Elizabeth J. Kahle
Boston College
15 April 2024

MESA MEd, MA and MS Comprehensive Exam

Section I: Research Problem and Purpose

1.   What was the general problem that was being investigated?

Digital change initiatives are becoming ubiquitous in nearly every organizational domain – except the public service sector. Recent research on the implementation of algorithmic decision-making tools within domains of public service delivery suggests that public organizations "face multiple barriers that ultimately hinder public sector IT projects from delivering on their promises" (Doring et al., 2023). These barriers, however, have yet to be defined or empirically tested – the authors note that there is "astonishingly little" empirical research on digital changes within the public service sector and their subsequent effects on employee attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors. As stated in the article there is a "pressing need to understand not only why such digital change processes in the public sector fail to deliver on their promises, but also the implications of project implementation failure for the public organizations themselves as well as the employees" (Doring et al., 2023) .Existing research has primarily focused on implementing similar tools into public sector organizations, the outcomes that were most often assessed focused on tool efficiency and effectiveness, in essence pushing the assumption that the public employees who implement them in practice are entirely unaffected.

In addition to little empirical evidence existing on organizational change in the public sector, it is also the case that, regardless of organizational domain, little knowledge exists in the literature about the causal effects linked to individual episodes of change during organizational change initiatives. Despite this study's main findings showing limited direct effects of change episode on cynicism and fatigue, the article offers novel field experiment evidence on the intra-organizational effects of technologically driven change processes.

2.   What was the specific <u>purpose</u> of the article in your own words?

The purpose of this research article was to investigate individual changes in attitude (i.e. cynicism) and behavior (i.e. fatigue) because of implementing an algorithmic-based assessment tool at the organizational level. More specifically, this study followed a randomized controlled trial design to empirically analyze and disentangle causal links between technology-based organizational change initiatives and as hypothesized by the authors, the subsequent impacts that digital change processes have on an individual's cynicism and fatigue.

The researchers first aim to provide insight into the psychological mechanisms underlying change cynicism and fatigue through the development of a theoretical model consisting of attribution theory, expectancy theory, and conversation of resources theory. The researchers test the theoretical framework and its cynicism and fatigue constructs through field experiments: "our research group was given full control [over]l the experimental setup including the randomization process, we can test causal claims about the impact of a single change episode on our variables of interest: change cynicism and change fatigue" (Doring et al., 5). In tandem with the experiment's purpose, the research team's overall goal was to provide insight for understanding whether or how

organizational change can be a driver of fatigue and cynicism for employees working within the public service domain specifically.

3.   Analyze the author's purpose statement:
a. To what extent was the purpose clear (could you find it), unambiguous (were there poorly defined popular fad phrases such as "family-values" that were not defined) and objective (was there biased language such as "we will prove…")?

An explicit purpose statement was not included in the article. However, in the introduction section there is a clearly marked and well-defined research question, along with a sequential explanation of how the study addresses this question (page 2: "*In this paper…*"). The research question is: *"How does an individual change episode relating to algorithm-based tools affect employees' change fatigue and cynicism?"* (Doring et al., 2023). The remaining paragraph explains this question in more detail and context.

In terms of ambiguity, one criticism I have pertains to the author's word choice in the phrase, "individual change episode." The phrase itself is vague and thus up to subjective interpretation. Likewise, this terminology does not appear to align with the experiment timeline; the experiment lasted a total of 10 months, with data collection only occurring at one time point (6 months after implementation). The word "episode" would be more applicable for describing the hypotheses of an experiment that is designed using an intermittent time frame. For example, an intervention that is implemented once a week over the span of several months.

b. To what extent were the important variables and population clearly identified?

The two dependent variables, change cynicism and change fatigue, are mentioned in the question itself. Similarly, the population is explicitly discussed in the same paragraph.

c. To what extent was the significance of the problem clear?

Lastly, the language, vocabulary, and acronym use is poorly structured. It becomes difficult to conceptualize important key aspects of the research such as the problem, purpose, and questions at hand when dealing with topics that utilize concepts such as "algorithmic-based assessment tools" and "AI machine learning for risk assessment" and "street-level bureaucrats" Most people reading this study likely know what these terms mean in the general sense, yet it does not make the study any more useful to wait until the third and fourth page to define them in context and application use.

