

# Organizational Change Dynamics and Their Impact on Employee Well-Being: A Quantitative Exploration within a Moroccan Hotel Chain

Ghita Taoussi, Khaoula Afilal

Permanent University Professor

Doctor in Economics, Management and Sustainable Development

Private University of Marrakech (UPM)

Associate Professor

Doctor in Economics, Management and Sustainable Development

Faculty of Sciences and Techniques (FST) of Tangier

## Abstract

This research aims to examine the effect of organizational change on the health and well-being of employees, a topical issue in the contemporary professional environment. The study focuses on a case of a Moroccan hotel company, providing an original insight into the hotel industry in Morocco. The main goal is to explore the links between the dimensions of organizational change and the health and well-being of employees, in order to determine how organizations can optimize the management of these transformations. The research adopts a quantitative approach, including the collection of primary data from the employees of the hotel chain, followed by the validation of the instruments and a rigorous statistical analysis. The results show that the clarity of the goals and the vision of the change is essential for the health and well-being of employees. Moreover, the involvement of employees in the decisions related to the change has a positive influence on their health and well-being. However, the role of communication in the change process has not been verified significantly. These findings have practical implications for managers, highlighting the importance of clarity in communicating the goals and the involvement of employees in the decision-making process. They suggest strategies to improve the health and well-being of employees and their adaptation to the change, fostering a more positive and productive work climate.

**Keywords:** Organizational change, employee well-being, hotel sector, quantitative exploration.

## Introduction

This research is situated in the context of the hotel sector, characterized by a demanding and dynamic environment, and examines the crucial issue of employee well-being. Hotels face specific constraints such as extended hours, high service standards and constant interactions with customers. These conditions highlight the need to preserve employee well-being to ensure their satisfaction, engagement and performance. The growing awareness of this need encourages hotels to implement initiatives for a healthy work environment. However, given the frequent organizational changes required to adapt to the evolving expectations of customers and industry trends, it becomes essential to understand the impact of these changes on employee well-being. This study aims to assess in depth this impact in the hotel sector, focusing on changes such as organizational restructuring, implementation of new policies, procedures or technologies. To achieve this objective, a quantitative method is employed, using an online questionnaire to collect data on the well-being, job satisfaction, stress level and engagement of the employees of the hotel chain in question following the organizational changes. The research addresses several key questions:

- ✚ Does organizational change lead to ill-being at work?
- ✚ What are the specific elements of organizational change that can influence positively or negatively the well-being of employees?
- ✚ What organizational support mechanisms can be established to reduce the negative effects of change on employee well-being?

The study aims to provide useful results for managers and decision-makers in the hotel sector, allowing a better understanding of the challenges related to organizational changes and the identification of appropriate strategies to support the adaptation and well-being of employees. In summary, it will contribute to an increased awareness of the importance of employee well-being in the context of organizational change in the hotel industry. As part of our research, we will develop a comprehensive literature review that will focus on three key areas: organizational change, employee well-being and the interrelation between these two aspects. This literature review aims to provide a complete overview of previous studies, relevant theories and research findings, thus providing a solid foundation for our study. Regarding the methodology adopted, our approach is quantitative, it will be systematic and rigorous, from the collection to the analysis of quantitative data. For data collection, we will use validated instruments to measure the variables of interest and ensure the reliability and validity of the data. Once collected, these data will be subjected to an in-depth statistical analysis to identify trends, correlations and possible causalities. Finally, the results will be presented in a clear and concise manner, followed by a thorough discussion that will highlight the practical and theoretical implications of our findings, as well as their contributions to the field of study of organizational change and employee well-being. This rigorous methodological approach will ensure that our research makes a significant and well-founded contribution to the existing literature in this area.

## **1. Literature Review**

This literature review examines the impact of organizational change on employee well-being, based on the definitions and key concepts related to these two notions. It explores the different theoretical perspectives and approaches of organizational change, as well as the different aspects and indicators of employee well-being. It analyzes the links between organizational change and employee well-being, identifying the favorable or unfavorable factors, and the strategies and practices of change management. It uses key concepts such as resistance to change, employee engagement, organizational communication and corporate culture.

### **1.1. Organizational change**

This section presents the concept of organizational change, its types, motivations, consequences and challenges. It emphasizes the importance of change for the survival and development of organizations in a dynamic world.

#### **1.1.1. Attempt at definition**

The concept of change is multidimensional and complex, and can be interpreted differently depending on the context and perspective adopted. Several authors have provided their definition of this concept:

Change as a process (Burnes, B. (2004)): This approach considers change as an evolutionary, transitional or transformational process that takes place over time. It involves modifications within the structures, systems, practices, processes or behaviors of an organization or a larger system.

Change as a state or outcome (Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2014)): Here, change is perceived as a state or outcome resulting from a transformation. This outcome can manifest itself through tangible or observable changes, such as the adoption of new policies, products, technologies or strategies.

Change as a disruption or rupture (Kotter, J. P. (1996)): This definition emphasizes the disruptive or disruptive nature of change. It can refer to events or situations that upset the balance or stability of an organization, requiring major adjustments.

Change as an adaptation (Dunphy, D., Griffiths, A., & Benn, S. (2014)): This perspective highlights the ability of an organization to adjust or adapt to changing conditions. Change is thus seen as a response,

proactive or reactive, to internal or external pressures, with the aim of maintaining the performance and viability of the organization.

Change as a learning process (Senior, B., & Swailes, S, 2017): Here, change is considered as a process of learning and organizational development. It involves the acquisition of new knowledge, skills, abilities, as well as the evolution of mindsets and behaviors within the organization.

### ***1.1.2. The forms of organizational change***

Organizational change takes several forms, classified into several main types: Structural change (Rosabeth M. Kanter, 1977): This is a change in the organizational structure of a company, including the distribution of tasks, hierarchy and internal communication. This change aims to improve organizational efficiency and can be motivated by the growth of the company or the adaptation to changing economic conditions. However, it can entail challenges and requires effective change management strategies to minimize the impacts on employees.

Technological change (Rosabeth M. Kanter, 1977): This type of change concerns the adoption, integration or updating of new technologies. It may involve the adoption of advanced technologies such as artificial intelligence, the updating of existing technologies, or the integration of new technological methods. Although it can improve efficiency and competitiveness, technological change can also present challenges, requiring strategic management and adequate training of employees.

Strategic change (Rosabeth M. Kanter, 1977): This is a profound transformation of the direction, structure and practices of an organization to meet new challenges or seize opportunities. This change may include diversification, merger, internal reorganization or strategic innovation. Its success depends on rigorous planning, clear communication and strong commitment of stakeholders.

