptive analytical method for collecting, presenting, analyzing and interpreting data and information.

- **Statistical methods :** to answer the study's questions and test its hypotheses, the researcher resorted to **the SPSS** (Stratistical package for social sciences), through which the researcher used the following statistical methods:
  - Alpha Cronbach coefficient to check the stability of the scale used.

- Frequencies and percentages to describe the demographic variables of the study sample members.
- Arithmetic averages and standard deviations in order to answer the questions of the study and to know the relative importance of each paragraph to the aspects of the study.
- **Spearman's test** to know the relationship between the areas of structural change and the forms of resistance, where the researcher compiled the various items for the areas of change, as well as the various forms of resistance, according to the ACP method, which showed the presence of one output that was named, and then we measured the relationship of the areas of structural change and the forms of resistance.
- An analysis of variance **ANOVA** to find out if there are differences in the workers' answers to the forms of resistance due to demographic and functional variables.

Second: Presentation and discussion of the results
2-1-Characteristics of the research sample
-    **Distribution of study sample members by gender variable:** Table No. 1 shows the distribution of study sample members by gender variable through frequencies and corresponding percentages for each iteration.

Table (2): Distribution of research sample members by gender variable

Public institutions				Private institutions			
Variable	Item	Frequency	Percentage	Variable	Item	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	male	74	66,1%	gender	male	41	60,3%
	female	38	33,9%		female	27	39,7%

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.

Through the table, we notice that the percentage of males was predominant, whether in public or private institutions, where it was 66.1% in public institutions and 60.3% in private institutions, while the percentage of females in public institutions was 33.9%, and the percentage in private institutions was 39. 7%.

-    **Distribution of the study sample members according to the age variable:**
Table (3): Distribution of the research sample members according to the age variable.

Public institutions				Private institutions			
Variable	Item	Frequency	Percentage	Variable	Item	Frequency	Percentage
Age	From 20 to 30	13	11,6%	Age	From 20 to 30	7	10,3%
	From 31 to 40	36	32,1%		From 31 to 40	23	33,8%
	From 41 to 50	38	33,9%		From 41 to 50	26	38,2%
	Over 50	25	22,3%		Over 50	12	17,6%

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss,

It is clear from the table that most of the sample members range in age from 41 to 50 years, with a percentage of 33.9% in public institutions and 38.2% in private institutions, then the age group comes from 31 to 40 years, with a percentage of 32.1% in public institutions, as well as In private institutions, 33.8%, while the age group is over 50 years old, 22.3% in public institutions and 17.6% in private institutions, and in the end comes the age group from 20 to 30 years with 11.6% in public institutions and 10.3 % in private institutions.

- **Distribution of the study sample members according to the marital status variable:**

Table (4) : Distribution of study sample members according to the marital status variable.

Public institutions				Private institutions			
Marital status	single	23	20,5%	Marital status	single	12	17,6%
	married	80	71,4%		married	53	77,9%
	Widower/ widow	5	4,5%		Widower/ widow	2	2,9%
	divorced	4	3,6%		divorced	1	1,5%

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.

We note that the percentage of married people reached 71.4% in public institutions and 77.9% in private institutions, while the rate of singles in public institutions was 20.5% and 17.6% in private, while the percentage of widows was 4.5% in public and 2. 9% in the private sector, and the percentage of divorced in the public reached 3.6% and 1.5% in the private.

- **Distribution of study sample members according to the educational level variable:**
  - **Table(5): Distribution of study sample members according to the educational level variable.**

Public institutions				Private institutions			
Educational level	Primary	0	0	Educational level	Primary	0	0
	Middle	3	2,7%		Middle	0	0
	Secondary	25	22,3%		Secondary	10	14,7%
	University	64	57,1%		University	52	76,5%
	Postgraduate	20	17,9%		Postgraduate	6	8,8%

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss. -

The table shows that the majority of the sample members are from public institutions, representing 57.1% with a university level and 76.5% in the private ones, 22.3% with a secondary level in the public and 14.7% in the private ones. Postgraduate studies in public institutions, whose number reached 20 individuals, at a rate of 17.9% and 8.8% in private ones, and the percentage of the middle level reached 2.7% in the general public, while the percentage was absent at the primary and middle levels in private institutions.

- **Distribution of study sample members according to seniority variable**

Table (6) Distribution of study sample members according to seniority variable.