Section II: Research Hypotheses

5. State the primary hypothesis in your own words. Simply address one hypothesis if multiple ones were presented.

The alternative hypothesis being tested in the experiment is that employee's cynicism towards change, as well as their change fatigue, will proliferate as an expected result of encountering the contested implementation of the risk-assessment tool. In the article, these two measures (i.e. the two dependent variables) are framed as two separate hypotheses (H1 and H2); The hypotheses are based on a common argument found in the literature that predicts change cynicism and change fatigue to be positively related. The research study operationalizes change cynicism and change fatigue independently because of their construct properties: cynicism is conceptualized as an attitudinal construct designed to assess beliefs, affects and behaviors while the construct of fatigue is designed to measure perceptions, such as one's perceived control, influence, and power on outcomes.

6. Was the author's hypothesis clear and were the variables and population clearly described and consistent with the purpose statement? \

The hypothesis was easy to locate in the article itself, however the authors could have been more explicit in describing the population, sample, and independent variable in the hypothesis. For instance, as the study's purpose is to investigate implementation effects of algorithmic tools, yet the term "algorithmic" is not used as an adjective in the hypotheses. This is an important detail that should be included in order to reiterate purpose and relevance. Likewise, by using the word "employees" to describe the collective identity of the participants, the researchers do not specify the distinction between them: only half of the employees in the study are exposed to the treatment condition. If the authors were to of refer to "employees" as "the treatment group" this would also provide insight to the study's experimental design.

a.   Was there a sufficient rationale presented to support it?

The authors argue that, in response to organizational change, there are increases in an individual's cynicism and fatigue; the rationale for this is embedded in the theoretical model which visualizes direct links between A) change failure, change cynicism, and change fatigue, and B) attribution theory, expectancy theory, and conversation resource theory. Here is the rationale they provide in the text: We argue that organizational change triggers coping mechanisms that will lead organizational members to attribute blame to other members of their organization. This attribution will interrupt the expectancy link between personal effort and potential future success of projects, eliciting cynicism. Furthermore, the loss of individual resources due to organizational change induces coping, which reduces the willingness to participate in future change, thus increasing change fatigue." (Doring et al., 2023). While this is indeed a great use of these theories, the researchers never utilize the model again after the literature review.

The authors argue for this three-part theoretical model as being the basis for increases in an individual's cynicism and fatigue, as these two qualities are theorized (by their model) to manifest as behavioral patterns that can be explained by the theories themselves. With that in mind, I would have to simply answer this question with "no" and here is why: they never test the theoretical model. For example, within the scales used to measure cynicism and fatigue, items correlating to the constructs of attribution theory and expectancy theory are not included. The constructs of the theoretical model are also never discussed in the data analysis section, results, or discussion I think perhaps the most perplexing aspect of the hypothesis statements is where they are formatted in the text itself. While the hypotheses are introduced in tandem with the creation of this theoretical model within the literature review, there is no clear delineation for how the theoretical model is related to the hypotheses and vice versa. Likewise, the constructs belonging to the three psychological theories are not included in the development of the measurement scales, nor are they ever explicitly addressed further on in the text.

7. What was the level of detail in the hypothesis appropriate?

Both hypothesis #1 and #2 are inadequate in terms of the expected and required level of detail. In their current form they lack operationalization, directionality, and the inclusion of possible confounds. As stated in the article, the two hypotheses are as follows: *H1*) "Experiencing the contested implementation of the risk assessment tool increases the employee's cynicism towards change," and *H2)* "Experiencing the contested implementation of the risk assessment tool increases the employee's change fatigue" (Doring et al., 2023). these statements do not distinguish between the levels (i.e. treatment and control) of the independent variable (AI tool). This discrepancy is necessary to include because only 30 out of the 60 total funds were randomly assigned to the treatment group;

in essence, these two hypotheses encapsulate only half of the study because they only represent half of the participants.

8.   What type of hypothesis was stated (directional or non-directional) and was it written in a verbal research statement or as a statistical expression in terms of parameters?

Both hypotheses state that experiencing the contested implementation of the risk-assessment tool increases cynicism / fatigue towards change. However, the actual direction of the relationship is not specified as it is unclear whether experiencing the implementation increases or decreases cynicism/fatigue. Likewise, the directionality of the relationship between the two dependent variables is not discussed, which is odd considering a considerable amount of the literature review covered the relationship between the two.