Personnel change (Rosabeth M. Kanter, 1977): This change relates to the modifications of the workforce of employees, including hiring, firing, transfers and promotions. These changes influence the structure of the company, the corporate culture and the motivation of employees. Effective management of these changes requires strategic planning, transparent communication and consideration of human aspects.

Each of these types of organizational change has a significant impact on the organization and its employees, requiring careful management to ensure a successful transition and the well-being of employees.

### ***1.1.3. The models of organizational change***

The Kurt Lewin model (1940) proposes a process of organizational change in three stages: Unfreezing, Transition and Freezing. It emphasizes the need to challenge existing practices, adopt new attitudes and stabilize the change in the organizational culture, while recognizing the importance of communication, leadership and collective learning.

The eight-step model of John P. Kotter (1996) guides organizations through change, focusing on creating a sense of urgency, forming a guiding coalition, developing and communicating a shared vision, achieving quick wins, consolidating gains and sustaining the change in the organizational culture.

The 7S model of McKinsey (1980) addresses change management by focusing on seven interdependent elements: Strategy, Structure, Systems, Management Style, Skills, Staff and Shared Values. This model emphasizes the importance of aligning these elements to create an environment conducive to change.

These models, each with its specificity, offer comprehensive frameworks for understanding and effectively managing organizational change, highlighting the importance of preparation, communication and involvement of all levels of the organization.

### ***1.1.4. The determinants of organizational change in the hotel sector***

The hotel sector, constantly evolving, faces several challenges and opportunities that require organizational changes. Adapting to the changing expectations of customers for personalized experiences and quality services is crucial (Ottenbacher, M., Harrington, R. J., & Semeijn, J., 2012). The increased competition in the sector, exacerbated by new forms of accommodation and online booking platforms, pushes hotels to innovate (Buhalis, D., & Sinarta, Y., 2019). Market trends, such as sustainable tourism and health requirements, also influence the sector (Cheng, M., & Jin, X., 2017). Technological advances, including

online booking systems and artificial intelligence, require adaptation to improve customer experience and operational efficiency (King, C., & Prideaux, B., 2019). In addition, talent management is essential to maintain a competent and motivated staff (Sigala, M., & Michopoulou, E., 2019). Finally, the ability to respond to crises and unforeseen events is crucial for security and business continuity (Sigala, M., & Michopoulou, E., 2019). The sector must therefore navigate through these challenges to remain competitive, focusing on innovation, compliance with regulations and adaptation to market changes.

## **1.2. Well-being**

The well-being of individuals within the organization is a crucial aspect influencing their satisfaction, performance and engagement. It is therefore essential for managers and human resources professionals to understand the fundamentals of well-being in order to create a conducive work environment that fosters employee well-being. This section focuses on the fundamentals of well-being, exploring the key concepts, theories and factors that influence well-being at work.

### **1.2.1. Attempt at definition**

Well-being at work, encompassing the physical, mental and social well-being of employees, is fundamental in the professional context. It aims to create an environment where employees feel fulfilled, satisfied and balanced, which translates into an increase in productivity, creativity and customer satisfaction. Well-being at work encompasses the search for meaning, professional fulfillment, autonomy and recognition of employees' achievements. Several theoretical definitions illustrate the multidimensionality of well-being. The WHO defines it as a complete state of physical, mental and social well-being. Diener and Ryan (2009) distinguish between evaluative and experiential well-being. Ryff and Keyes (1995) evoke six dimensions of psychological well-being, including autonomy and positive relationships. Seligman (2011) highlights five key elements of lasting well-being, including positive emotions and sense of life. Deci and Ryan (2008) present the self-determination theory, emphasizing the importance of satisfying the basic psychological needs. These definitions highlight different aspects such as life satisfaction, positive emotions, social relationships and personal achievement.

### **1.2.2. The dimensions of well-being**

Well-being at work is a multidimensional concept, encompassing various aspects of employees' lives: Physical well-being: It concerns physical health, energy, and work-life balance, including nutrition, physical exercise and stress management.

- ✚ Emotional well-being (Ryff & Singer, 20081): It involves healthy emotion regulation, resilience, and a positive emotional state.
- ✚ Mental well-being (Wang et al., 20142): It refers to mental health, including stress, anxiety, self-esteem and a positive outlook on life.
- ✚ Social well-being (Diener & Seligman, 20023): It encompasses quality relationships with family, friends, colleagues, and a sense of belonging.
- ✚ Professional well-being (Deci & Ryan, 20004): It touches on job satisfaction, autonomy, recognition and opportunities for growth.
- ✚ Spiritual well-being (Emmons, 20055): It is about the quest for meaning, values and spiritual connection.
- ✚ Environmental well-being (Schultz & Tabanico, 20076): This dimension concerns the relationship with the physical environment and nature.
- ✚ Financial well-being (Luhmann, Hofmann, Eid, & Lucas, 20127): It includes financial stability and effective management of financial resources.
- ✚ Intellectual well-being (Csikszentmihalyi, 19908): It relates to intellectual stimulation and lifelong learning.
- ✚ Cultural well-being (Biswas-Diener, & King, 2006): It involves engagement in culture and arts.

These dimensions are interdependent and contribute to a global and holistic well-being. The balance between these different dimensions is crucial for a complete well-being.

### 1.2.3. The indicators of well-being

The indicators of well-being vary depending on the context and the measurement objectives. Here are some indicators that are frequently used. The table below summarizes these indicators:

**Table 1. Indicators of well-being**

<i>Indicator</i>	<i>Definition</i>
Indicators Definitions Job satisfaction (Warr, P., 1999)	Assessment of the general satisfaction of employees with their work, including contentment and professional fulfillment.
Work-life balance (Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C., 1998)	Measure of the ability of employees to reconcile professional responsibilities and personal commitments.
Stress level (Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R., 1983)	Assessment of the stress perceived by employees, related to various professional factors.
Physical health status (Hurrell, J. J., & Murphy, L. R., 1996)	Assessment of the general physical health, including illnesses, absences and vitality.
Work engagement (Kahn, W. A., 1990)	Measure of the engagement, involvement and motivation of employees.
Organizational climate (Schneider, B., 1990)	Perception of employees on the quality of relationships, support and communication at work.
Recognition and rewards (Rynes, S. L., Gerhart, B., & Parks, L., 2005)	Perception of employees on the recognition of their efforts and the opportunities for development.
Emotional well-being (Fredrickson, B. L., 2001)	Assessment of the emotional well-being, including satisfaction, optimism and resilience.
Social engagement (Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P., 1990)	Measure of the engagement of employees in social activities and their sense of community belonging.
Autonomy and control (Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M., 1985)	Assessment of the degree of autonomy and control of employees over their work.