Public institutions				Private institutions			
Seniority	Less than 5 years	7	6,3%	seniority	Less than 5 years	3	4,4%
	From 5 to 10 years	35	31,3%		From 5 to 10 years	22	32,4%
	From 11 to 15 years	14	12,5%		From 11 to 15 years	20	29,4%
	More than 15 years	56	50%		More than 15 years	23	33,8%

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.

Through the table, it is clear to us that most of the sample members have an a experience of more than 15 years, with a percentage of 50% in public institutions and 33.8% in private ones. As for the category of individuals whose experience ranges from 5 to 10 years, their percentage was 31.3% in public and 32.4% in private sector, while the percentage of

individuals with experience from 11 to 15 years was 12.5% in public and 29.4% in private sector, and the category of less than 5 years was 6.3% in public and 4.4% in private sector.

6   Analyzing the results of the study and testing hypotheses

6.1 Analyzing the responses of the sample members to statements related to structural changes in institutions.

The researcher analyzed the responses of the study members by focusing on frequencies, percentages, average , standard deviation, and coefficient of variation.

- **Flexibility of the organizational structure:**

Table (6): Flexibility of the organizational structure.

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.

Statements	Public institutions				Private institutions			
Flexibility of the organizational structure:	Average	deviation	coefficient	f	Average	deviation	coefficient	f
1- The organizational structure was changed when departments or functions were created	3,71	1,043	0,280	3	4,04	0,742	0,183	1
2- The structure has been simplified by reducing the number of administrative levels.	3,69	1,066	0,289	5	3,75	0,870	0,232	2
3- New departments have been created that did not previously exist in the institution	3,81	1,018	0,267	2	3,53	1,240	0,351	5
4- New sections that did not exist before have been canceled	3,91	1,027	0,262	1	3,50	1,310	0,374	6
5- The administrative departments, which are similar in their activities, were grouped into one department.	3,82	1,092	0,285	4	3,72	1,208	0,324	4
6- Elimination of duplication of tasks in the various administrative departments of the institution.	3,81	1,135	0,297	6	3,75	1,098	0,292	3
7- All jobs were redistributed according to the educational qualifications of the employees.	3,57	1,367	0,382	8	3,24	1,436	0,443	8
8- The tasks were redistributed according to the skills and abilities possessed by the workers.	3,62	1,344	0,371	7	3,41	1,374	0,402	7
Total	3,74	1,136			3,61	1,159		

The results of the table indicate that this variable achieved an average of 3.74 for a 5-degree scale that falls in the OK domain and with a deviation of 1,136. "New departments that did not previously exist in the institution have been canceled" with a coefficient of 0.262, while statement No. 7 "all jobs were redistributed according to the educational qualifications of the workers" came in the last rank with a coefficient of 0.382, whereas private institutions achieved an average of 3. 61, with a deviation of 1,159, where the phrase No. 1 "has changed the organizational structure when creating departments or jobs" with a deviation of 0.183 ranked first, meanwhile phrase No. 7 "all jobs were redistributed according to the educational qualifications of workers" came in the last rank with a difference coefficient of 0, 443 .

These results indicate that institutions, whether public or private, seek structural change to face competition, to survive, to avoid the obsolescence of the organizational structure, and to become more effective.

- **Authority and Responsibility:**

Table (7) : Making changes by institutions (public, private) in authority and responsibility domain.

	Public Institutions				Private Institutions			
1- The institution changes the amount of responsibilities and powers.	3,78	0,984	0,260	2	3,78	1,049	0,277	5
2- The organization encourages employees to take responsibility.	3,69	1,066	0,289	4	3,97	0,846	0,213	2
11- Redistribution of responsibilities is carried out according to internal and external variables.	3,69	0,949	0,257	1	3,63	0,896	0,246	4
12- Employees see that taking responsibility is an opportunity to develop their business and themselves.	3,60	0,981	0,272	3	3,96	0,836	0,211	1
13- The structure works to delegate powers to individuals at another level.	3,45	1,222	0,354	6	3,29	1,328	0,403	6
14- There is a job description that defines the duties and responsibilities of each job.	3,78	1,145	0,303	5	4,32	0,921	0,213	3
Total	3,66	1,057			3,82	0,979		

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.