9.   What was the stated or implied alpha level, and what rationale was provided for it?

The alpha level used in this study was 0.05. An *a-priori* power analysis was conducted to determine effect size. They used rationale found in previous literature on an empirical study utilizing similar variables.

Section III: Literature Review

10. Explain how the literature was used for each of the following:*to set the problem up, to justify the methodology, and to explain the significance of the results*

The literature review helps set up the research study's problem by first discussing the previous literature in terms of the current gaps and disagreements: "...while existing studies suggest that fatigue and cynicism can accumulate in employees over time and negatively affect both performance and the likelihood of successful change … surprisingly, few empirical studies causally disentangle such organizational change from its effects on employees attitudes and perceptions" (Doring et al., 2023). The significance of this quote is that it points to the fundamental issues in research on organizational change that the study is ultimately trying to mitigate through its experimental design and post-hoc exploratory analysis.

Building on my previous answer, a major theme in this article is that the research team was attempting to gain insights on how organizational change, individual psychology, and AI and machine learning integration are causally linked by focusing specifically on one organizational domain where organizational change efforts have proved to be unsuccessful. Their methodology is justified by its ability to produce novel insights – not its precision or its statistically significant results. The reserarch team was able to provide experimental evidence regarding the negative effects seen in organizational change initiatives that are driven by implementing algorithm tools that must be used at the individual level. The ability for the researchers to actually conduct a double-blind randomized controlled experiment offered a lot of advantages to the barren, yet nascent, field of organizational change research in public service sectors: "While there are several observational case and survey studies investigating how employees – and organizations more generally – respond to such developments … there is little knowledge about causal effects regarding individual episodes of change. Yet obtaining such knowledge is important as observational assessments of the cynicism and fatigue effects of organizational change are vulnerable to endogeneity and reverse causation …" (Doring et al., 2023).

Despite the fact that the OLS regression models proved to be statistically insigifcant, the researchers used other similar empirical studies as sources of criteria and comparison: "To base our expectations on statistical power, we rely on the limited empirical evidence about the effects of change occurrences on employees' cynicism towards change or fatigue"(Doring et al 2023). Overall, the study provided three main contributions to the field, one of which is they were able to provide direct links between organizational change, technology, and psychological mechanisms that occur within change projects. This contribution was significant because they were able to provide elements that were absent from the previous studies.

11. How well did the study build on the literature?

Throughout the article the authors allude to the importance of measuring change in response to the rapid encroachment of novel AI tools in organizational systems multiple times, yet in the same vein, my main critique is this same discursiveness. It's as if they wrote this paper in a strict, linear fashion, with each section blatantly ignoring predecessors while simultaneously refusing to take accountability for how its outcomes will affect its successors. In my opinion, if you read this paper back to front instead, it will conceptually make more sense. Answering this question is quite difficult as the entire article feels like a literature review plus an experiment and not the other way around. In fact, the authors cite over 100 sources in the 11 page document. While extensive research is always necessary in designing, conducting, and analyzing your own research, I think that their extensive use of outside literature had an adverse consequence on the research team by indirectly clouding their end goal and overall research purpose.

Section IV: Population and Sampling

12. Explicitly define the <u>population</u> to whom generalizations were made. That is, what was the common feature or content of the population units, what restrictions were placed on the scope of the population, what was the unit of analysis, what was the time frame (retrospective, current, prospective)?

This study focuses on implementing change within Denmark's public service sector. The team partnered with the Danish unemployment sector specifically because this sector is decentralized; there are a total of 60 insurance funds (collectively referred to as "the fund") within the unemployment sector, all of which are private, autonomous organizations working to provide official services to blue collar workers. These services include job counseling, unemployment benefits, educational support, etc., and are delegated by the central government. The common feature within the population was employment status as caseworkers in the fund during the intervention period. Likewise, regardless of the employment fund's location or size, all caseworkers performed similar services (regulated by the central government).

The unit of analysis in this study was the individual. Both of the outcome measures (i.e. cynicism and fatigue) were operationalized into survey items and participant responses were collected from individual employees. The researchers' choice to use individuals as the unit of analysis was in deliberate attempt to fill a research gap; most of the previous literature only utilized group-level units of analysis, such as group behavior, attitudes, and perceptions during organizational and implementation change. On the contrary, the present study offers a micro-level understanding of the relationship dynamic between humans and AI tools while in a workplace setting.