It is crucial to select the appropriate indicators according to the measurement objectives and to evaluate them regularly to monitor the trends and improve the well-being of employees.

### 1.2.4. Well-being models

This section examines various theories and models to understand well-being at work, including the organizational support model, the burnout theory, and the job demands-resources (JD-R) model.

Burnout model (Maslach & Jackson, 1970): This model addresses the consequences of chronic stress at work, highlighting the emotional, cognitive and behavioral dimensions of burnout. The main aspects include emotional exhaustion, depersonalization and reduced personal accomplishment. The theory sheds light on the risk factors of burnout and its impact on the physical and mental health of employees, as well as on their professional performance. Organizational support model (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002): This model explores the impact of perceived organizational support on the well-being and performance of employees. It focuses on three forms of support: perceived organizational, supervisory and resource support. High support is linked to increased engagement, job satisfaction and psychological well-being.

JD-R model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2001): This model analyzes the relationships between job characteristics, personal resources, motivational processes and work outcomes. It distinguishes job demands (work requirements) from job resources (elements that help achieve work goals). This model suggests that

high demands and low resources lead to burnout, while high resources foster engagement and job satisfaction, thus influencing work performance.

These models and theories provide a framework for understanding and addressing the different factors that influence well-being at work, highlighting the importance of a healthy work environment and an appropriate balance between job demands and resources.

### ***1.2.5. The antecedents of employee well-being in the hospitality sector***

In the hospitality sector, various factors and antecedents influence the well-being of employees. This section explores elements such as workload, customer interactions, and human resource management policies. De Bloom and Kompier (2012) identify key factors affecting well-being in the hospitality sector, such as excessive workload, irregular schedules and time pressure.

Relationships with customers, sometimes stressful, and limited social support in seasonal or contractual jobs can also impact well-being.

Workplace safety, work-life balance and recognition and rewards are other important factors. Opportunities for professional development, a positive organizational culture, stress management, a pleasant physical work environment, and policies focused on well-being and health are crucial.

Autonomy and empowerment can also contribute to employee well-being. It is essential for employers in the hospitality sector to take these factors into account to foster a positive work environment, improve employee satisfaction and productivity, and ensure the quality of services offered to customers.

## **1.3. The dynamics between organizational change and employee well-being**

In this section, we will analyze the link between organizational change and employee well-being, focusing on the theoretical models that explain the impact of this change on well-being. We will also examine the factors that moderate this relationship and review previous studies on well-being in the hospitality sector, an area where organizational change is frequent and has notable effects on employees.

### ***1.3.1. Conceptualization of the impact of OC on EW***

In the hospitality context, it is crucial to understand the impact of organizational change on employee well-being. Various theoretical models have been developed to analyze this complex relationship. Among the most influential models are: The transition model of William Bridges (1991): This model describes the emotional and psychological phases that employees go through during a change. It emphasizes the recognition of emotions and the need for clear communication to facilitate a successful transition. The participation model of Edwin A. Locke (1960): This model highlights the importance of employee participation in the decision-making process. The involvement of employees enhances their sense of value, control, improves the adaptation to individual needs, and increases their commitment to the change. The social support model of Robert Kahn (1980): This model highlights the crucial role of social support in the well-being of employees facing changes. The support can come from various sources and take different forms, such as emotional, instrumental and informational. These theoretical models help to understand how organizational change affects employee well-being and emphasize the importance of coping and support strategies. They are essential for managers and human resources professionals to create a work environment conducive to the mental and physical health of employees in the hospitality sector.

### ***1.3.2. The moderators of the impact of OC on EW***

In this section, we study the moderating factors of the impact of organizational change on employee well-being, including organizational support, personal resources, and coping skills. The key mechanisms include stress, workload, loss of control, job insecurity, social support, development opportunities, justice perception, role clarity, change management, leadership quality, recognition, and work-life balance. It is essential to take these mechanisms into account to minimize the negative effects of change and promote employee well-being (Cohen et al., 1983; Karasek, 1979; Spector, 1986; De Witte and Näswall, 2003; House, 1981; Hakonen et al., 2006; Greenberg, 1990; May et al., 2004; Ford et al., 2008; Avolio and

Gardner, 2005; Bakker et al., 2004; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Deci and Ryan, 2000; Tims et al., 2013; ten Brummelhuis and Bakker, 2012).

### ***1.3.3. A review of the current knowledge on the effects of OC on EW***

Several previous studies in this field have been reviewed, providing specific insights on how industry-specific factors can influence employee well-being during organizational changes. Previous studies in the hospitality sector have revealed the following elements:

A study by Zhang et al. (2014) showed that organizational change, especially if it was perceived negatively or poorly managed, was linked to a decrease in employee well-being, resulting in more stress and less job satisfaction.

Karatepe and Kilic (2007) found that organizational change, especially if it was unpredictable and non-participatory, was associated with a decline in job satisfaction and mental health problems among employees.

Lee and Choi (2016) discovered that organizational change, especially if it was intense and frequent, was positively related to employee burnout.

Chiang and Hsieh (2012) showed that organizational change, especially if it was perceived as positive, was associated with an increase in organizational commitment and employee well-being.

Chen et al. (2015) found that the implementation of a new human resource management system had a positive impact on employee well-being by improving their job satisfaction and organizational engagement.

Maier et al. (2017) revealed that the merger of hotels had a negative effect on employee well-being, but the communication and participation of employees in the merger process could mitigate these negative effects.

A study by Liu et al. (2018) showed that change management, including the provision of organizational support, effective communication and development opportunities, could improve employee well-being during periods of change.

These studies highlight the importance of perception and management of change in the hospitality sector. Effective change management practices, such as transparent communication and employee participation, can mitigate the negative effects of change on employee well-being.

## **2. Methodology Adopted**

This section presents the methodology implemented for this study, which aims to analyze the impact of organizational change on employee well-being. It details the design of the study, describes the procedure of data collection and presents the method of data analysis.

### **2.1. Research framework: Churchill's paradigm (1979)**

In this section, we present the methodological framework of our study, inspired by Churchill's paradigm (1979). This paradigm allows us to organize the research, from data collection to analysis and interpretation, in a rigorous way.

#### ***2.1.1. Objectives of the study***

The objective is to understand how change influences employee well-being and to identify factors that mitigate its negative effects, including engagement, social support, communication and available resources. The results will help to enrich the literature on well-being at work and organizational change, and offer strategies to improve employee well-being during periods of transition.