The results of the table indicate that this variable achieved an average of 3.66 for a scale consisting of 5 degrees located in the OK field and with a deviation of 1.057 in public institutions, where the first rank was occupied by the phrase No. 11 "The responsibilities are redistributed according to internal and external variables" with a coefficient of variation of 0.257 , when phrase No. 13 "The structure delegates powers to individuals at another level" came in the last rank with a coefficient of variation of 0.354, whereas private institutions achieved an average of 3.82 and with a standard deviation of 0.979, where the first rank was occupied by phrase No. 12 "The workers see that taking responsibility is an opportunity to develop their business and themselves" with a coefficient of variation of 0.979, while the statement No. 13 "The structure delegates powers to individuals at another level" came in last place with a coefficient of variation of 0.979.

These results also indicate that institutions, whether in the public or private sector, when undertaking structural change change the size of powers and responsibilities, where in public institutions they are primarily concerned with redistributing responsibilities according to internal and external variables, while in private institutions managers see that responsibility is an opportunity to develop their business and themselves.

- **Communication lines:**

- **Table (8): Communication in institutions (public, private).**

	Public Institutions				Private Institutions			
15- Ease of communication between departments.	3,79	1,099	0,289	4	4,22	0,769	0,182	3
16 - Increasing informal contacts between administrative levels.	3,51	1,162	0,331	5	3,97	0,880	0,221	4
17 - Relying on the use of modern means of communication.	4,09	0,833	0,203	1	4,21	0,939	0,223	5

18- The information transmitted through communication is accurate.	3,82	1,059	0,277	3	4,13	0,731	0,176	1
19 - Diversity of means of communication within the institutions.	4,02	0,968	0,240	2	4,24	0,755	0,178	2
Total	3,84	1,024			4,15	0,814		

The results of the table indicate that this variable achieved a total mean of 3.84 for a 5-degree scale that falls in the OK field and with a standard deviation of 1,024. Reliance on the use of modern means of communication" with a coefficient of variation of 0.203, while phrase No. 16 "increased informal communications between administrative levels" came in the last rank with a coefficient of variation of 0.331, while private institutions achieved an average of 4.15 and a standard deviation of 0.814, where the first rank was occupied by phrase No. 18 "information transmitted through communication is characterized by accuracy" with a coefficient of variation of 0.176, while phrase No. 17 "relying on the use of modern means of communication" came in the last rank with a coefficient of variation of 0.223.

- **Decision making:**

Table (8) : Decision-making in institutions (public and private

	Public Institutions				Private Institutions			
20- Decisions are studied before they are issued	3,96	0,879	0,221	1	4,15	0,950	0,229	2
21- Employees are involved in decision-making.	3,07	1,243	0,404	5	2,81	1,374	0,489	5
22 - The various alternatives available are evaluated before making a decision.	3,63	0,93	0,256	2	3,84	0,971	0,253	3
23- The administration works to reduce centralization in decision-making.	3,34	1,135	0,339	4	3,18	1,326	0,417	4
24- Information is available to the decision maker in a timely manner.	3,71	1,11	0,299	3	4,04	0,818	0,202	1
Total	3,54	1,059			3,60	1,087		

The results of the table indicate that this variable achieved an average of 3.54 for a 5-degree scale that falls in the OK field and with a standard deviation of 1,059, where the phrase No. 20 "Decisions are studied before they are issued" occupied the first position with a coefficient of difference of 0.221, while the phrase No. 21 "Workers are involved in decision-making" in the last rank with a coefficient of variation of 0.404, while private institutions achieved an average of 3.60 and a standard deviation of 1,087, whereas the phrase 24 "information is available to the decision maker in a timely manner" ranked first, with a coefficient of variation of 0.202 while phrase No. 21, "workers are involved in decision-making," came in the last rank with a coefficient of variation of 0.489.

For the purpose of identifying the extent to which public and private institutions carry out structural change, the total arithmetic average and standard deviation of all its fields were extracted, and the results were as follows:

	Dimensions of structural change	Public Institutions		Private Institutions	
		total average	total deviation	total average	total deviation
1	- Flexibility of the organizational structure.	3,74	1,136	3,61	1,159
2	- Authority and responsibility	3,66	1,057	3,82	0,979
3	- Communication lines	3,84	1,024	4,15	0,814
4	-Decision making.	3,54	1,059	3,60	1,087
	Total	3,69	1,069	3,79	1,009

- **Source:** Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.