Regarding the study's time frame, the entirety of the experiment lasted approximately 10 months. The rollout of the experimental treatment began in February 2022 and ended in November 2022. The research team was involved in parts of the implementation; however they did not begin administering and collecting survey data until late September 2022. While routine data was collected by the administration fund, the time frame can be referred to as "current" since the main outcome variables were measured 6-7 months into the study.

a. What sample demographics were reported (who was in the sample)?

Within these 60 funds was a total of 282 individual caseworkers, all of which were employed during the time that this intervention was implemented. Therefore, the target population was 282 caseworkers.

B.How was the sample selected? Was it probability or non-probability?What name would you give to the selection technique?

The research team worked alongside a team of internal caseworkers from the unemployment insurance fund: "In liaison with the fund's main office, our research team were given the opportunity to support and examine the rollout of the decision support tool in a randomized control trial" (Doring et al., 2023).

d.   What sources of sampling bias do you think might exist?

The main form of sampling bias present in this study is non-response bias. The researchers were only able to collect data from 120 of the 282 total participants. Non-response bias is an evident issue in this section of the study because an a-priori power analysis revealed that they needed at least 140 participant responses in order to detect a medium effect size (Cohen's $d = 0.05$, 80% power at a 0.05 alpha level).

e.What were potential consequences of the bias?

A consequence of non-response bias is underrepresentation or overrepresentation of certain groups of caseworkers. These groups could manifest both internally within individual funds, or across the funds themselves – for example, all of the individuals in certain funds have no representation while others had a 100 percent response rate. When non-response bias occurs in a study it could potentially impact the generalizability of the findings. However, in the present study, the results failed to reject the null hypotheses, therefore causal links and generalizations were not made.

f. How might the bias have been controlled?

The survey was sent out to the target sample which consisted of all employees who (at the time) worked at one of the 60 funds during the length of the intervention. Despite the experiment lasting 10 months, the research team only collected data at one time point, which was about 6 months into the study. Given that the research team worked in liaison with the admissions office overseeing the fund and were also greatly involved in the implementation of the algorithmic tool, the survey could have been admistired more than once in order to control for non-response bias. As you will see in the data analysis section below, the team performed exploratory post-hoc analyses in the study to discuss the theoretical implications

Section V: Research Design
14. Describe the research design:
a.   Identify one major independent and dependent variable. How was each operationalized?

The independent variable is the algorithm risk assessment tool. The two dependent variables are change cynicism and change fatigue. Change cynicism was operationalized through scale adaptation of a previous instrument used to measure the cynicism construct. Four items were adapted from the previous scale based on relevance and context to the research question. Similarly, change fatigue was operationalized by the same process; the research team used a previously established scale that measured the construct of organizational fatigue. Three items were adapted from the previous scale based on relevance and context.

The final scale included 7 total items for both of the dependent variables and was measured on a 5-point likert scale

b. **Were the independent/predictor variables manipulated (what was manipulated) or observed/measured?**

The independent variable is the algorithmic risk assessment tool. This was the only independent variable in the study. It was manipulated. Pilot testing: the tool was tested in a pilot testing phase by the fund's caseworkers. The research team manipulated this predictor variable through its randomized control trial research design. The treatment group received the tool while the control group was not able to access the tool until the investigation ended. Exposure to material explaining the tool's purpose, such as how it is intended to operate when embedded in practice was distributed to the treated departments ahead of the rollout.

c. **Was it basically a multiple-subject or single-subject design (why did they choose the sample size they used);**

The participants followed a between-subjects design so that each group of participants was only exposed to one treatment condition. There were effectively two samples in this study: the treatment group and the control group. The population sample was randomly assigned to a sampling group using probability (i.e. 50/50 chance in this case).

d. **Did it employ random assignment of subjects to various experimental conditions or nonrandom assignment to the different groups (they apply only for experimental or quasi-experimental designs)?**

Double-blind randomized control trial: The name of the assignment technique utilized in the experimental design is matched pair cluster randomization: "The study thereby follows a between-subjects design in which we manipulate one-factor (the introduction of the risk-assessment tool during the first meeting) with two levels. To help ensure that departments were matched on size, we matched departments in pairs based on their number of benefits recipients, and used matched-pair cluster randomization at the level of the fund's departments to randomly assign one department of each pair to the treatment group and the other to the control group.

e. **Suggest one <u>potential extraneous</u> variable and its possible effect(s).**