#### ***2.1.2. Research model***

This conceptual model explores the impact of organizational change on employee well-being, integrating updated variables and relationships between them (Kurt Lewin, 19478; Maslach and Leiter, 19979). It focuses on two main dimensions: the various aspects of organizational change (nature, scope, implementation process, and management strategies) and employee well-being (job satisfaction, stress, engagement, and quality of work life).

Moreover, it examines the moderating factors such as social support, leadership, communication, available resources and individual coping ability, assessing their influence on the relationship between change and

employee well-being (Bass, 19851; House, 19812). The model guides the data collection and analysis through quantitative methods and statistical analyses (factor analysis, reliability analysis, and linear regression) to test the hypotheses regarding the impact of organizational change on employee well-being. The research hypotheses are formulated according to the variables identified in our conceptual model. Here are the hypotheses for this study:

**Table 2. Research hypotheses**

<i>Main hypothesis</i>	<i>General hypotheses</i>
A high level of communication on organizational change is associated with a high level of employee well-being (Men, 2014)	H0: There is no relationship between communication on organizational change and employee well-being. H1: Higher communication on organizational change is associated with a higher level of employee well-being.
The opportunities for employee participation in the decision-making process related to change are positively related to employee well-being (Cotton, Vollrath, Froggatt, Lengnick-Hall, and Jennings, 1988).	H0: There is no relationship between employee participation in the decision-making process related to change and employee well-being. H1: Greater employee participation in the decision-making process related to change is associated with a higher level of employee well-being.
The additional resources made available to employees to help them adapt to change are associated with a higher level of employee well-being (Hobfoll,1989).	H0: There is no relationship between the additional resources to help employees adapt to change and employee well-being. H1: A greater availability of additional resources to help employees adapt to change is associated with a higher level of employee well-being.
An increased clarity of the objectives and vision of organizational change is associated with a higher level of employee well-being (Kotter,1996).	H0: There is no relationship between the clarity of the objectives of organizational change and employee well-being. H1: Greater clarity of the objectives of organizational change is associated with a higher level of employee well-being.
Adequate support to cope with the stress caused by organizational change is associated with a higher level of employee well-being (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984)	H0: There is no relationship between the support to cope with the stress caused by organizational change and employee well-being. H1: Adequate support to cope with the stress caused by organizational change is associated with a higher level of employee well-being.

## 2.2.Data collection

This section deals with how to collect data. We will present the different phases of the process, such as defining the construct domain, creating a sample of items, designing the questionnaire, measuring the variables and choosing the sample.

### 2.2.1. Specify the domain of constructs

Our research focuses on the impact of organizational change, as defined by Armenakis and Harris (2009), on the well-being of hotel chain employees. It specifically studies well-being at work, a concept encompassing satisfaction, work-life balance, and stress, described by Warr (1999). We analyze how structural, technological and cultural changes influence these aspects, using the stress management framework of Lazarus and Folkman (1984) to understand the mechanisms and moderating factors involved.



### 2.2.2. *Generate a sample of items*

In our dissertation, we adopt a rigorous methodology to generate a reliable and valid sample of items, essential for measuring the variables of interest. The steps include:

- Definition of variables: clear identification of the variables to be measured, such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment.
- Literature review: use of previous studies to identify valid measurement scales (Cronbach, 1951 for the importance of scale reliability).
- Selection of items: choice of items demonstrating high validity and reliability from the existing literature.
- Measurement scales: adoption of scales recognized for their relevance and psychometric validity:
  - ✚ Well-being at work scale (Diener et al., 2004).
  - ✚ Clarity of change objectives scale (Xiong et al., 2014).
  - ✚ Employee participation scale (Li et al., 2012).
  - ✚ Communication on change scale (Ashford and Cummings, 1983).
  - ✚ Stress management related to change scale (Beehr et al., 2000).
  - ✚ Additional resources for learning scale (Saks and Ashforth, 1997).
- Adaptation of items: necessary adjustments to ensure the relevance of the items to our specific sample.
- Organization of items: logical structuring of the items in the questionnaire.
- Validation of the sample of items: use of statistical analyses, such as factor analysis and Cronbach's alpha, to ensure the validity and reliability of the measures.

### 2.2.3. *Development of the questionnaire*

Our study uses a questionnaire, developed following these steps, as the main tool for data collection (see appendix):

- Introduction of the questionnaire: a concise introduction explains the purpose of the study, ensures the confidentiality of the responses and guides the participants (Dillman, 2000).
- Demographic section: Collection of information such as age, gender, seniority, to contextualize the sample (Fowler, 2013).
- Organizational change section: Includes items on communication, participation and adaptation to change, assessed via a five-point Likert scale<sup>1</sup> (Likert, 1932).
- Employee well-being section: Includes items on job satisfaction, stress, work-life balance, also measured on a Likert scale (Diener et al., 2004).
- Formatting and presentation: Logical and consistent organization of the items, readable layout, and space for comments (Oppenheim, 1992).

The development of the questionnaire is done with particular attention to the clarity of the items and the adequacy of the scales, ensuring the validity and reliability of the results (Cronbach, 1951).

### 2.2.4. *Sampling*

In our study on the well-being of the employees of the hotel chain concerned, which has approximately 444 employees, we opted for a non-probabilistic accessible sampling. The choice was made to disseminate the online questionnaire via Google Forms, because of the simplicity of its distribution and collection of responses (Couper, 2000). A total of 98 questionnaires were used for the analysis. The advantages of this method include increased accessibility for employees, regardless of their location, and flexibility of response (Dillman, 2000). The automated collection of data facilitates their processing and analysis. Employees will receive an email containing the link to the questionnaire and information about the study, highlighting the voluntariness, anonymity, and confidentiality of the responses (Fowler, 2013). Participation is voluntary and

---

<sup>1</sup> In social and management sciences research, the number of points usually chosen is 5 or 7 (Roussel and Wacheux, 2005).

the data will be treated confidentially, used only for research purposes and without discrimination (Bryman, 2016).

After the collection, the data will be statistically analyzed to examine the trends and correlations related to well-being at work.

## **2.5. Data analysis**

Data analysis is an important step in any research, dissertation or thesis, as it involves the use of specific methods and techniques to process the data collected. This chapter is essential to formulate meaningful conclusions, answer the research questions and verify the hypotheses posed, as highlighted by Creswell (2014) and Yin (2018).

### **2.5.1. Purification of measurement instruments**

This section focuses on the purification of measurement instruments in our study, mainly analyzing the dimensionality of the instruments via SPSS. Factor analysis is used to condense a large number of variables into a reduced number of factors, revealing underlying relationships (Field, 2013). SPSS offers methods such as principal component analysis to discover the structure of the data and identify the main factors. Then, confirmatory factor analysis tests the validity of these factors (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Measures such as eigenvalue extraction, percentage of explained variance, and KMO test are used to assess dimensionality. This approach simplifies the complexity of the data and helps to understand the underlying structures, crucial for the analysis.