The results of this table indicate that this variable achieved an average of 3.69 for a 5-degree scale and a standard deviation of 1,069, and this is with regard to public institutions, while private institutions achieved an average of 3.79 and a standard deviation of 1,009. When it comes to « lines of communication », public institutions had the highest arithmetic average of 3.84 as well as private institutions with an average of 4.15, then it came in second place after « the flexibility of the organizational structure » in public institutions with an average of 3.74, while private institutions ranked the second when it comes to « authority and responsibility » with an average of 3.82, and in the third place comes « authority and responsibility » in public institutions with an average of 3.66, while « the flexibility of the organizational structure » came after with an average of 3.61, and the last rank is in public institutions it comes after « decision-making » with an arithmetic average of 3.54 and a standard deviation of 1,059, and in private institutions after (decision-making) with an average of 3.60 and a standard deviation of 1,087.

This means that there is approval by the sample members on this area of change, and this is due to the importance of the organizational structure. Institutions that have a strong and clear organizational structure that is changed from time to time see that the effectiveness of administrative decisions and the speed of their implementation need to constantly develop the organizational structure and clarify the powers, responsibilities and levels of decision-making in the institution in order to avoid conflict in decision-making and the ease of transferring them to the executive levels increases their effectiveness and speed of implementation, which is reflected in the development of the performance of the institution as a whole.

- **2.2. Testing the validity of the first hypothesis:**

For the purpose of identifying the extent to which the employees face the structural change of resistance, the total arithmetic average and standard deviation of all the existing forms of resistance were extracted, and the results were as follows:

- **Analyzing the responses of the sample members to statements related to the forms of resistance taken to repel structural change.**
  Table (11): Arithmetic average and standard deviation of the resistance forms.

Visible resistance.	Public Institutions				Private Institutions			
When your organization makes a change in structure, you:	Average	deviation	coefficient	f	Average	deviation	coefficient	f
25 - openly declare the employees' refusal to change.	3,04	1,196	0,392	1	2,75	1,480	0,538	3
26- Increase hostility	2,90	1,215	0,418	2	2,46	1,365	0,555	5

towards the initiators of proposing change.								
27 - Increase conflicts within the institution.	3,01	1,305	0,433	4	2,43	1,364	0,562	7
28- feign illness, increase absence and delays	2,70	1,192	0,442	5	1,91	0,989	0,517	1
29- Increase the tendency towards union and the activities of labor unions	2,84	1,270	0,447	7	1,90	1,039	0,547	4
30- Leave work or increase job transfer seekers.	2,77	1,170	0,422	3	2,03	1,133	0,558	6
31- Organize and participate in a strike.	2,74	1,272	0,463	8	1,97	1,159	0,587	9
32 - sabotage production systems.	2,51	1,238	0,493	9	1,72	0,912	0,529	2
33- Increase the number of complaints and discontentment.	2,53	1,131	0,447	6	1,91	1,116	0,583	8
34- Do not abide by the rules and procedures of work.	2,55	1,279	0,501	10	1,82	0,078	0,591	10
Total	2,75	1,226			2,09	1,063		

- **Source:** Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.

- As for the implicit resistance, it is as follows:

Implicit resistance	Public Institutions				Private Institutions			
When your organization makes a change in structure, you:	Average	deviation	coefficient	f	Average	deviation	coefficient	f
35- have low motivation to work.	3,92	1,323	0,453	6	3,60	1,373	0,381	1
36 - Fail to use the full potential available.	3,51	1,301	0,370	1	3,54	1,348	0,394	2
37- Take longer periods of time to carry out the work.	3,34	1,298	0,388	2	3,49	1,409	0,404	3
38 - the number of mistakes committed is increasing.	3,18	1,344	0,422	3	3,01	1,409	0,467	5
39-Use high pitched voice and hand gestures.	2,54	1,275	0,447	5	2,21	1,073	0,486	6
40- Spread rumors about the negative consequences of the change.	2,85	1,350	0,514	7	2,93	1,353	0,462	4
41- Withhold information and delay its arrival.	2,63	1,315	0,436	4	2,06	1,035	0,502	7
Total	3,13	1,315			2,97	1,285		

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.

Workers' resistance (arithmeticaverage and total standard deviation).