Two of the potential extraneous variables that they discuss are 1) length of tenure and 2) change buildup. To expand on the latter, they essentially had no way of knowing if and/or how previous episodes of change influenced an individual's capacity for resiliency or predispositions to cynicism / fatigue. They offer ways to test this in a future study in exploratory analysis.

f. **What <u>control </u>variables were included and why were they controlled? If none were discussed what control variables might have been included?**

To try and control potential confounding variables such as fund size (i.e. number of employees and clients) and treatment contagion across departments, the research team matched all 60 funds into pairs based on their respective numbers of client beneficiaries. This helped control between group differences because the pairs

are what were used in randomization. In other words, each pair of funds (30 in total) was randomly assigned to the treatment or to the control. Secondly, to minimize the risk of treatment contagion, the research team treated two sets of large-city departments with overlapping jurisdictions. The purpose of controlling for size and treatment contagion were in an effort to maintain the study's double-blind design.

g. **What threats to internal and external validity were discussed, what threats should have been addressed?**

The authors frequently mention ecological validity. Due to the non-response bias and the inability to get enough sample participants necessary to meet the desired effect size, this posed several threats to both types of validity.

h. Explain whether or not the research design seemed reasonable for the task at hand. How might the design have been improved?

Section VI: Measurement Instruments

15. Address the following questions using one (if there are more than one) of the measurement instruments employed (this would usually be the dependent/outcome variable).

a. How was it operationalized (how was it measured)?

In the post-hoc exploratory analysis the items used in the cynicism scale and the fatigue scale are combined into one scale with two constructs. With that said, in analyzing the questionnaire survey (located in the research paper's appendix), I was shocked by the sheer bias in the wording of the questions as well as the complete lack of adherence to the study's proposed theoretical model. The scale items should have reflected the associated constructs explained by the theoretical model.

Example of an item from the cynicism scale:

Example of an item from the fatigue scale:

b. Was the instrument standardized (and, if so, what evidence was given) or non-standardized?

Yes, the instrument appears to be standardized based on the McDonald's Omega reliability assessment.

c. Was it a norm-referenced (how do you know) or criterion-referenced (what were the criteria) instrument?

The instrument was criterion referenced because the items in the scale were meant to align with specific criteria / definitions of both cynicism and fatigue. Likewise, there was no mention of norm-referencing in the text.

d. What forms of reliability were reported (if none were reported, what should have been done)?

The only type of reliability that was included in the study was internal consistency reliability, which was reported as a measure of McDonald's Omega. A high Internal consistency reliability (i.e. high McDonald's Omega value = 0.70 and above) indicates a strong correlation between items and their respective construct within the scale. The change cynicism scale had a reliability of 0.84 McDonald's Omega. The change fatigue scale had a reliability of 0.90 McDonald's Omeg*a*.

It should be noted, however, that, the cynicism scale had four items and the fatigue scale had three items; it is important to be aware of the lack of robustness within the two scales, as the small number of items could be a possible source of error attributing to indicators of (false) psychometric reliability. The scales for both measures were operationalized through adapting items from previous scales measuring the same construct.. Despite the

relatively low number of scale items, the researchers did not perform any pilot testing of the scales. Accordingly, the researchers did not report either test-retest reliability nor inter-rater reliability.

e. What forms of instrument validity were reported (if none were reported, what <u>should</u> have been done)?

A confirmatory factor analysis was performed for both measurement models to test the scale's internal validity. What should have been reported / point of concern: content validity. This scale does not appear to measure what it "intends" to per the criteria of the theoretical model.

16. Explain why you either were or were not <u>convinced</u> that the instrument would reliably and validly measure what it claimed to measure.

I was convinced that it would NOT measure anything reliably or validly! Tbe research team did not correctly operationalize the constructs and items based on the theoretical model that they designed specifically for the two measurements.

To explain their error in operationalization, consider this from the article: "On the context of change cynicism, expectancy is thus of special importance and defined as a momentary belief on the part of an individual that acting in a particular way will actually be followed by a given outcome….However, experiencing episodes of organizational change failure comes with a risk of breaking this perceived link between effort and performance as the personal resources spent on undergoing organizational change are believed to be only weakly – if at all – related to improved performance, let alone valued rewards" (Doring et. Al 2023). Now go look at the appendix at the end of this paper. The researchers not only force perceptions and attitudes on people via biases language, but they completely neglect to include any sort of objective measurement relating to the psychology measurement properties the authors so proudly boast.