### **2.5.2. Quality of measurement instruments**

Reliability analysis in SPSS, frequently used to evaluate the quality of measurement instruments, verifies the internal consistency of the items of an instrument, i.e. their ability to measure uniformly the same theoretical construct. The main indicator of this analysis is Cronbach's alpha (Cronbach, 1951), which determines the degree of correlation between the items. A high Cronbach's alpha (ideally above 0.70) indicates good internal consistency, ensuring the reliability of the measure. This analysis is crucial to confirm that the instruments produce consistent and accurate results, an essential factor for the robustness and reliability of the research results (Nunnally, 1978).

#### **2.5.3. Correlations between variables**

Linear regression analysis in SPSS, a major tool for studying the relationships between variables, quantifies the linear relationship between a dependent variable and independent variables (Cohen et al., 2003). The method involves the following steps:

Data preparation: ensuring the cleanliness of the data in SPSS, without missing or aberrant values.

Variable selection: identifying the dependent variable and the influential independent variables.

Execution of linear regression: use the "Regression" then "Linear" function of SPSS to specify the variables to be analyzed.

Interpretation of results: Examine the regression coefficients, the p-values for statistical significance, and the coefficient of determination  $R^2$ , which indicates the variance explained by the model (Field, 2013).

In our results, it is essential to present these results clearly, highlighting the significant relationships and interpreting the model fit measures. Linear regression in SPSS provides an effective and reliable analysis of the correlations between variables.

## **3. Results**

This section is devoted to the presentation and interpretation of the results obtained through the analysis of the data collected. We will examine the results of the statistical analyses performed to answer our research questions and achieve our objectives.

### **3.1. Descriptive statistics of measurement scales**

#### **3.1. Descriptive statistics**

In this section, we present the descriptive statistics of the data collected from our survey of 98 employees undergoing different types of organizational change. We use numerical and graphical tools, to summarize and display the main characteristics and patterns of the variables of interest. The descriptive statistics provide a preliminary overview of the data and help us prepare for the inferential analysis in the next section.

### 3.1.1. Sample statistics

**Table 3. Descriptive statistics of the sample**

Variable	Interpretation
<b>Employee age</b>	The sample consists of 98 people: The majority of employees (44.9%) are between 35 and 44 years old. The 18-24 and 25-34 age groups are the least represented, with 19.4% and 18.4% respectively. Few employees are over 55 years old (2%).
<b>Gender distribution</b>	Out of 98 people, 51 are men (52%) and 47 are women (48%).
<b>Marital status</b>	Among the employees, 40.8% are single and 44.9% are married. A small proportion are divorced (13.3%) or engaged (1%).
<b>Region of residence</b>	Most of the employees (85.7%) live in the Marrakech-Safi region. Tangier-Tetouan-Al Hoceima and Casablanca-Settat have much fewer resident employees, with 13.3% and 1% respectively.
<b>Hotel of work</b>	The employees work in different hotels of the chain: The largest number of employees (32.6%) work at the Rabat hotel. The other hotels located in Marrakech also have a significant distribution of employees (18.4% and 16.3% respectively).
<b>Seniority in the hotel chain</b>	The employees have varied seniority periods: A large part of the employees (24.5%) have been working in the hotel for more than 10 years. About 19.4% have less than one year of seniority

Source : SPSS

### 3.1.2. Descriptive statistics of measurement scales

**Table 4. Descriptive statistics of measurement scales (CO) and (BE)**

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Moyenne	Ecart type
Changement organisationnel (15)	98 réponses/variable	1,00	5,00	2,2015	1,59113

Source : logiciel SPSS

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Moyenne	Ecart type
Bien être (27)	98 réponses/variable	1,00	5,00	2,3784	1,61781

Source : logiciel SPSS

The mean of 2.2015 indicates that the participants have on average a relatively low perception of organizational change among the 15 variables. The standard deviation of 1.59113 measures the dispersion of the responses around this mean, indicating a greater variability in the perceptions of change among the participants. These descriptive statistics show a variability in the perceptions of organizational change among the participants, with a relatively low mean. These results can serve as a starting point for a more in-depth analysis and a more detailed interpretation of the study.

The mean of 2.3784 suggests a moderate level of perception of organizational change among the participants for the 28 variables. The standard deviation of 1.61781 measures the dispersion of the responses around this mean, indicating a greater variability in the perceptions of change. These statistics show some variability in the perceptions of organizational change among the participants, with a moderate mean. These results serve as a basis for a more in-depth analysis and a detailed interpretation of the study.

### 3.2. Purification and reliability of measurement scales

**Table 5. KMO and Bartlett index of (CO) and (BE)**

Indice KMO et test de Bartlett		Vision et direction	Participation et implication	Communication	Gestion de stress	Apprentissage organisationnel
Indice de Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin pour la mesure de la qualité d'échantillonnage.		0,787	0,767	0,778	0,748	0,784
Test de sphéricité de Bartlett	Khi-carré approx.	416,205	295,035	350,612	349,368	359,132
	ddl	3	3	3	3	3
	Signification	<,001	<,001	<,001	<,001	<,001

Source : logiciel SPSS

Indice KMO et test de Bartlett		Satisfaction au travail	Bien être physique et psychologique	Engagement et réalisation de soi
Indice de Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin pour la mesure de la qualité d'échantillonnage.		0,946	0,924	0,943
Test de sphéricité de Bartlett	Khi-carré approx.	1818,567	1053,274	1774,199
	ddl	55	21	36
	Signification	<,001	<,001	<,001

Source : logiciel SPSS

In our study, the KMO index for the five dimensions of the organizational change variable varies between 0.748 and 0.787. These values indicate that the sampling quality is high, making the data suitable for factor analysis. A KMO index above 0.7 is generally considered good, suggesting that our sample is representative and that the variables measured are sufficiently correlated for a reliable analysis. We also performed the Bartlett's test of sphericity, obtaining a p-value lower than 0.001 for the five dimensions. This significant value indicates a strong correlation between the variables, thus justifying the factor analysis. These results show that the dimensions measured are interdependent, which is essential for factor analysis, allowing to identify the underlying structures and relationships between the dimensions. Moreover, for the three dimensions of well-being, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin index varies between 0.924 and 0.946, indicating a very satisfactory sampling quality. A KMO index above 0.9 is generally considered excellent, confirming that the variables measured in these dimensions are interdependent and suitable for factor analysis.

These results reinforce the validity of our measures and allow us to proceed with factor analysis with confidence, exploring further the relationships between the variables in the dimensions of well-being studied.