	Workers' resistance	Public Institutions		Private Institutions	
		Average	Deviation	Average	Deviation
1	- Visible resistance	2,75	1,226	2,09	1,063
2	- Implicit resistance	3,13	1,315	2,97	1,285
	Workers' resistance	2,94	1,270	2,53	1,174

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss

The results of the table indicate that workers' resistance variable achieved a total average of 2.94 and a standard deviation of 1,270 in public institutions, while private institutions achieved a total average of 2.53 workers' resistance and a deviation of 1,174, where the implicit resistance comes first with a total arithmetic average of 3.13 With a standard deviation of 1.315, then in the second place the visible resistance with an average of 2.75 and with a standard deviation of 1,226. As for private institutions, the total average amounted to 2.53 and with a standard deviation of 1,174, where the implicit resistance comes first with an average of 2.97, then visible resistance comes with an average of 2.09 Through these results, it can be said that structural change, whether in public or private institutions, does not face resistance from workers, because this change is in their interest and benefits the organization. Therefore, we reject the first hypothesis "organizations, whether in public or private sectors, face resistance when changing organizational structure".

2.3. Testing the validity of the second hypothesis:

Correlation analysis is used to estimate the degree of linear relationship (the extent of a linear relationship) between two variables and the direction of this relationship. Using Spearman's coefficient to determine the type and strength of the relationship between workers' resistance and structural change.

-    **The Relationship of visible resistance and structural change**

Table (12) : The relationship of visible resistance and structural change.

Variables	Public Institutions		Public Institutions	
	Correlation coefficient	Significance level	Correlation coefficient	Significance level
The relationship between apparent resistance and the organizational structure	0,062	0,515	0,117	0,343
The relationship between apparent resistance, power, and responsibility	0,037	0,695	-0,043	0,728
Relationship between apparent resistance and communication lines	-0,149	0,117	-0,019	0,878
The relationship between visible resistance and decision-making	-0,114	0,232	0,269	0,027

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.

It is clear to us from the previous table regarding public institutions that the correlation coefficient between the apparent resistance and the change of the organizational structure is 0.062. It is also noted that the p.value is equal to 0.515, and this indicates that there is no correlation between the apparent resistance and the change of the structure, and it is also

clear from the table: there is no direct correlation between visible resistance and power with a correlation coefficient of 0.037 at the level of significance of 0.695, as well as the absence of a correlation between visible resistance and the lines of communication with a correlation coefficient of -0.149 and t p.value is 0.117, as well as the absence of a correlation between the apparent resistance and decision-making with a correlation coefficient -0.114 and a signifficance level of 0.232. As for private institutions, there is no correlation between the apparent resistance and the structure with a coefficient of 0.1117 at a signifficance level of 0.343, as well as a direct correlation between the apparent resistance and decision-making with a coefficient of 0.269 at a signifficance level of 0.027, and an absence of a correlation between the apparent resistance and power with a coefficient of -0.043 at the level of significance 0.728, as well as between the apparent resistance and the communication lines with a coefficient of -0.019 at the level of significance 0.878.

- **The Relationship between implicit resistance and structural change.**

Table 12: Implicit resistance and structural change1.

Variables	Public Institutions		Public Institutions	
	Correlation coefficient	Significance level	Correlation coefficient	Significance level
The relationship between implicit resistance and flexibility of the organizational structure	0,183	0,050	0,213	0,081
The relationship between implicit resistance, power, and responsibility	0,201	0,034	0,162	0,188
Implicit resistance relationship with lines of communication	0,107	0,260	0,119	0,333
The relationship between implicit resistance and decision-making	0,024	0,803	-0,220	0,071

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.
The correlation is statistically significant at the significance level of 0.05 .

It is clear to us from the previous table with regard to public institutions that the correlation coefficient between the implicit resistance and the flexibility of the organizational structure is 0.183. It is also noted that the p.value is equal to 0.050, and this indicates a weak direct correlation between the apparent resistance and the change of the structure. Also, there is a correlation between the implicit resistance and the power with a correlation coefficient of 0.201 at the level of significance 0.034 and the absence of a direct correlation between the implicit resistance and the lines of communication with a correlation coefficient of 0.107 and a P.Value of 0.260 as well as the absence of a correlation between the implicit resistance and decision-making with a correlation coefficient of 0.024 and a level of significance of 0.803, as for private institutions, there is no correlation between the implicit resistance and the structure with a coefficient at 0.213 and a level of significance of 0.081, as well as the absence of a direct correlation between the implicit resistance and the authority with a coefficient of 0.162 at a level of significance of 0.188 and an absence of a correlation between implicit resistance and communication lines with a coefficient of 0.119 at a level of significance of 0.333 and there is no correlation between the implicit resistance and decision-making with a coefficient of -0.220 at a level of significance of 0.071.

2.4. Testing the validity of the third hypothesis:

To find out if there are differences in the demographic variables (gender, age, marital status, educational level, years of experience) on individuals' resistance to change, we will use ANOVA

2.4.1. Public Institutions:

Table (14): Differences of demographic and functional variables in the apparent resistance.

	sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Gender	18,190	86	0,212	0,765	0,819
	6,917	25	0,277		
Age	77,670	86	0,903	0,977	0,552
	23,107	25	0,924		
Marital Status	32,679	86	0,380	0,911	0,637
	10,429	25	0,417		
Educational Level	45,455	86	0,529	1,263	0,259
	10,464	25	0,419		
Years of Experience	96,884	86	1,127	1,299	0,232
	21,679	25	0,867		

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.
The effect is statistically significant at the significance level of 0.05 .

We note from the table that there are no differences in individuals' answers to visible resistance to change due to personal and functional variables in public sector institutions.

. Table (15) Effect of demographic variables on implicit resistance.

	sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Gender	18,625	78	0,239	1,216	0,270
	6,482	33	0,196		
Age	79,618	78	1,021	1,592	0,069
	21,159	33	0,641		
Marital Status	28,774	78	0,369	0,849	0,725
	14,333	33	0,434		
Educational Level	44,811	78	0,574	1,707	0,045
	11,109	33	0,337		
Years of Experience	98,134	78	1,258	2,032	0,013
	20,429	33	0,619		

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.
The effect is statistically significant at the significance level of 0.05 .

We note from the table that there are differences in individuals' answers to implicit resistance due to educational level and years of experience in public sector institutions.

2.4.2. Private Institutions:

Table (16) : Differences in individuals' responses to visiblet resistance due to demographic variables.

	sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Gender	10,077	42	0,240	0,967	0,549
	6,202	25	0,248		
Age	37,482	42	0,892	1,366	0,205
	16,327	25			
Marital Status	13,367	42	0,318	2,155	0,022
	3,692	25	0,148		
Educational Level	9,370	42	0,223	0,872	0,660
	6,394	25	0,256		
Years of Experience	34,918	42	0,831	0,957	0,560
	21,715	25	0,869		

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.
The effect is statistically significant at the significance level of 0.05 .

We note through the table that there are differences in the responses of individuals to visible resistance to change due to the variable of social status.

Table (17) : Differences in individuals' answers to implicit resistance due to demographic and functional variables.

	sum of squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Significance
Gender	9,263	40	0,232	0,891	0,636
	7,017	27	0,260		
Age	35,875	40	0,897	1,350	0,208
	17,933	27	0,664		
Marital Status	12,959	40	0,324	2,133	0,021
	4,100	27	0,152		
Educational Level	11,948	40	0,299	2,113	0,022
	3,817	27	0,141		
Years of Experience	31,899	40	0,797	0,871	0,661
	24,733	27	0,916		

Source: Prepared by the researchers based on the outputs of the statistical program spss.

3. Results:

-        **Gender:** Through the results of the table, it is clear that the male element dominates the work, which gives them the greatest opportunity to advance to higher positions, while females tend to pay more attention to family and children than to developing their career path.

-        **Age**: Through the results of the table, it is clear that the institutions, whether public or private, each depend on older workers because they are distinguished by awareness and scientific knowledge as they are more experienced and competent, and the result also indicates that there is diversity in the average ages of the study community and this diversity serves the objectives of the study because it includes recognizing the attitudes of workers towards topics related to the field of work, and the accumulated experiences of individuals through their experiences contribute to a large extent in the formation of negative or positive attitudes towards a particular topic.

-        **Marital status:** This explains that most workers in leadership positions in institutions are married, and this indicates professional stability, and this is reflected positively on their job performance.

-        **Educational Level**: It positively indicates the extent to which Algerian institutions, whether in public or private sectors, are interested in having frameworks with high academic qualifications, which contributes to increasing the effectiveness of the requirements for change, and this reflects that it is possible to benefit from the scientific knowledge of the sample members of their different educational levels as well as their important opinions and experience regarding the subject of the study.

-        **Years of Experience:** Through the results of the table above , we note that the institution seeks to benefit from years of experience, especially in light of the process of expansion, restructuring and change that it is carrying out becase experience plays an important role in research , especially in keeping pace with the structural changes made by the institutions.