Section VII: Data Analysis

17. Describe the data analysis procedures by answering the following questions:
a. Were the analysis procedures primarily parametric or non-parametric procedures?
The main analysis is an OLS regression with fixed effects for matched pairs
b. To what extent did they address missing data?

To address the missing data and non-response bias, the research team performed post-hoc exploratory analyses of their hypotheses. The process by which they conducted the post-hoc exploratory analysis is as follows: "we re-estimate our models in a repeated measures framework, utilizing the response for each individual item for change cynicism and fatigue as a within-respondent observation. We run these models with fixed effects for pairs as well as for items, and cluster standard errors by departments and individuals. Effectively, this approach trades increased power for increased measurement error, which the latent variable framework is designed to eliminate" (Doring et al., 2023).
c. To what extent did they address assumptions and test them?

OLS Regression models have four assumptions: linearity, independence, homoscedasticity, and multi-collinearity. These are not mentioned in the article. It is perhaps the effect of the independence assumption not being met that is causing insignificant and unexpected results in the model .Simply in terms of the research question and variable structure at hand, I do not know why an OLS regression was the test they chose to use because while, yes, there is only one independent variable, it has two levels that need to be accounted for in the analysis. A two-way ANOVA should have been used.
d.Did the authors report the results of a power analysis?

Yes. The initial OLS model had relatively small effect sizes for all the variables, which the researchers attributed to the results of the power analysis.

e. Did the authors explain the purpose of the statistical procedures they used?

Yes, however they explain their logic more so in the post-hoc exploratory analysis. This is likely because they were manipulating the data into a repeated measures

f. Did the authors explain and justify the options they chose when they ran the procedures?

They only explained them in context of the exploratory analysis.

g. Could you replicate what they ran?

Theoretically, yes I could replicated the statistical tests (first was OLS regression, then repeated measures) outlined in the hypothetical exploratory analysis. However, I would not have designed my experiment the same way they did. I would not advise anyone to use their future directions as guide.

Section VIII: Conclusion

18. Finally, in your opinion, explain why the article either does or does not make a useful contribution to the field: "So what and who cares" about this specific article?

The only field that this study made contributions to is the government agency for whom hired the research team to conduct and perform this RCT experiment. I did not realize how politically motivated the study's methods were until I was on day three of my analysis. The key give away was the complete absence of sampling methods. The article does not discuss why they chose this specific sector of public service or how the team persuade 100% of the employees to take part in it.

I would like to preface this by saying that I normally would not be critical of other fields or institutions utilizing research, intervention, or evaluation methods. I believe these are powerful sources of knowledge that should be more widespread – especially in government. My point of contention is that so many researchers and evaluators – especially in the field of education and psychology – work so hard to uncover results that will influence policy so that children can lead better lives. If governments would prefer to work from the inside out – to employ "researchers" to conduct highly valid and randomized and error free studies – so that they have, in turn, their sources of empirical knowledge that will precipitate policy and agenda, all the power to them. In fact, it could be a great way to allocate more resources to researchers dedicated to the craft.

From an ethical standpoint, researchers always want to ask themselves: "Who is this benefitting?" Realistically, did this research study benefit anyone who was in the treatment group? Was the tool discontinued? Did it stay in implementation? When a team of researchers surveys nearly three hundred people with such a preposterous and vacuous instrument, and then proceed to blame negligible effects on the participant response rate, what manifests is a major ethical dilemma – not post-hoc tests and exploratory analyses.

Appendix A (from article): all items used to survey participants:
Appendix A
Measurement of variables

Cynicism:

    1. How much do you agree with the following statements? (1 – strongly disagree to 5 – strongly agree)

        •   The statistical profiling tool is part of a trend that will vanish as quickly as it emerged.

        •   I am skeptical of the motives behind the introduction of the statistical profiling tool.

        •   I experience that there is a 'hidden agenda' behind the introduction of the statistical profiling tool in counselling.

•I am skeptical whether the statistical profiling tool actually works.

Change fatigue:
How much do you agree with the following statements? (1 – strongly disagree to 5 – strongly agree)

•We are in need of a period of stability at XXX before we introduce more change.

•I am tired of all the change that is happening at XXX.

•Way too many changes are introduced at XXX.