In conclusion, the high KMO indices strengthen the reliability and validity of our factor analysis results. In the study on organizational change, five dimensions were measured, excluding one component in each dimension.

The percentages of explained variance vary between 91% and 95%, indicating that these dimensions are essential to understand and explain the variance in the sample. A high explained variance demonstrates the relevance and representativeness of the dimensions to understand the phenomena studied, enhancing the validity and reliability of the results. Regarding the study on well-being, the percentages of explained variance range between 87% and 92%, showing that the three dimensions included explain a significant part of the variability of the data. These dimensions capture a major portion of the total variation, which validates and confirms the reliability of the measurement approach.

However, it is important to acknowledge that a small part of the variance remains unexplained, possibly resulting from factors not considered in the selected dimensions or random variations.

**Table 6. Reliability of measurement scales (CO) and (BE)**

Variable/ dimensions	Statistiques de fiabilité	
	Alpha de Cronbach	Nombre d'éléments
Changement organisationnel : Vision et direction	0,977	3
Changement organisationnel : Participation et implication	0,951	3
Changement organisationnel : Communication	0,966	3
Changement organisationnel : Gestion de stress et soutien	0,963	3
Changement organisationnel : Apprentissage organisationnel	0,968	3

Source : logiciel SPSS

Variable/ dimensions	Statistiques de fiabilité	
	Alpha de Cronbach	Nombre d'éléments
Bien être : Satisfaction au travail	0,986	11
Bien être : Bien être physique et psychologique	0,979	7
Bien être : Engagement et réalisation de soi :	0,990	9

Source : logiciel SPSS

In our studies on organizational change and well-being, the high values of Cronbach's alpha coefficient (0.951 to 0.977 for organizational change and 0.970 to 0.990 for well-being) indicate a strong internal consistency of the items in each dimension measured. These values, well above the generally accepted threshold of 0.7, confirm the reliability of the measures used. For organizational change, these values suggest that the items are closely related and measure consistently the concept studied. The similar responses of the participants to each dimension reinforce the internal validity of the measure. Similarly, for well-being, the high values of Cronbach's alpha demonstrate that the items of each dimension are strongly correlated, ensuring the reliability and validity of the measurement scale. This indicates that the items are consistent and reliably assess the specific concept targeted, thus consolidating the internal validity of this measure.

### 3.3.Linear regression

**Table 7. Results of linear regression**

Récapitulatif des modèles				
Modèle	R	R-deux	R-deux ajusté	Erreur standard de l'estimation
1	0,965 <sup>a</sup>	0,931	0,928	10,58540

Source : logiciel SPSS

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Modèle		Somme des carrés	ddl	Carré moyen	F	Sig.
1	Régression	139787,476	5	27957,495	249,508	<0,001 <sup>b</sup>
	de Student	10308,657	92	112,051		
	Total	150096,133	97			

Source : logiciel SPSS

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Modèle		Coefficients non standardisés		Coefficients standardisés	t	Sig.
		B	Erreur standard			
1	(Constante)	3,433	2,168		1,584	0,117
	Vision et direction	4,576	0,679	0,555	6,736	<,001
	Participation et implication	2,004	0,810	0,234	2,475	0,015
	Communication	-0,190	0,968	-0,022	-,197	0,845
	Gestion du stress et du soutien	1,946	0,881	0,222	2,209	0,030
	Apprentissage organisationnel	0,034	0,921	0,004	0,037	0,971

Source : logiciel SPSS

In this regression analysis, several key indicators are used to evaluate the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable.

- The multiple correlation coefficient of 0.965 indicates a very strong linear correlation between the independent variables and the dependent variable, suggesting that the independent variables are strongly related to the dependent variable.
- The coefficient of determination (R-squared) of 0.931 means that 93.1% of the variance of the dependent variable is explained by the independent variables. This indicates that a large part of the variance of the dependent variable is captured by the model.
- The adjusted R-squared of 0.928, considering the number of independent variables and the sample size, shows that the adjusted model explains 92.8% of the variance, which is slightly lower than the unadjusted R-squared but still high, indicating a good fit of the model.
- The standard error of the estimate at 10.58540 reveals some dispersion around the values predicted by the model, indicating that the predictions may vary by about 10.6 units from the actual values.
- Regarding the B coefficients, they indicate the impact of each independent variable on the dependent variable. For example, a B of 4.576 for “Vision and direction” suggests a significant positive contribution to the dependent variable. The associated standard errors, such as 0.679 for “Vision and direction”, indicate the accuracy of these estimates, with a lower standard error implying a more precise estimate.
- The Beta coefficients show the standardized impact of each independent variable, with, for example, 0.555 for “Vision and direction”, indicating a significant impact.
- The t-value, such as 6.736 for “Vision and direction”, allows to test the statistical significance of the coefficients, with higher values indicating greater significance.

Finally, the Sig values (p-value) provide the statistical significance of the coefficients. For example, a Sig value of <0.001 for “Vision and direction” indicates that this coefficient is statistically significant, unlike a Sig value of 0.971 for “Organizational learning”, suggesting that the latter is not significant.

#### 4. Discussion

The last section of our work will be devoted to the discussion of the results. We will explain these results in light of the literature review carried out previously and discuss their practical implications for managers and employees in the hotel sector. Following our analysis including reliability, item validation and linear regression, we explored the impact of organizational change on the well-being of employees in the hotel

chain. Our results highlight significant links, in agreement with several key theories and studies in the field of change management and well-being at work.

#### **4.1. Communication and clarity of objectives**

Our results indicate a positive correlation between clear communication of the objectives of change and employee well-being. This finding aligns with the theory of organizational commitment by Meyer and Allen (1997), which emphasizes the importance of clarity of objectives for employee engagement. However, Men (2014) also highlighted that information overload can lead to confusion, suggesting that the quality of communication is as crucial as its clarity. It is therefore essential to balance the quantity and quality of information communicated to optimize the effect on employee well-being.

#### **4.2. Employee participation**

The active participation of employees in decisions related to change is positively linked to their well-being, which corroborates the theory of self-determination by Deci and Ryan (2000). However, participation is not always possible in all organizational contexts, and there may be limitations to how it is implemented. As Wilkinson (1998) points out, effective participation requires not only the involvement of employees but also a real consideration of their opinions, which is not always the case in practice. This raises questions about the authenticity of participation and its real impact on well-being.

#### **4.3. Support for stress**

The support provided to employees to cope with stress related to change is positively correlated to their well-being. This conclusion is in line with the theory of conservation of resources by Hobfoll (1989), which highlights the importance of social and organizational support. Nevertheless, as the studies by Bakker and Demerouti (2007) show, the perception of support can vary greatly among individuals. Thus, the same level of support may not be sufficient for all employees, highlighting the need for personalized approaches in stress management.