- Through the results of the applied study, it is clear that the Algerian organizations, whether public or private , always strive to make their organizational structure flexible in order to be able to carry out structural changes to adapt to internal and external environmental changes, to improve performance and to avoid the obsolescence of the organizational structure, where the total average of structural change in public institutions was 3 , 69 with a standard deviation of 1,069. As for private institutions : a total average of 3.79, with a deviation of 1,009.

- The presence of weak resistance by the workers to the changes that were established in the institutions of the study sample, which is an expression of their dissatisfaction , as well as the fear of the unknown and losing powers. The total average of resistance in this case in public institutions was 2.94 with a standard deviation of 1,270 and the predominant type was implicit resistance, as for the private institutions : the total average of the resistance was 2.53, with a deviation of 1,174, and the predominant type is also implicit resistance.

- There is a direct correlation between apparent resistance, authority and responsibility, as well as a direct correlation between implicit resistance and power, and implicit resistance and the flexibility of the structure in public institutions.

- There is a direct relationship between the apparent resistance and decision-making in the private institutions.

- There are differences in individuals' responses to implicit resistance in public institutions due to educational level and years of experience.

- There are differences in individuals' answers to apparent resistance due to marital status, and differences in implicit resistance due to both marital status and educational level.

- **Conclusion:**

From what was previously seen , we conclude that administrative work is no longer easy to implement, for example, as a hobby, but rather has become a continuous effort based on science and practical experience to deal with different circumstances, and that the knowledge and leadership capabilities of the manager have the main role in dealing with the surrounding changes and the challenges and effects they bear and by using scientific methods and ways to ensure the survival and continuity of the organization, whether public or private, when change has become an inevitable necessity in the life of organizations.

Reference:
Books:

– Beal III, L., Stavros, J. M., & Cole, M. L. (2013). Effect of psychological capital and resistance to change on organisational citizenship behaviour. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, *39*(2), 1-11.
– Brilman, J., & Hérard, J. (2011). *Les meilleures pratiques de management*. Editions Eyrolles.
– Geralds, J, Skiblins, (1994), *Organization elevation program for managing redicallehance,* American management associations.
– Griffin, R. W. (2021). *Management*. Cengage Learning
– Johnson, G., Scholes, K., & Fréry, F. (2000). *Stratégique*. Publi-Union. Pearson Education, France,
– Robbins, S. (2017). *Management: l'essentiel des concepts et pratiques/Stephen P* nouveux horizons-ARS, 6ème édition, Paris
– Salaman, G. (2003). Strategy and capability: sustaining organizational change.
– Schermerhorn Jr, J. R., Hunt, J. G., & Osborn, R. N. (1991). *Managing organizational behavior*. Wiley.
– Uhl-Bien, M., Piccolo, R. F., & Schermerhorn Jr, J. R. (2020). *Organizational behavior*. John Wiley & Sons.

Articles:

– Agbim, K. C. (2013). The impact of organizational structure and leadership styles on innovation. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*, *6*(6), 56-63.
– Fritzenschaft, T. (2013). *Critical success factors of change management: An empirical research in German small and medium-sized enterprises*. Springer Science & Business Media.
– Gabriel, J. M. O., Oburu, C. E., & Aduba, O. (2013). Managing change in Nigerian business organizations. *European Journal of Business and Management*, *5*(18), 138-143.
– Hellriegel, D. (2010). *Organizational behavior*. Cengage learning.
– Hendrickson, S., & Gray, E. J. (2012). Legitimizing resistance to organizational change: A social work social justice perspective. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, *2*(5), 50-59

- Kotter, J. P., & Schlesinger, L. A. (2008). Choosing strategies for change. *Harvard business review*.

- Kumar, S., & Shankar, B. (2014). ROLE OF ENTERPRISE RESOURCE PLANNING SYSTEMS IN MANAGING CHANGE: A CASE OF PUBLIC SECTOR ORGANIZATION. *Management Insight*, *9*(2).

- Strebel, P. (1994). Choosing the right change path. *California management review*, *36*(2), 29-51.

- Tran, Q., & Tian, Y. (2013). Organizational structure: Influencing factors and impact on a firm American journal of industrial Business management, 03.

- Waddell, D., & Sohal, A. S. (1998). Resistance: a constructive tool for change management. *Management decision*. , University press.