#### **4.4. Limitations of additional resources**

The absence of a significant effect of additional resources on employee well-being is a surprising finding, contrary to expectations based on the work of Karasek (1979) on the demand-control theory. This suggests that other factors, such as the adequacy of resources to the specific needs of employees or their ease of access, could be important variables. This observation highlights the complexity of the interaction between resources, work demands and employee autonomy, as discussed by Demerouti et al. (2001) in their demands-resources model.

Although our results support the importance of communication, participation and support in change management, they also reveal the need for a nuanced and personalized implementation of these strategies. The approach must be adapted to the specific needs and individual perceptions of employees to maximize the impact on their well-being. These findings suggest directions for future research as well as practical implications for managers in the hotel sector, in order to promote a more favorable work environment for employee well-being during periods of change.

### **Conclusion**

Our study, focused on the employees of the hotel chain in question, offers crucial practical implications for managers and employees in the tourism sector, aiming to improve employee well-being. We emphasize the importance of clear and transparent communication strategies to reduce uncertainty and stress, in line with Meyer and Allen (1997) on organizational commitment. Regular meetings and open communication channels are essential for a common understanding of the objectives.

The active participation of employees in the decision-making process, supported by the theory of self-determination by Deci and Ryan (2000), is another key element. Working groups and brainstorming sessions can enhance their sense of appreciation and contribute to their well-being. However, Wilkinson (1998) warns against the limitations of effective participation, highlighting the need for a real consideration of employee opinions.

Support for managing stress from change is also crucial. Stress management programs, individual coaching and training on stress management techniques, in accordance with the theory of conservation of resources by

Hobfoll (1989), can help employees maintain their well-being. However, Bakker and Demerouti (2007) remind us that the perception of support varies among individuals, requiring personalized approaches. Although our study did not establish a significant link between additional resources and well-being, it is important to continue to explore this relationship. Providing appropriate resources, including training and professional development, remains crucial, even if their direct impact on well-being is not clearly demonstrated. We also recommend that managers regularly assess the level of employee satisfaction through surveys and interviews, to identify and address potential issues. By implementing these recommendations, managers can foster employee well-being, having a positive impact on their engagement and performance. Despite these contributions, our study has limitations, notably in terms of sample size, response bias and context specific to the hotel chain. These factors could influence the interpretation of the results and limit their generalization. Future research should consider these limitations, exploring various contexts and sectors, and using longitudinal and objective measures for a deeper understanding of the impact of organizational change on employee well-being.

## References

1. Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1-18.
2. Armenakis, A. A., & Harris, S. G. (2009). Reflections: Our journey in organizational change research and practice. *Journal of Change Management*, 9(2), 127-142.
3. Ashford, S. J., & Cummings, L. L. (1983). Feedback as an individual resource: Personal strategies of creating information. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 32(3), 370-398.
4. Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315-338.
5. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 499-512.
6. Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Verbeke, W. (2004). Using the job demands-resources model to predict burnout and performance. *Human Resource Management*, 43(1), 83-104.
7. Beehr, T. A., Jex, S. M., Stacy, B. A., & Murray, M. A. (2000). Work stressors and coworker support as predictors of individual strain and job performance. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(4), 391-405.
8. Biswas-Diener, R., & King, L. A. (2006). The psychology of subjective well-being. In M. Eid & R. J. Larsen (Eds.), *The science of subjective well-being* (pp. 63-84). Guilford Press.
9. Bridges, W. (1991). *Managing transitions: Making the most of change*. Addison-Wesley.
10. Buhalis, D., & Sinarta, Y. (2019). Real-time co-creation and nowness service: lessons from tourism and hospitality. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 36(5), 563-582.
11. Burnes, B. (2004). Emergent change and planned change – competitors or allies? The case of XYZ construction. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 24(9), 886-902. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01443570410552108>
12. Cheng, M., & Jin, X. (2017). What do Airbnb users care about? An analysis of online review comments. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 76, 58-70.
13. Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
14. Cohen, S., Kamarck, T., & Mermelstein, R. (1983). A global measure of perceived stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 24(4), 385-396.
15. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
16. Cronbach, L. J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16(3), 297-334.
17. Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
18. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.

19. De Witte, H., & Näswall, K. (2003). Objective vs subjective job insecurity: Consequences of temporary work for job satisfaction and organizational commitment in four European countries. *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, 24(2), 149-188
20. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500-507.
21. Emmons, R. A. (2005). Striving for the sacred: Personal goals, life meaning, and religion. *Journal of Social Issues*, 61(4), 731-745.
22. Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.
23. Ford, J. K., Smith, E. M., Weissbein, D. A., Gully, S. M., & Salas, E. (1998). Relationships of goal orientation, metacognitive activity, and practice strategies with learning outcomes and transfer. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 218.
24. Fowler, F. J. (2013). *Survey research methods* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
25. Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, 56(3), 218-226.
26. Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.
27. Hakanen, J., Bakker, A. B., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2006). Burnout and work engagement among teachers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 43(6), 495-513.
28. House, J. S. (1981). *Work stress and social support*. Addison-Wesley.
29. Hurrell, J. J., & Murphy, L. R. (1996). Occupational stress interventions. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 29(4), 338-341.
30. Kahn, R. L. (1980). Social support: Content, causes and consequences. In A. Baum, J. E. Singer, & S. E. Taylor (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology and health* (Vol. 4, pp. 253-267). Erlbaum.
31. Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. Basic Books.
32. Karasek, R. A. (1979). Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: Implications for job redesign. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(2), 285-308.
33. King, C., & Prideaux, B. (2019). *Tourism, climate change and sustainability*. Routledge.
34. Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading Change*. Harvard Business Review Press.
35. Kossek, E. E., & Ozeki, C. (1998). Work-family conflict, policies, and the job-life satisfaction relationship: A review and directions for organizational behavior-human resources research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 83(2), 139-149.
36. Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer Publishing Company.
37. Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method and reality in social science; social equilibria and social change. *Human Relations*, 1(1), 5-41.
38. Li, A., Cropanzano, R., & Molina, A. (2012). Fairness at the unit level: Justice climate, justice climate strength, and peer justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2), 421-436.
39. Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, 22(140), 1-55.
40. Luhmann, M., Hofmann, W., Eid, M., & Lucas, R. E. (2012). Subjective well-being and adaptation to life events: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102(3), 592-615.
41. McKinsey & Company. (1980). *The McKinsey 7S Framework*.
42. Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). Affective and continuance commitment to the organization: Evaluation of measures and analysis of concurrent and time-lagged relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82(1), 30-43.
43. Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory* (2nd ed.). McGraw-Hill.
44. Oppenheim, A. N. (1992). *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement*. Pinter Publishers.
45. Ottenbacher, M., Harrington, R. J., & Semeijn, J. (2012). Innovations in the international hotel industry. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 36(3), 391-411.
46. Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The structure of psychological well-being revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719-727.
47. Rynes, S. L., Gerhart, B., & Parks, L. (2005). Personnel psychology: Performance evaluation and pay for performance. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 56, 571-600.



48. Saks, A. M., & Ashforth, B. E. (1997). Socialization tactics: Longitudinal effects on newcomer adjustment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(1), 149-178.
49. Schneider, B. (1990). The climate for service: An application of the climate construct. In B. Schneider (Ed.), *Organizational climate and culture* (pp. 383-412). Jossey-Bass.
50. Schultz, P. W., & Tabanico, J. (2007). Self, identity, and the natural environment: Exploring implicit connections with nature. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(6), 1219-1247.
51. Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish: A visionary new understanding of happiness and well-being*. Free Press.
52. Senior, B., & Swales, S. (2017). *Organizational Change* (5th ed.). Pearson.
53. Spector, P. E. (1986). Perceived control by employees: A meta-analysis of studies concerning autonomy and participation at work. *Human Relations*, 39(11), 1005-1016.
54. Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson Education.
55. ten Brummelhuis, L. L., & Bakker, A. B. (2012). Staying engaged during the week: The effect of off-job activities on next day work engagement. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(4), 445-455.
56. Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Derks, D. (2013). The impact of job crafting on job demands, job resources, and well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 18(2), 230-240.
57. Wang, M., et al. (2014). Work-family conflict and burnout among Chinese doctors: The mediating role of psychological capital. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 56(4), 300-306.
58. Warr, P. (1999). Well-being and the workplace. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp. 392-412). Russell Sage Foundation.
59. Warr, P. (1999). *Psychology at work* (5th ed.). Penguin Books.
60. Wilkinson, A. (1998). Empowerment: Theory and practice. *Personnel Review*, 27(1), 40-56.
61. Xiong, J., Lipsitz, O., Nasri, F., Lui, L. M. W., Gill, H., Phan, L., ... & McIntyre, R. S. (2020). Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on mental health in the general population: A systematic review. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 277, 55-64.
62. Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.

## APENDIX: Questionnaire

Dear participant,

We are grateful for your willingness to complete the questionnaire on organizational change and the well-being of collaborators working in the Hotel Chain. The aim of this survey is to better understand how to manage organizational change to ensure the well-being of collaborators.

Please note that all your responses will be treated anonymously and confidentially, and will only be used for research purposes. The estimated time to complete this questionnaire is about five minutes.

We would like to emphasize that your responses are valuable for improving the HR policies and practices of the hotel Chain in terms of well-being and mental health. We therefore express our sincere appreciation for your contribution to this study.

If you have any questions or concerns about this questionnaire, please feel free to contact me at [taoussighita@gmail.com](mailto:taoussighita@gmail.com)

Once again, thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

TAOUSSI Ghita

### PART 1: Socio-demographic information

How old are you?

- 18-24 years old
- 25-34 years old
- 35-44 years old
- 45-54 years old

What is your gender?

- Female
- Male

What is your marital status?

- Married
- Single
- Divorced
- Other

In which region do you live?

- o Tangier - Tetouan - AL Hoceima
  - o Marrakech - Safi
  - o Casablanca - Settat
  - o Other
- What is your current position?  
In which Hotel do you work?

- o Menzah
  - o Kasbah
  - o Agdal Palace
  - o Menara
  - o Tangier
- How long have you been working in the hotel?
- o Less than a year
  - o Between 1 and 3 years
  - o Between 3 and 5 years
  - o Between 5 and 10 years
  - o More than 10 years

## **PART 2: ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE**

### ***Section 1: Vision and direction***

- Did the senior management communicate a clear vision of the change?
- Did the senior management set clear goals for the change?
- Did the senior management show a strong commitment to the change?

### ***Section 2: Participation and involvement***

- As an employee, were you involved in the decision-making process related to the change?
- As an employee, did you have the opportunity to give your opinion on the change?
- As an employee, were you encouraged to actively engage in the change?

### ***Section 3: Communication***

- Was the communication on the change regular and transparent?
- As an employee, did you receive adequate information on the reasons and objectives of the change?
- Were the communication channels used for the change effective?

### ***Section 4: Stress management and support***

- As an employee, did you receive adequate support to cope with the stress caused by the change?
- Were additional resources made available to help you adapt to the change?
- As an employee, were you encouraged to express your concerns and ask for help during the change?

### ***Section 5: Organizational learning***

- As an employee, were you encouraged to acquire new skills and knowledge related to the change?
- Were the knowledge and lessons learned during the change shared and used to improve the organization?
- Did the organization put in place mechanisms to foster continuous learning related to the change?

## **PART 2: WELL-BEING**

### ***Section 1: Job satisfaction***

- Are you satisfied with the relationship you have with your co-workers?
- Are you satisfied with the recognition you receive for your work?
- Are you satisfied with the promotion opportunities in your work?
- Does your work provide you with a sense of financial security?
- Are you satisfied with the communication within your work?
- Are you satisfied with the problem-solving in your work?
- Are you satisfied with the quality of the information you receive to perform your work?
- Are you satisfied with the quality of the social benefits (health insurance, life insurance, etc.) offered by your work?
- Are you satisfied with the quality of the training you receive to perform your work?
- Does your work provide you with a sense of job security?
- Are you satisfied with the way your work is evaluated and rated by others?

### ***Section 2: Physical and psychological well-being***

- Are you satisfied with your safety in your work?
- Are you satisfied with the freedom and autonomy in your work?
- Are you satisfied with your free time in your work?
- Are you satisfied with the working conditions (noise, temperature, light, etc.)?
- Are you satisfied with the physical environment of your work?
- Does your work give you a sense of control over your life?
- Does your work allow you to maintain a good balance between your professional and personal life?

### ***Section 3: Commitment and self-fulfillment***

- Do you find your work stimulating and interesting?
- Does your work allow you to use your skills?
- Does your work give you a sense of accomplishment?

- Does your work give you a sense of personal importance?
- Are you satisfied with the variety of your work?
- Are you satisfied with the clarity of the objectives of your work?
- Are you satisfied with the quality of the equipment and tools you use in your work?
- Are you satisfied with the way your workload is distributed?
- Does your work allow you to contribute positively to society?
- Are you satisfied with the way your work is organized?

If you have any comments, please feel free to mention them: