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The purpose of this study is to explore and explain how and why perceived support can create a sense of want to, ought to and have to change. This study investigates perceived organizational support (POS) and perceived supervisor supports (PSS) influences on the dimensions of commitment to change (C2C), affective- (AC2C), continuous- (CC2C) and normative commitment to change (NC2C).

To investigate the relationships, a mix-method approach is applied. Data is yield from 168 survey respondents from three subsidiaries in Southeast Asia within a multinational corporation (MNC) and through eight interviews with employees at one subsidiary.

The findings reveals that POS is more important in change initiatives than PSS, indicating that POS is vital to understand the influence on employees C2C mindset. POS is identified as the glue that binds employees and change goals together into the desired mindset of AC2C. This study contributes to literature by presenting new perspectives concerning POS and PSS influences on C2C dimensions within an MNC. Adding a layer to research that has largely focused on the concepts within psychology. This study is an introduction to deeper understanding of the relationships between POS, PSS and the C2C dimensions. Signaling that further research should focus more on this context.
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1. Introduction and Problem statement

Change, change, change echoes throughout the halls of most organizations all around the world. In the corporate environment of the 21st century, change has become a buzzword used to illustrate forward thinking and innovation. The endless process of change is the norm in most corporate organizations (Elias, 2009; Turner Parish, Cadwallader & Busch, 2008). In the modern corporate environment, change is inevitable and to large extent unavoidable. The question is no longer if an organization will change rather, who will commit to change and who will flourish in change. Many corporations today, particularly those who function internationally are affected by multiple stakeholders (Morin, Meyer, Bélanger, Boudrias, Gagné & Parker, 2016; Van Looy, Martens & Debackere, 2005), which motivate the concept of continuous development and change (Johansson & Heide, 2008). Even if organizational change is often stressed as highly important, a definition of what constitutes an organizational change is repeatedly avoided in literature and the constitution of change is frequently taken for granted (Quattrone & Hopper, 2001). Organizational change is often conceptualized as moving from point “A” to a new desired point “B” to better match responses from external and internal conditions (Quattrone & Hopper, 2001; Nelson, 2003; Johansson & Heide, 2008). It is argued that organizational change separates itself from development and innovation since they are described as planned actions (Quattrone & Hopper, 2001; Johansson & Heide, 2008).

Organizational change implementations are not an easy process, as it can both be time- and resource consuming. There is evidence that 70% of all change initiatives fail to meet expectations (Beer & Nohria, 2000; Burnes & Jackson, 2011; Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005). There are multiple examples of corporations that have crumbled due to failure to change i.e. NOKIA, Pam Am, Blockbusters, General Motors and Kodak. Illustrating the need for organizations to be able to act in the continuous changing environment of the modern business (Shin, Seo, Shapiro & Taylor, 2015). Without dedication, support and employee commitment the processes of organizational change are likely to fail (Neves, 2011; Shin et al., 2015). A key factor for successful implementation of organizational change relies on individuals’ attitudes and commitment to the change. Organizational changes generally require ongoing support from employees, suggesting that employees’ commitment to change is more important than the actual organizational transformation (Kotter & Cohen, 2002; Shin et al., 2015). Commitment to change (C2C) is considered to be “the glue that provides the vital bond between people and change goals” (cit. by Conner, 1992 in Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002, s. 474).
Yet, there is limited research regarding employees’ reactions to change (Turner Parish et al., 2008; Rousseau & Tijoriwala, 1999; Choi, 2011). Most research has focused on organizational commitment rather than C2C (Meyer & Allen, 1991) or has taken a macro approach rather than a micro approach (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). Still, research has discussed that individual commitment and support of change are vital components for organizational change success (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). Furthermore, research within commitment has noticed that employees can be committed to many different work-related foci, such as organizational commitment, supervisor commitment and change commitment (Neves & Caetano, 2009; Turner Parish et al., 2008).

Largely based on organizational commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1991), Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) introduced a change context-specific three-component model of C2C. The three components of C2C are; affective-, continuance- and normative commitment, referred to as want to -, have to - and ought to - commit to change. This multidimensional model has increased the understanding of what matters in shaping change recipient attitude (Bouckenooghe, Schwarz, & Minbashian, 2015). The three dimensions of C2C can work simultaneously or separately in varying combinations and is identified as an individual C2C profile. The C2C model is used in change contexts specifically, as the model has shown to better illustrate how dimensions and combinations of C2C are connected to different responses to change (Bouckenooghe et al., 2015).

Research on employees’ attitudes towards organizational change has had varying results. Chen and Wang (2007) found a significant relationship between personal characteristics and attitudes toward organizational change, whereas Devos, Buelens and Bouckenooghe (2007) research showed that personal characteristics had limited or no effect. Johnson and O’Leary-Kelly (2003) even state that attitudes toward organizational change are “shaped by experiences in the work context” (p. 641). Suggesting that attitudes toward change are likely to differ depending on change narratives, context and C2C profile. These ambiguous research findings encourage further research within C2C, especially as commitment is seen as crucial in order to change (Elias, 2009; Turner Parish et al., 2008).

There are still many uncovered aspects of the relationship of C2C (Choi, 2011; Neves & Caetano, 2009; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002), where little focus has been given to identify organization and supervisors influence on employees C2C profiles (Rhoades, Eisenberger & Armeli, 2001; Neves, 2011; Shin et al., 2015). To promote committed attitudes and ensure that
the employees are dedicated to change, it is important that organizations and supervisors encourage employees to become committed to organizational change (Rhoades et al., 2001). These influences can be recognized as perceived organizational support (POS) and perceived supervisory support (PSS) (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armeli, & Lynch, 1997; Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison & Sowa, 1986; Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Rhoades et al., 2001; Shore & Shore, 1995). Support from upper management and supervisors can emerge in many forms but typically stems from the perception that the organization or supervisor cares for the well-being of the individual employee and values employee efforts (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

There is limited coverage on the effect of POS and PSS on the different dimensions of C2C. Currently, there is limited and inconclusive research concerning POS and PSS influence on each dimension of C2C. Most studies have been interested in the relationship between AC2C and POS and PSS and have shown a positive correlation between these constructs (Chawla & Kelloway, 2004; Neves & Caetano, 2009; Turner Parish et al., 2008; Rhoades et al., 2001). As each C2C profile differs it can be beneficial for organizations to understand how the two different forms of perceived support influence each dimension of C2C, when subjected to change.

Furthermore, most studies regarding the relationships of the concepts, have been in the field of psychology and of an explanatory nature, instead of a holistic focus of what underlies the C2C dimensions (Chawla & Kelloway, 2004; Neves & Caetano, 2009; Turner Parish et al., 2008). The limited research of exploring and explaining C2C within a corporate environment, motivates this studies research context and object. The corporate setting has been identified as change intense, so it is likely that employees in this setting have high exposure of organizational change. Additionally, current literature regarding C2C is of an quantitative approach whereas an qualitative research approach is rare. Hence, there is little understanding of why POS and PSS influence the underlying factors of C2C dimensions. This research gap was addressed by the use of a mix-method approach.

The purpose of this study was to explore and explain the relationship between POS and PSS on each of the dimension of C2C; affective-, continuance- and normative commitment to change in a corporate setting. In this study, the aim was to investigate the influences of the perceived support on C2C dimensions and ask the question why this influence exists. These argumentations derived two overall research questions to answer within this research.
• How does perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support influence affective-, continuous- and normative commitment to change?

• Why does perceived organizational support and perceived supervisor support influence the C2C dimensions?

To approach the research questions, a mix-method approach was necessary since the questions both addresses how as well as why POS and PSS influence the three C2C dimensions. Survey data was collected through 168 respondents from three MNC subsidiaries in Southeast Asia. The qualitative data was collected through eight in-dept interviews with employees at one of the subsidiaries in order to provide rich narratives of the change experience in the Southeast Asian MNC setting. The site was chosen since the organization recently experienced a major organizational change, moving from centralized regional management to decentralized and local management. This change affected all employees and functions, thus providing recent experiences and narratives to change processes.
2. Theoretical Background

2.1 From Organizational Commitment to Commitment to Change

Commitment has been a central aspect in explaining employees’ behavior and is most often conceptualized in terms of organizational commitment. Organizational commitment has received a lot of attention in the literature where a seminal contribution is Meyer and Allen’s (1991) three-component model of organizational commitment (Neves & Caetano, 2009). Organizational commitment is defined as a psychological state, or mindset, which increases the likelihood that an employee will remain in an organization. The three components involved in the model are named affective-, continuance- and normative commitment and are considered as different mindsets that employees can experience simultaneous and in different combinations. The combinations of these three mindsets are reflecting an employee’s organizational commitment profile (Meyer & Allen, 1991).

Research has found that employees can be committed to different work-related foci, such as organizational commitment, supervisor commitment and commitment to change (C2C) (Neves & Caetano, 2009; Turner Parish et al., 2008). However, C2C is viewed as an “action commitment” and reflects an employee's commitment and acceptance of new work rules, policies, and so forth (Jaros, 2010). Building on organizational commitment, Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) introduced a three-component model of C2C, which stems from Meyer and Allen's (1991) work theory of organizational commitment. Both Meyer and Allen (1991) and Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) uses the same terminology but analyses different work-related types of commitment. Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) have empirically demonstrated that their C2C measure was distinct from the multidimensional model of organizational commitment since it focuses on commitment in the context of change processes rather than the organization. While, organization commitment and commitment to change can influence each other the two models explains distinctly different sources of commitment.

2.1.1 The three-component model of Commitment to Change

Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) explain that C2C is “a force (mindset) that binds an individual to a course of action deemed necessary for the successful implementation of a change initiative” (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002, p. 475). There are as mentioned three distinguished types of dimensions of C2C: (1) affective commitment to change (AC2C), which is a desire to provide support for the change based on beliefs in its inherent benefits, (2) continuance commitment to change (CC2C), a recognition of the costs associated with failure to support the change, and (3)
normative commitment to change (NC2C) a sense of obligation to provide support for the change (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002).

2.1.1.1 Affective Commitment to Change
The first dimension of C2C is the affective dimension, which has become a desired mind-state among employees (Bouckenooghe et al., 2015; Turner Parish et al., 2008; Neves 2011). AC2C resonates from a desire to support change implementation driven by emotional commitment. Employees with high levels of AC2C identify with the change, believe that support of change has a purpose and is in their best interest thus, leading to attractive employee behavior during change processes (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002).

Due to its desirable consequences, AC2C has become the leading component among researchers (Choi, 2011, Turner Parish et al., 2008), as it has been related to lower turnover intentions (Neves & Caetano, 2009), higher job satisfaction (Yousef, 2017), higher job motivation (Turner Parish et al., 2008), trust in supervisor (Neves & Caetano, 2009) and increased support during organizational change (Eisenberger, Stinglhamber, Vandenbergh, Sucharski, & Rhoades, 2002; Neves, 2008; Neves & Caetano, 2009). Research has found that AC2C influence important perceptions, such as individual learning, enhanced performance and successful implementation (Turner Parish et al., 2008).

Furthermore, research has noticed that at least a moderate level of AC2C among employees is necessary to achieve the desired change outcome (Sinclair, Tucker, Cullen, & Wright 2005: Turner Parish et al., 2008). Employees with a high level of AC2C are more willing to engage in change related activities that are intended to ensure the success and are more prone to see the value of the change initiative (Morin et al., 2016). Research regarding the development of factors contributing to AC2C, has been limited and mostly unstructured (Morin et al., 2016). The factors that has shown to have a positive relationship with AC2C are trust and charisma of management (Neves & Caetano, 2009), engagement in decision making (Sverke, Hellgren, Näswall, Göransson & Öhrming, 2008), favorable and just treatment in the context of the change process (Foster, 2010), communication and information exchange concerning the change (Conway & Monks, 2008), perceivable benefit for the employee (Fedor, Caldwell & Herold, 2006) and psychological empowerment (Morin et al., 2016). This suggesting that AC2C may be influenced or increased by the actions of the organization or supervisor.
2.1.1.2 Continuance Commitment to Change

The second dimension of C2C is continuance commitment to change. Continuance commitment derives from Becker’s (1960) side-bet theory, which suggests that employees maintain within their organization to preserve collected “side-bets”, such as investments in close working relationships, pensions and other career investments (Umoh, Amah & Wokocha, 2014). People scoring high on CC2C have a completely different motivational force than people scoring high on AC2C. Instead of wanting to support the change, people with this mindset only support the change because they feel that the cost not supporting the change is too high (Bouckenooghe et al., 2015). By not supporting the change, there is an underlying belief that attractive benefits might be lost or that there is a risk of being laid off. (Bouckenooghe et al., 2015). Thus, CC2C has been found to be positively related to stress (Cunningham, 2006), turnover intentions (Neves & Caetano, 2009), but negatively related to extra work behavior (Cunningham, 2006), job satisfaction and performance (Allen & Meyer, 1996). Research has indicated that individuals scoring high on CC2C has a lower level of trust in their supervisors (Neves & Caetano, 2009), hinting that organization and supervisor influence CC2C.

2.1.1.2 Normative Commitment to Change

The third dimension of C2C is the normative dimension, which relates to the loyalty and moral obligation of the employee. The NC2C dimension is the obligation to support the organization and its changes because it is the “right” thing to do, due to normative pressures (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). The NC2C is driven by the duty to support and contribute to change since it is in the interest of the organization. This sense of loyalty is often installed in employees through beneficial organizational policies or favorable treatment thus creating a relationship in which the employee repays the benefits with loyalty or duty (Meyer & Allen, 1991). NC2C cultivates in organizations and employees based on the benefits received, such as training or personal growth. Developing NC2C mindsets in an organization is a continuous process, employees that show high level of NC2C often remain in the organization and adapts to desired work behavior. NC2C consequently leads to support of change since their loyalty and sense of duty tells them to do so. (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Thus, suggesting that the process of instilling NC2C is a question of the organization and the supervisor.

2.2 Perceived Organizational Support and Perceived Supervisory Support

Organizational changes are in many cases a difficult process for organizations and for the employees, as it demands increased efforts and adaptations to be successfully implemented (Shin et al., 2015). Thus, indicating that change implementation demands both direction and
support from management. Support is generally important to encourage employees and to motivate high performance. Yet, the source of the perceived support can vary. Eisenberger et al. (1997) looked at perceived support from two perspectives POS and PSS, which are based on Organizational Support Theory. According to Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) there are different forms of treatments, namely; fairness, supervisor support, and organizational rewards and job condition that relates to overall support. These forms are the base from how the concepts of POS and PSS are understood. Eisenberger et al. (1986) and Shore and Shore (1995) suggests that Organizational Support Theory may explain how meeting socioemotional needs and evaluation can form a belief that the organization values and cares about employees’ efforts and well-beings.

POS is the employees’ perception that the organizational values and cares about its employees and treat them in a favorable way. Thus, relating to organizational values, potential organizational benefits and the level of self-identification with the organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). POS is a matter of perception since it relates to the employees’ perception of the organizations’ structures and values. According to Organizational Support Theory employees react positively and are more motivated if POS is high and are more likely to remain in their profession longer (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

PSS is described as the relationship between employees and the supervisor. According to the Organizational Support Theory (Eisenberger et al., 1997; Eisenberger et al., 1986; Shore & Shore, 1995; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) employees responds positively to the notion that their supervisor cares about their well-being and values their efforts (Kottke & Sharafinski, 1988; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Thus, cumulating the level of commitment and the formation of emotional bond (Rhoades et al., 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). When the employee feels appreciated or cared for by the supervisor the performance is likely to improve, and the employee retention increases (Neves & Caetano, 2009; Rhoades et al., 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

The separation between POS and PSS is the personal bond between the supervisory and the employee that exist within the concept of PSS and not necessarily in POS. However, it is suggested that even in the PSS relationship there is a third influencer. According to the Organizational Support Theory, it is understood by the employee that the supervisor is an acting agent in the interests of the organization. Thus, it is assumed that most employees understand that directives and evaluations that are conveyed by supervisors often resonates from the
organization (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Levinson, 1965). Indicating that there is a strong relationship between PSS and POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Because of this interconnection, research often views supervisory- and organizational support as one entity (Rhoades et al., 2001; Kottke & Sharafinski, 1998), as it is suggested that it can be difficult for employees to distinguish between these two concepts (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Furthermore, studies have shown that PSS often leads to POS (Hutchison, 1997; Rhoades et al., 2001). Yoon and Thye (2000) claimed that that relationship could occur in reverse, suggesting that the employees’ perception of the organizations’ favorable inclination towards them can lead them to believe the supervisory to have the similar favorable position. POS and PSS are associated with applying humanlike characteristics of the organization (Eisenberg et al., 1986; Rhoades et al., 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberg, 2002). These characteristics can be communicated by the organization through the supervisor to the employees (Levinson, 1965; Rhoades et al., 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberg, 2002). Humanlike characteristics are in most cases important in order to build a bond, where support can be acknowledged (Eisenberg et al., 1986; Rhoades et al., 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberg, 2002).

Research has noticed that it is still important to investigate POS and PSS as separate concepts since it is not necessarily the case that the POS and PSS have the same characteristics, proceedings or ultimately consequences (Ng & Sorensen, 2008). Research has noticed that employees form individual relationships with their supervisors that are distinct from employees’ perceptions of the organizational (Maertz, Griffeth, Campbell & Allen, 2007). Maertz et al., (2007) research noticed that employees both could see the supervisor as an agent, and as an independent actor. This indicates that PSS can influence employees’ perceptions and attitudes separately from POS. Both support constructs are affected by three main form of treatment claimed by Eisenberger and Rhoades (2002) but to which extent is still unclear. The three types of treatment relate to both organizational driven actions and those of supervisors, but can have different components and outcomes (Ng & Sorensen, 2008). For the purpose of this study, these types have been divided to be more connected to either POS or PSS. Building on theory (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), this study divided the three main treatments as Fairness and Job Conditions being stronger connected with POS and as PSS being closer linked to Supervisor Support.

Fairness or procedural justice (Greenberg, 1990) relates to the fair and equal way of distributing resources among employees, and that repeated instances of fairness concerning resources can have a strong effect on POS. Since being fairly and equally treated can be perceived as a sign
of that the organization cares about the employees’ well-being (Shore & Shore, 1995). Treating employees with respect helps facilitate a personal bond and loyalty to the organization. Consequently, perception of fairness influences employees and have a positive effect on POS. (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002.) Support in the form of fairness is therefore suggested to be an effective way of influencing employees and creating a supportive relationship (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

Organizational Rewards and Job Conditions are identified the second form that support is conveyed (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). The treatment form of organizational rewards and favorable job conditions can be translated into both POS and PSS, while the association with POS is stronger (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). This form is built on supportive treatment and relates to different types of rewards such as salary and other types of investments in the employees. Indicating that the employee is valued by the organization by receiving training and other career opportunities (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). This type of support is anchored in organizational structures and rewards, which are closely linked to POS. Yet, as suggested previously by Yoon and Thye (2000) it can lead to increased PSS because of the impression of supervisors as agents of the organization. The strength between POS and PSS depends on the employees’ ability to detach the action of the supervisor from the actions of the organization (Eisenberger et al., 2002).

Supervisor Support refers to the nature of the relationship between the closest manager and the employee. As suggested by Kottke and Sharafinski (1988) employees form a general perception regarding the supervisors’ appreciations, evaluation and concerns for the employees' personal well-being. Geller and Herold (1975) found that employees relied more on their immediate supervisor in regard to information exchange rather than the organization or co-workers. Support that is transferred in the form of supervisory support is the essence of PSS, but it is still an important form of how POS can be conveyed.

POS and PSS are animated by the organization and the supervisor, but the perception of the support is perceived by the employee. Consequentially, it is the employee that finally rules the effect of the organizational or supervisory efforts (Eisenberger et al., 2002). This implies that there are individual differences in the C2C profile that could be influenced by POS or PSS. This depends on how the organization and the supervisor convey support, indicating that different types of support could trigger different C2C dimensions and lead to different consequences (Ng & Sorensen, 2008).
2.3 Hypothesis development

2.3.1 POS influence on C2C dimensions

Scholars have discussed the importance of C2C, like Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) stated: “commitment is arguably one of the most important factor involved in employees’ support for change initiatives” (p. 474). Huy (2002) expressed similar notions and argued that employees are more likely to collectively support organizational change programs when there is a sense of trust and attachment to the organization. In that sense, commitment is the product of an equilibrated relationship between the organization and the employee and affected by efforts of both parties. Each individual employee reacts to change differently, some embrace it while other suffer, which can create a strain on the relationship. C2C is described as crucial for change implementation (Neves & Caetano, 2009; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002), so the relationship between organization, supervisor and employee should be of high priority.

It is suggested that when employees have a high level of POS, they arguably should develop strong emotional attachments to organizational goals (Neves, 2011), which in turn should increase their desire to support change. Suggesting that if the employee perceives the organization as having favorable values and job conditions, then the identification with the organization is likely to increase. According to Rhoades et al. (2001) affective commitment is positively associated with POS and the concept of AC2C by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002). When an employee perceives organizational support, it could potentially increase the positive emotional associations with the organization, thereby increase affective commitment (Rhoades et al., 2001). There is an identified relationship between POS and affective organizational commitment as supported by Neves (2011) and Eisenberger et al. (2002) which could suggest that there is a relationship between AC2C and POS. This relationship has yet to be tested in an MNC context, hence this relationship might not be as obvious as previous research has suggested, leading to the impending hypothesis.

**H1: AC2C will be positively influenced by higher degrees of POS**

POS is linked with the employees’ identification and feeling of appreciation from the organization. According to Eisenberger et al. (2002) POS leads to a personal desire to work towards fulfilling organizational goals and support organizational changes. CC2C which is understood as the reasoning of possible costs of not supporting change (Neves, 2011). There are inconsistency in the research regarding CC2C relationship with POS. Some studies have revealed a negative relationship (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), while others have showed a
no significant relationship (Aubé, Rousseau & Morin, 2007) or even a positive relationship
(Colakoglu, Culha & Atay, 2010). However, more frequently research have tried to explain
how POS could be related to CC2C in a negative way (Colakoglu, et al., 2010 Rhoades &
Eisenberger, 2002; Aubé et al., 2007). One widely used argument is that POS would reduce an
employee's feelings of entrapment that could be associated with the high costs of leaving an
organization (Colakoglu et al., 2010; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Others suggests that
CC2C is negatively affected by POS since it is related to factors outside the control of the
organization such as employability or personal non-transferable investments such as pensions
or co-worker relationships (Umoh et al., 2014). POS should thus, have negative effect on the
fear of the consequences of not supporting change. Another argument is based on the notion
that POS is likely to lessen fear and uncertainty (Eisenberger et al., 1997; Kottke & Sharafinski,
1988), as uncertainty is associated with weighing options and calculating costs (Meyer & Allen,
1991). Organizational support theory (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002)
suggests that POS should lessen uncertainty, which could lead to that CC2C should decrease
with POS.

Additionally, according to van den Bos (2001) organizational fairness does reduce uncertainty.
As fairness is part concept POS this should indicate that POS has a negative effect on
uncertainty. Consequently, CC2C is negatively affected by POS. It can also be reasoned that
POS could change employees’ mindsets to continue to work within the organization from a
CC2C to an AC2C or an NC2C (Colakoglu et al., 2010). The argumentations are based on
findings from previous research (Eisenberger et al., 1986; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Meyer
& Allen, 1992; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) and produced following hypothesis.

**H2: CC2C will be negatively influenced by higher degrees of POS**

Based on previous argument, it could be reasoned that both AC2C and NC2C should be
positively associated with POS. The function of POS is to create an inclusive feeling within the
organization, stimulate a feeling of belonging and a sense that the organization cares about the
employees. These feelings are often associated with a sense of loyalty towards the organization
to perform to the best ability. Effective POS should install a sense of organizational loyalty
within the organizational culture but also within the individual employees (Eisenberger et al.,
1997; Levinson, 1967; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002), thus creating a sense of purpose of
supporting the organization (Shin et al., 2015). Consequently, leading to a situation were
supporting the plans and actions of the organizations are perceived as the employees’ duty
(Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). It can thus, be argued that employees that have a high level of POS should feel the duty to support the change since it is in the interest of the organization. From this discussion this hypothesis could be generated:

**H3: NC2C will be positively influenced by higher degrees of POS**

### 2.3.2 PSS influence on C2C dimensions

Supervisors are mediators of change within organizations and have key roles in implementing successful change (Herold, Fedor, Caldwell, & Liu, 2008). Supervisors do not only identify groups’ strengths and weaknesses, they also motivate the employees’ to commit to change (Neves, 2011). Neves (2011) research showed that there is a fully mediated relationship between both AC2C and NC2C and supervisor competence whereas CC2C revealed a negative relationship with supervisor competence.

Research has shown that when a supervisor cares about the well-being of their employees, affective commitment to the organization increases (Eisenberger et al., 2002; Ng & Sorensen, 2008). The same argument should apply to the relationship between PSS and employees’ AC2C. Especially in the context of commitment and trust, as affective commitment is associated with the formation of an emotional bond, which is efficiently created through personal interaction and communication (Morgan & Hunt, 1994). Others argue that supervisors facilitate commitment by providing a human and personal perspective to organizational change implementation (Levison, 1965; Rhoades et al., 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). It can be argued that PSS is especially important during organizational change since change can be associated with increased stress for the employee (Shin et al., 2015), hence support can be crucial to build and facilitate AC2C (Neves & Caetano, 2009; Shin et al., 2015). The relationship between competence and AC2C and the positive relationship was also proposed by Neves (2011). Consequently, this hypothesis was constructed:

**H4: AC2C will be positively influenced by higher degrees of PSS**

Research has shown that employees scoring high on CC2C have a lower level of trust to their supervisors (Neves & Caetano, 2009). According to Neves (2011) high levels of PSS should decrease the fear of the costs of not supporting change and should decrease fears associated with change. PSS is mutually accumulated with the personal and emotional bond between supervisor and employee (Rhoades et al., 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Indicating that PSS should have negative influence on calculating behavior and lessen the perception of change
associated costs. Change is often associated with increased costs such as adaptation or other types of increased workload (Elias, 2009; Neves, 2011; Shin et al., 2015). These costs are perceived as less stressful if there is a high level of PSS (Neves, 2011). Hypothesizing that when employees perceive a high level of PSS, their fear of losing attractive benefits by not supporting the change will decrease.

**H5: CC2C will be negatively influenced by higher degrees of PSS**

Finally, the relationship between PSS and NC2C is based on the employees’ sense of duty to support the organizational change. This duty is driven by a perceived debt towards the supervisor due to the norm of reciprocity (Neves, 2011; Shin et al., 2015). NC2C could be instilled and sustained through supportive behavior from organization and supervisor (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Meyer et al., 2002; Neves, 2011) and through the supervisors’ continuous favorable treatment of the employees. Basically, suggesting that that received PSS creates an obligation to support the actions of the supervisor (Turner Parish et al., 2008; Neves, 2011; Shin et al., 2015). Thus, when employees perceive a higher level of PSS, they will develop a sense of loyalty toward the supervisors and a sense of moral obligation to support change initiatives (Neves, 2011). Hence, deriving the last hypothesis:

**H6: NC2C will be positively influenced by higher degrees of PSS**

### 2.4 Research framework

Each dimension of C2C affects the relationship between organization change and employee differently. AC2C emerges when employees “want to” support the change, CC2C reflects employees “need to” to support the change, whereas NC2C illustrates employees “ought to” support the change (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). CC2C is generally considered to be a less desired mindset from an organizational standpoint rather than AC2C and NC2C. Each commitment dimension can be combined in varying levels, ranging from high to low within each individual C2C profile. Thus, suggesting that individuals who perceive high levels of both POS and PSS may continue to work within the organization from a CC2C to an NC2C or an AC2C. Previously, research has focused on POS and PSS as one entity, however it was considered to be important to detached POS and PSS from each other. This was done in order to evaluate the individual influence on each of the C2C dimensions. Even if POS and PSS can influence each dimension of C2C differently, it is important to understand why these suggested relationships exist. By exploring change narratives nested within a corporate environment, a
richer understanding can be derived. The analysis was based on both the quantitative and qualitative findings.

*Figure 1. Conceptual Model*
3. Method

3.1 Research method

The study investigated the relationship between the three dimensions of C2C and perceived support through a mixed-method approach of both exploratory and explanatory nature. A mixed-method approach was utilized as it allows the use of different analysis and data collections (Cheek, Onslow & Cream, 2004; Stentz, Clark & Matkin, 2012). The aim of the research method was to maximize the strengths of each strategy and to reduce scarcities within each strategy alone (Stentz et al., 2012). By using multiple methods, a better understanding of the results can be achieved by uncovering new perspectives regarding the phenomena of C2C (Arora & Stoner, 2009). Enabling the discovery of patterns and meanings between POS, PSS and the three dimensions of C2C.

Moreover, research within C2C has almost exclusively focused on quantitative research, increasing the importance of using a mixed approach as a research method. By following the convergence model, qualitative and quantitative data was collected and analyzed separately to compare and contrast the different results (Creswell, Plano Clark, Gutman & Hanson, 2003) (See figure 2). While data was collected and analyzed separately, the two approaches supplement each other in the two last steps to get a richer understanding of the relationships and the underlying drivers between POS, PSS and the three C2C dimensions. Thus, enabling validity and substantiated conclusions.

Figure 2. Illustrate the research approach

The study presented six hypotheses derived from existing theory regarding POS, PSS and the three dimensions of C2C (Eisenberger et al. 1986; Eisenberger et al. 1997; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). The deductive approach aimed to confirm or reject the hypothesis whereas the inductive approach was used to build further richness to the
concepts and the relationships. Together these approaches illustrated a multifaceted picture of the phenomena.

3.2 Research object and sampling
The study has used a Swedish MNC as point of departure to elucidate its practice and processes. With the use of a single MNC as a research site, with a focus on nested cases within the MNC, a deeper contextual knowledge can be achieved (Lervik, 2011). The setting enabled a dialog between quantitative and qualitative data when interpreting the results. Thus, viewing the phenomena in its context and discovering embedded organizational change narratives within the three subsidiaries.

This particular MNC had recently undergone a major organizational change, where the three subsidiaries had decentralized themselves and established a new business area within the MNC. The decentralization affected all employees within the business area. Hence, the site could provide recent change experiences. The MNC was therefore identified as an appropriate context to address the research questions. The Swedish MNC is a large-cap corporation with over 95,000 employees, production facilities in 18 countries and sells to over 190 markets. The three subsidiaries within the MNC was selected on the criteria that they recently had undergone a major change and was part of the same business area. The three subsidiaries are located in Southeast Asia, namely in Thailand, India and Singapore, which are considered growing markets for the MNC. The quantitative population of this study consists of all employees with English proficiency from the three subsidiaries. Hence, the true population subjected to the study was unknown.

The qualitative data was appropriated solely from the subsidiary in Thailand. The eight respondents were selected based on position, gender, availability and English language proficiency, in order to avoid homogeneity and misinterpretations (See Table 1). Many of the respondents also acted within different functions of the Bangkok office, thus providing variation of organizational change experiences. Each respondent represents a case of change experience.
3.2.2 Procedure

The quantitative data was collected through an online survey distributed internally to the three subsidiaries. This process was aided by internal communication managers at each subsidiary. The survey was available online to be completed at any time during a four-week period. After each week a reminder was sent out to encourage more respondents to complete the survey.

The qualitative data was collected through eight interviews, each taking approximately 45 minutes and held at the subsidiary in Bangkok. The choice to conduct interviews at the site was based on the notion that face to face interviews has shown to generate rich qualitative data (Shuy, 2003).

3.3 Interview design

The interviews were semi-structured, and the interviews intended to investigate why and how POS and PSS influence the three C2C dimensions. The interview guide consisted of 21 questions and was based on work by Eisenberger et al. (1986), Eisenberger et al. (1997) and Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) (See Appendix 2 for full Interview Guide). All respondents were anonymous to provide freedom of expression without fear of repercussions. The interview framework consisted of 3 main themes; (1) C2C profile, (2) Organizational support, (3) Supervisor support. A background and evaluation theme were included to get an understanding of the respondents current- and desired states. The framework of themes was created based on the conceptual theoretical framework (See Figure 1).

3.4 Survey design

The survey was developed by using the items based on research by Herscovitch and Meyer (2001) and Eisenberger et al. (1997) thus, increasing the appropriateness of the items, and affecting the validity positively (See Appendix 1 to view the questionnaire). As seen in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Job Title</th>
<th>Number of years within the MNC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Senior Acting Manager</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Senior Manager</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>15 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>31 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>7 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Head of Operation</td>
<td>5.5 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
previous research there are many other factors that could potentially influence the relationship between the constructs, such as gender or age (Aydin, Sarier & Uysal, 2011; Balay, 2000; Dodd-McCue & Wright, 1996; van der Velde, Bossink & Jansen, 2003).

The survey was constructed with an introduction about the project, a description of the purpose and a statement that total confidentiality was guaranteed (See Appendix 1). This was done to capture respondents’ interest in the survey and to generate high respondents rate. The structure of the survey consisted of 18 items regarding the three dimensions of C2C, eight items on POS and four items on PSS. All constructs were measure on the same 7-point Likert-type scale and description of the meaning of the measurements was clearly stated throughout. In the finale analysis not all items were used due to low factor loadings (See Table 2 for used items).

The survey was designed to be as comprehensible and easy to complete as possible in order to get a large sample and limit misunderstandings. To limit the potential loss of respondents during the completion of the survey it was important that it was not too time-consuming. Five test runs of the survey with external respondents suggested that the survey took approximately seven minutes to complete. The benefits of distributing the survey online were that it could in some extent encourage respondents reluctant to disclose sensitive or personal information due to the anonymity (Sivo, Saunders, Chang & Jiang, 2006). It can subsequently provide insight into individual perceptions and attitudes (Baruch & Holtom, 2008), aligned with the purpose of the study. It can also enable the collection data from a greater sample since responders are able to do the survey at their own time within the four-week period. (See Appendix 1 for full questionnaire).

3.4.1 Measures

Affective commitment to change was assessed via three items, each of which was scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). Sample items were all derived from Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) and include for example, “I believe in the value of change” and “Change serves an important purpose”.

Continuance commitment to change was assessed via three items, each of which was scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). These items were all derived from Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) and include for example, “I have too much at stake to resist change” and “It would be too costly to resist change”.
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Normative commitment to change was assessed via three items, each of which was scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). Sample items were all derived from Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) and include for example, “I do not think I would be right for me to oppose change” and “It would be irresponsible for me to resist change”.

Perceived organizational support was assessed via five items, each of which was scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). Sample items were all derived from Eisenberger et al. (1997) with some alterations to remove value adding word such as “strongly” and “really”. Such wording could have a leading or confusing effect on participants. Sample items include for example, “My organization cares about my well-being” and “My organization is willing to help me if I need a special favor”.

Perceived supervisory support was assessed via three items, each of which was scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale (1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). Sample items were derived from Eisenberger et al. (1986) with some alterations to remove value adding word such as “strongly”, “really” and “very”. Such wording might confuse or be seen as leading for participants. The items used included, “My supervisor care about my well-being” and “My supervisor cares about my opinion”.
### Table 2. Measurement Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Constructs and Items</th>
<th>Factor loading</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
<th>R2-value</th>
<th>t-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC2C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1: Value of change</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>CR = 0.94</td>
<td>AVE = 0.83</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2: Change is a good strategy</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>29.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4: Change has serves purpose</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>19.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC2C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8: Pressured to change</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9: Side-bets reduces resisting change</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>CR = 0.82</td>
<td>AVE = 0.60</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10: Resisting change is too costly</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>7.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC2C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14: Not right to oppose change</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16: Irresponsible to resist change</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>CR = 0.72</td>
<td>AVE = 0.48</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17: Sense of guilt</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19: Organization cares</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20: Organization cares about values</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>25.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22: Organization cares about opinion</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>CR = 0.97</td>
<td>AVE = 0.93</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>23.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23: Organization helps employees</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>15.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25: Organization forgives mistakes</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>13.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27: Supervisor cares about opinion</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q28: Supervisor cares about well-being</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>CR = 0.93</td>
<td>AVE = 0.72</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>59.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q29: Supervisor cares about goals and values</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>33.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.6 Data analysis

3.6.1 Quantitative

3.6.1.1 Descriptive statistic
The survey yielded 168 responses from the three subsidiaries with only two missing values within the entire sample. The respondents were of mixed origin, sexes, age and other backgrounds. Most responders were locals, meaning from the Southeast Asia region, while 13 respondents were expats. Of the respondents, 33.7% were female and 65% male and most commonly with 38.1% around 25-35 years, although there was a high variance of both age and backgrounds, most respondents had a university degree. The factor of number of years within the organization also showed large variation, but most frequently, with over 33.7%, the respondents in this study had remained in the organization for 1-5 years.

3.6.1.2 Structural equation model
The six hypotheses based on the constructed model (See Figure 3) were analyzed using structural equation modeling (SEM) in a LISREL-model. The LISREL-model allows for simultaneous estimation of the constructs validity and reliability of the six hypotheses. Thus, enabling to confirm or reject the hypotheses.

3.6.2 Qualitative
All interviews were transcribed and analyzed using Thematic Content Analysis (TCA) in order to structure, to understand the data and to identify common patterns (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The patterns were captured by importance and in relation to the overall research question (DeSantis & Ugarriza, 2000; Braun & Clarke, 2006). The processes of conducting the analysis followed Braun and Clarke (2006) six-step model. First, the transcribed material was reviewed to find codes, leading to detection of themes and discovery of their implications on the overall research questions. The analysis consequently reduced the data into quotes and keywords that fitted with the theory-based categories and classifications. This means that some assumptions and interpretations were needed. However, the base in theory meant that the method could still be considered trustworthy (Braun & Clarke, 2006). To view an example of the conducted TCA analysis, see Appendix 3.

Inspired by Gioia methodology, inductive codes and themes were derived from the data (Gioia, Corley & Hamilton, 2013), after the TCA material had been reviewed. Recurrent and reflected themes emerged into first-order codes (See Table 3). The first-order codes followed a cyclical
approach moving back and forth between theory and the thematic material to theorize the concepts. These first-order themes were then aggregated into 11 second-order themes and subsequently aggregated into the five main themes, AC2C, CC2C, NC2C, POS and PSS to conduct a progression analysis (See Table 3 & 4). The progression analysis was made to create a cross-case analysis between the eight cases (See Table 4). Each case was subjectively weighted against the occurrence of each of the 11 subthemes to match each of the cases levels of C2C dimensions with perceived support. The aggregated themes, to the furthest right in the table below were uncovered using a deductive approach leaning on theory. The second-order subthemes and the first-order codes derived from inductive reasoning thus creating a richer and deeper analysis.

Figure 3. Codes and themes
4. Empirical Findings

4.1 Quantitative Result
A structural equation model was applied to test the hypothesis in a LISREL analysis as all constructs were latent variables. This was done in order to simultaneously get an estimation of the validity and reliability of the constructs, as well as the hypothesized relationship presented in the conceptual model. The constructs and measures have been tested in previous research, thus to ensure control of the interpretation of the constructs, one item of each construct has been fixed to one which indicates a t-value of zero (See Table 2) (Hair, Black, Babin, Anderson & Tatham, 2010)

4.1.2 Measure validity and reliability
To determine that the constructs were internally coherent, tests of convergent validity were tested. All inter-factor correlations were verified in a saturated measurement model (See Table 2) (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993).

The first step was to measure the strength of the linearity in relations between constructs and items. The R-squared values are presented in Table 2. The strength of the linearity was relatively robust, with R-squared values at 0.24 and above, which is above the recommended threshold of 0.20 (Hair et al., 2010). The t-values for all items were significant as they were all above 3.32. All factor loadings except one was considered strong, being above the recommended level of 0.5. The factor loading for item 17 which was part of the NC2C construct were slightly low at 0.49. The next step was to understand the interaction between the items and their constructs, a measurement referred to as the composite reliability. The composite reliability was calculated for each construct as the portion of common variance described by each construct. All five constructs gave a value above the suggested threshold of 0.70 with the lowest at 0.72 (See Table 2) (Anderson & Gerbing, 1988; Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

The constructs were relatively stable according to Fornell and Larcker (1981) measurement of convergent validity referred to as AVE, which measures the error-free variance of the set of items related to a construct. All constructs except one were above the recommended threshold of 0.50. Levels of the constructs varied from 0.48 to 0.93. NC2C was weakest. Thus, suggesting that all constructs but NC2C can be considered to provide strong evidence of the validity of the four remaining constructs.
The goodness-of-fit statistics for the measurement model showed acceptable results, with a GFI of 0.85, an NNFI of 0.99, P-value of 0.05524 and an RMSEA of 0.037. The Chi-square was at 133.54 and the degrees of freedom was 109. The RMSEA was below the recommended level of 0.08. The NNFI- and GFI-values shows that the proportion of improvement fit in relation to the null model while monitoring for model frugality (Bollen, 1989). The model had a good fit and the data were of acceptable levels. According to Andersen and Gerbing (1988), the loading in the Phi-matrix plus standard error times two should be less than one. If it is less than one then discriminant validity is achieved, which was achieved in this structural model.

To enable to analyze the hypotheses in the structural model the data was improved to produce a model that gave a clearer illustration of the quantitative findings. This enabled to specify the causal relations in accordance with the hypothesis. By testing multiple alternative combinations and models, the concluding remark was that this model was the superior option.

As a second step in the analysis a structural model was formed to test the hypothesis. The model could only confirm one of the six hypotheses since the constructed structural model only showed one significant relationship (H1). The relationship was at the 5% significance level and identified as a positive correlation between the construct of POS and the construct of AC2C. Even if there was no other significant relationship between the other construct, there was a positive relationship between POS-NC2C and a negative one between POS-CC2C. There was also a negative relationship between PSS-AC2C, and PSS-NC2C, and a positive relationship between PSS-CC2C. But since no other significant relationship between the other constructs could be found, the model could neither confirm or deny the remaining hypotheses (H2, H3, H4, H5, H6).
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The final structural model had a Chi-square = 151.31, Degree of Freedom =112, P-value 0.0079, RMSEA= 0.046, NFI=0.96, NNFI=0.99, GFI=0.83. Indicated an overall good model fit for the structural model.

4.2 Qualitative Findings

The findings revealed that C2C profiles could vary within organizations and were motivated by individual drives and needs for support. All cases in this study had a mixture of AC2C, CC2C and NC2C within their C2C profile. From analyzing the aggregated themes and second-order themes (See Figure 3) it was established that each case had one or two prominent dimensions in their C2C profile (See Table 4).

4.1.2 Affective Commitment to Change

The AC2C dimension was divided into three subthemes in order to identify the dimension within the individuals C2C profiles. The subthemes, engagement, identification and emotional bond are a keystones of the AC2C dimension and can act both separately and simultaneously (See Table 1). Some essence of the AC2C was identified in most cases:

"Number one, I think is that you have a good vision, present where we are going and that you have influenced those who you think are key people in the company and that you always have
some form of feedback with them so that you can change over time so that a small problem will not be a huge problem in the end” (Case 6)

Engagement

Engagement was identified as a desire to be involved in the organizational change process and the most frequently identified. This can be expressed by a desire to have communication and dialogue or an exchange of views and ideas. The desire to influence and contribute to the change was also part of the subtheme of engagement and was expressed by multiple cases. The importance of understanding the change and why it happens was according to the cases a motivator to commit to change as suggested by the cases.

“We need to have the listening before we go to change” (Case 1)
“We need to prepare with the reasoning...when people understand we can get involvement from everybody” (Case 1)
“...if we communicate and let them understand what will happen or what is the objective I think that that will help them to feel confidence and feel safe and they see what will happen to them...” (Case 2)
“...ownership in the organization by creating ideas, suggestions” (Case 1)
“Clear picture, clear objective, what is the goal? Why do we have to change? Explain me. If I know then everything can make me better or the organization” (Case 7)

Identification

The second keystone and subtheme in the AC2C dimension was Identification. Which was when the cases identified with the objectives and the purpose of the change. Visualization of change was associated with identification and the AC2C dimension, since visualization was often based on finding a purpose and motivation. Visualization of change was often associated with a better future. Identification was further recognized as a sense of ownership over the change process and often act simultaneously with engagement. Some of the cases felt a sense of ownership due to identification with the change and thus became committed to change.

“...they want to bring us to a better position. That is the positive way...so all the change they send to us is aimed for something good, I believe in the objective” (Case 2)
“It's because I have a vision, a picture of how it will look” (Case 5)
“The future means benefits, they can see that they have a job, money, personal happiness because of the change” (Case 6)
“To show my performance, that people will know my work on the change and respect me.

Feeling part of the change” (Case 3)

Emotional bond
The third subtheme of the AC2C dimension was recognized as emotional commitment. This subtheme was important but the least frequent of the subthemes in the dimension. The emotional bond was often associated with positive affiliations with change and the belief that change was an important and enjoyable process. It was suggested that the emotional bond acts as a motivator that stems from the purpose of change. This was strongly associated with a personal desire to support change.

“I like to see results, I like to see people growing and if I see that, we talked about what satisfy you, if I see customers happy, if I see people happy then I get motivated. It is also a lot of learning during the way, for me as a person as well” (Case 8)

“It is also about the recognition...let people know they are valued” (Case 1)

“...when we change we always change for better things than our current situation. ... I am very comfortable to develop change and be change agent also” (Case 7)

4.1.2 Continuous Commitment to Change
Within this study the dimension of continuous commitment was divided into two subthemes, Risk and Calculating Cost to better understand the CC2C dimension (See Table 1).

“I think change is very important, it always happen, you cannot avoid change. we have to go with the change and know how to cope with it” (Case 2)

Risk
The subtheme of Risk was identified as that CC2C resonates from the need to avoid the risk associated with resisting change such as, that the organization might become uncompetitive. CC2C stems from the individuals’ attempts to avoid uncertainty and risk. This type of reasoning was identified in some of the cases. The risk of losing potential benefits can act as a facilitator of commitment according to some respondents. Most of the cases viewed change as something that needs to be adapted to and in many cases controlled by external pressures. Change was also seen as an unavoidable risk that needs to be handled. So resisting change would be useless and lead to unnecessary risk.
“when company survive, if we support company then employee can survive as well.” (Case 1)
“we are in the business so we must change in order to grow to be in a better position”
(Case 2)
“...how we are working and give the benefit to the business and also the business give to the people as well.” (Case 4)
“we need to change, we need to adapt to the environment and political things” (Case 1)

**Calculating costs**

The subtheme of *Calculating costs* was based on the reasoning of weighing potential costs of committing to organizational change. The costs of resisting change might be loss of social status, relationships or other personal benefits. Some cases explained that resisting or working against change might lead to the cost of losing side-bets, for instance the cost of losing valuable work relationships with co-workers. Calculation of costs was often associated with the negative impacts of change such as role uncertainty and stress due to lack of trust which was expressed by the cases.

“...from the colleges, I can see others person try to do something in the positive way and then I have to help, or we have to help each other” (Case 5)

“I think humans are quite resistant to change... they worry about the negative impact and they don't want to cooperate” (Case 2) and by “...it is actually that you can stay ahead, you can stay competitive. So, and then you secure good business opportunities and also good employee opportunities, for people working in the organization” (Case 8)

**4.1.3 Normative Commitment to Change**

From the interviews together with the analysis it became clear that three subthemes; *Loyalty, Duty* and *Personal Growth* could be extracted from the normative dimension of C2C (See Table 1).

“...duties to work together as a group” (Case 4)

**Loyalty**
The first subtheme, loyalty was seen in four cases, where the levels of loyalty varied. Some expressed loyalty as the loyalty to work with change by wanting to improve the competitiveness of the organization. It was further suggested that loyalty could increase by improving the line
of communication. Loyalty towards change was also expressed by putting trust in upper management decisions to implement change, and there was a suggested link between support and loyalty.

“...to develop and to make the organization competitive in the business” (Case 4)
“...information and communication can improve. Provide detail and detailed information and make them understand and get them involved...We get increased employee engagement and make people more loyal” (Case 7)
“I think mostly change is driven from the management level, so I think they see the room for improvement” (Case 2)
“I am one of those fouls that have lived with (Company). And it has given me a lot, but I work too much, very very too much, so the relationship is very good. So, I have no problems and I'm probably one of those old ones, so of course you are loyal too” (Case 5)

Duty
The second subtheme was identified as the duty to work towards change was expressed by two out of the eight cases. Even if changes are seen as necessary, there was a sense of duty to work toward change. The cases would see it as part of their job responsibilities to participate and work towards change, thus their duty to commit to change.

“I will accept it...It is part of my job too and responsibility” (Case 4)
"If I say as such, it has been my job for many years to make big changes" (Case 5)
"I buy that we need to change, but I think one should still have a dialogue before deciding whether it is good or bad” (Case 5)

Personal growth
Personal Growth, the third subtheme was more frequently seen through all of the cases compared to duty and loyalty. Personal growth and the belief that organizational change will lead to personal benefits was a way to identify NC2C. The cases expressed a motivation to work with change from seeing personal benefits with the change. Almost all of the cases expressed that personal benefits can derive from change as a learning opportunity by developing new competencies and capabilities.

“So, it is not only the benefit to the company but benefits to myself” (Case 1) and “I think that it is a good thing that we benefit from the change” (Case 3)
“The challenge to learn...When change is coming we expect that we are becoming to be better” (Case 3)

“I think that every change is adding to my value for my work. The change can learn new things” (Case 7)

“I guess salary but for me it is more about the development and opportunity to grow and to move to another position or other functions” (Case 4)

“In my personality, I always want to see something improve...my future within the organization, my capabilities and my need and wants” (Case 6)

4.1.4 Perceived Organizational Support

From the interviews two subthemes was extracted from the main theme POS, namely Fairness and Job Conditions (See Table 1). The majority of the cases expressed a high level of POS.

“...the organization, because I like to see that the organization I am working with can cope and meet the expectations for customer perspective but also from within the organization expectations which is people development” (Case 8)

**Fairness**

Most of the cases agreed that the organizational relationship was fair and supportive. The cases expressed clearly that they felt like the organization cared and that the relationship with the organization was good. The cases agreed that support was important in change processes since it could provide guidance and insurance. The cases further expressed the importance of POS in order to motivate change. The cases showed a high level of faith in the organizations’ practices, thus believing that organizational change processes will be fair and just. Consequently, the cases seemed to believe that organizational change would lead to a better future. There was a sense of proudness resonating from working with the organization.

“I feel like the organization is supporting and the relationship is good” (Case 3)

“I have very good relationship with all of the organization” (Case 6)

“They are successful, because now people believe in the (company) way” (Case 7)

“I feel valued within the organization, they know what I need and support me. It is important for change” (Case 1) “The organization the most, it can not only be the supervisor as we have to work with colleagues as well” (Case 1)

“...the values promote you as a leader to involve people in the organization, and I like that way of working” (Case 8)

“Trust is a key for successful change here” (Case 2)
“...there is a really good reason to why we do the things” (Case 5)
“Everything that we change, we change to serve the customer” (Case 3)

Organizational Rewards and Job Conditions
Organizational Rewards and Job Conditions relates to organizationally grounded activities like organizational values, favorable working hours and benefits such as training. Therefore, some cases identified that change gave them the opportunity to grow and learn new things thus, adding to their personal and professional value. POS was recognized as very important for change throughout the cases. POS was identified within cases and there was a sense of gratitude towards the organization. Yet, cases expressed communication issues and lack of control of the individual situation and within the professional role. This issue was also recognized by management as seen in the last quote presented below:

“This organization is like my second home, because it make me income, make me have good relationship and another thing is I am so happy to work with (the organization)”
(Case 7)

“we are not involved when something is going to happen...Even we don't have the right to make decision” (Case 4)

“you have to describe and how we contribute to the change. Or how we are working and give the benefit to the business and also the business give to the people as well” (Case 4)

“... if we communicate and let them understand what will happen or what is the objective I think that that will help them to feel confidence and feel safe and they see what will happen to them...” (Case 2)

“...creating dialogue and communication, supporting everyone from their perspective to contribute. That and I know it is a lot of training needed” (Case 8)

4.1.5 Perceived Supervisor Support
Relationship
The extracted subthemes from PSS was Relationship (See Table 1). The material provided some irregularities when it came to understanding PSS. Some cases highlighted the importance of having PSS in creating C2C whereas others explained that they were unaffected by it. Some cases highlighted the importance of support from supervisor, where some had a close relationship and referred to their supervisor as brother or mother. Suggesting that the relationship had great impact as a good relationship can lead to better involvement. Most agreed that the relationship was very important for change because their supervisor was seen as
the direct link between change and communication. While POS was still vital, PSS played an important role to build C2C. The reasons behind their non-affected “attitude” toward PSS was explained in different ways. The general explanation was that they saw the supervisor and the change as two separate entities. Another mentioned reason was that support came mainly from colleagues.

*He (supervisor) try to let us see how can we be better, what makes us better and what benefits we should get if we do some change” (Case 2)*

*My supervisor, she is like a mother...she can give me the recommendation and support”*  
(Case 1)

“...if you trust someone (supervisor) it is easy to change” (Case 2)

“I can easily follow his intentions and his process. I know how I can contribute into it, and I am also apart of the dialogue” (Case 8)

“I ask and I get great answer from my supervisor which motivates me since I then know why...It motivates me a lot sometimes, this dialog” (Case 6)

“...but more it would be my supervisor because more direct communication” (Case 3).

“Not affect at all, because supervisor and change is different” (Case 7)

“Not motivate (Supervisor) ...From the colleges (Case 4)

**Table 4. Cross-case analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>C2C Profile</th>
<th>Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Engagement/Identification/Organization/Supervisor</td>
<td>AC2C</td>
<td>POS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Calculating/Risk/Organization/Supervisor</td>
<td>CC2C</td>
<td>PSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Identification/Organization/Supervisor</td>
<td>AC2C</td>
<td>POS/PSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Loyalty/Duty/Calculating/Risk/Organization</td>
<td>NC2C/CC2C</td>
<td>POS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Engagement/Identification/Loyal/Duty/Organization</td>
<td>AC2C/NC2C</td>
<td>POS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Engagement/Identification/Organization/Supervisor</td>
<td>AC2C</td>
<td>POS/PSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Engagement/Identification/Organization</td>
<td>AC2C</td>
<td>POS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Engagement/Identification/Emotional Bond/Organization</td>
<td>AC2C</td>
<td>POS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “A” means that second-order subtheme occurred more than 3 times in the interviews, “a” means that second-order subthemes occurred below 3 times in the interviews “O” means that the second-order subtheme was not present.
5. Discussion

5.1 Affective Commitment to Change

The first dimension, AC2C is the most studied dimension, where studies have been more interested in the relationships between AC2C and POS, establishing a positive relationship. Studies regarding AC2C and PSS have shown similar results (Chawla & Kelloway, 2004; Neves & Caetano, 2009; Turner Parish et al., 2008; Rhoades et al., 2001). However, in the current study, the quantitative findings could only establish that POS had a positive significant relationship with AC2C, whereas PSS had no significant relationship with AC2C.

The same was discovered in the qualitative findings, as most cases within the MNC experience higher level of AC2C compared to the other two dimensions (NC2C and CC2C). Most often in combination with greater level of POS rather than PSS. Some cases had a mixture of characteristics of belonging in each C2C dimension, however in most of the cases there was one dimension that was more apparent. From the case analysis the most common C2C dimension identified was AC2C, which appeared within six of the eight cases (See Table 4). The AC2C dimension is frequently described as the most favorable mindset (Bouckenooghe et al., 2015; Turner Parish et al., 2008; Neves 2011) as employees with a high level of AC2C believes that change has a purpose and is in their best interest (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). It is further suggested that a moderate level of AC2C among employees is necessary to achieve the desired change outcome (Sinclair et al., 2005; Turner Parish et al., 2008; Morin et al., 2016). Suggested that the cases had a favorable change mindset and wanted to participate in change.

When analyzing the narratives, it was uncovered that reasons behind why POS had a greater influence on AC2C was because there was a feeling of involvement and participation in the organization as well as in the change. The cases shared experiences were change had been a favorable experience, hence they had a personal desire to support change. This personal desire to support organizational goals and organizational changes are a part of POS (Rhoades et al., 2001; Huy, 2002). It was also suggested that this desire had been created through fair and just organizational practices, which was identified as POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). The influence of POS is effective when the organization treats their employees fair and show that they care about their well-being (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). The cases also emphasized that in order to feel involved it was important that change suggestions also resonate from employees. The ability to be involved in change processes increased a sense of ownership of
the change leading to a strong AC2C profile (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Bouckenooghe et al., 2015). To respect the ideas of employees is an interpretation of POS suggesting an explanation for the link between POS and AC2C.

Two cases showed a high level of AC2C that indicated a combination of both POS and PSS within their profile. This combination was aligned with literature that suggests that it is difficult for employees to detach PSS from POS (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Within the context of an MNC it could be interpreted that decisions concerning change were often taken at organizational level rather than supervisor level. This implies that even if supervisors are important in change initiative, it was believed that change often resonate from top-management and was controlled by the organization rather than the supervisor. POS was also suggested to have greater influence in the context of organizational change since motivation and change decisions can stem from multiple sources and not only supervisor. This could potentially be an effect of using a large MNC as a point of reference, providing a sample with similar change process experiences.

Based on the findings, H1 could be confirmed since the relationship between POS and AC2C was significant and frequently clarified by the cases. There was no significant relationship between PSS and AC2C and not frequently explained by the case, so H5 could neither be confirmed nor rejected. The qualitative findings could provide a richer understanding of why POS and PSS can influence AC2C. These findings were aligned with previous research (Chawla & Kelloway, 2004; Neves & Caetano, 2009; Turner Parish et al., 2008; Rhoades et al., 2001).

5.2 Continuous Commitment to Change

The second dimension, CC2C in relation to POS have in previous research given ambiguous results. Studies have revealed a negative relationship (Rhoades and Eisenberger, 2002), while others showed a no significant relationship (Aubé et al., 2007) or even a positive relationship (Colakoglu et al., 2010). In the current study, the quantitative data suggests that there was a negative influence between CC2C and POS, but no significant relationship was found. Furthermore, a positive influence was identified between CC2C and PSS but again not significant. These findings could challenge Neves and Caetano (2009), which indicate that individuals scoring high on CC2C have lower trust in the supervisor. This finding was unexpected, since trust is supervisor should decrease the level of uncertainty that is associated with the CC2C dimension (Neves & Caetano, 2009).
Cases with CC2C characteristics showed a sense of risk avoidance and urgency to reduce role ambiguity that can be associated with change processes (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Bouckenooghe et al., 2015). The qualitative findings suggested that PSS could contribute to an acceptance of the change since direct information, good relationship and trust leads less uncertainty as derived from findings which stresses the personal relationship (Neves & Caetano, 2009). Characteristics of PSS in the cases indicated that the supervisor could reduce risk by communication. Such as reducing uncertainty by motivating the employees with possible benefits that can be derived from the change.

POS on the contrary, could reduce CC2C by making sure employees feel valued and secure within the organization. Consequently, by involving employees in the change, POS could lead to that their insecurities are reduced. This could explain why PSS and POS could potentially influence CC2C, even if H2 and H5 could neither be rejected or confirmed. However, these insignificant and inconclusive findings can be explained by previous research that suggests that CC2C is largely influenced by external factors (Umoh et al., 2014) thus less likely to be influenced by POS or PSS.

5.3 Normative Commitment to Change
The third dimension, NC2C, proved to be the most difficult construct to analyze, as there was neither a significant relationship between POS and NC2C nor PSS and NC2C. The NC2C dimension is often driven by the duty and obligation to support and contribute to change (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Meyer et al., 1991). The construct was difficult to analyze due to the low factor loadings on item 17 (0.49) and an AVE (0.48) below the desired level. The NC2C construct was considered a weak construct. This could be an explanation to why neither H3 or H6 could be confirmed or denied using the quantitative data. An explanation for the weakness of the construct could be that the respondents did not understand the questions due to language barrier, time constraints or the limited possibilities to ask questions. Even if efforts were made to ensure English proficiency, it was still a likely cause to irregularities in the material.

The relationships between NC2C, POS and PSS were not frequently found in the qualitative findings. However, some cases showed implications of NC2C characteristics, as there were narratives regarding personal growth, duty and loyalty. Meaning that there was a sense of wanting to repay the organization for being a good employer (Turner Parish et al., 2008; Neves, 2011; Shin et al., 2015). From the case narratives it could be argued that POS and PSS could influence on NC2C. As research has suggested the NC2C dimension could be installed through
supportive behavior from both the organization and the supervisor (Meyer & Allen, 1991; Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002; Meyer et al., 2002; Neves, 2011). NC2C illustrates a sense of loyalty to accept that change could be part of the job and that resisting change would not be the right thing to do. This can also explain why POS and PSS have little significance on NC2C, as this sense of loyalty could be connected to job responsibilities rather than by receiving POS or PSS.

The relationship that stands out within analysis of the NC2C dimension, was the non-significant negative relationship between NC2C and PSS. Research has mentioned that when employees perceive a higher level of PSS, they will develop a sense of loyalty to the supervisor and a sense of moral obligation to support change initiatives (Neves, 2011). However, since there was no significant relationship, H6 and H3 can neither be confirmed or rejected.
6. Conclusions

To understand how and why POS and PSS influence the C2C dimensions in the MNC context, the qualitative and quantitative findings were analyzed using mixed methods and ways of interpreting the data. The case narratives were used to better understand why POS and PSS influences the C2C profiles by looking at which forms of support influences which type of dimension. Previous studies have to a large extent focused on POS and PSS as one concept, interpreting PSS as an intricate part of POS (Levinson, 1965; Rhoades et al., 2001; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). This study detached PSS from POS to understand the influence of each form of perceived support. These constructs have previously been proposed as two distinctive constructs (Maertz et al., 2007). Thus, detaching them could provide a new perspective to why and how perceived support affect C2C, thus adding additional value to the field research.

This study contributed to the existing literature by introducing new perspectives concerning POS and PSS influences on the three C2C dimensions within an MNC context. Previous research within C2C has almost exclusively been in the field of psychology and of an exploratory nature, (Chawla & Kelloway, 2004; Neves & Caetano, 2009; Turner Parish et al., 2008). This study adds value by exploring the concepts in a management and business context. While it was important to understand how the constructs act in combinations it was perhaps equally important to understand the why. Especially, in a business context in order to use the knowledge effectively for managerial practices. Thus, motivating the research approach to be of both exploratory and explanatory nature. The study further offers support for the micro perspective of C2C (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002) by extending the literature and providing further research directions.

In conclusion, the results suggest that POS was a key concept for understanding the influence on employees C2C profile, particularly on the AC2C mindset. It was implied that POS binds people and change goals together into a “desired mindset” among the employees. It is important for organizations to provide a clear purpose of the changes and to create a feeling of being part of the change activities. However, as research has indicated NC2C and CC2C are just another way of committing to change and can be valuable in change implementations (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Neves, 2011) but possibly influenced by other factors rather than POS and PSS. It does not necessarily mean that the CC2C and NC2C does not get influenced by POS and PSS.
Rather it means that according to the case narratives and the survey data, AC2C were more important within change processes together with a high level of POS.

Still, it is important to bear in mind that at some point in an employees’ career it is most likely that they will experience a high level of CC2C as they feel a need to stay within their job to receive a paycheck and other benefits. Which is something management and MNCs need to be aware of to be able to provide the right incentives, minimize perceived risk and emphasize benefits. The construct of NC2C was the weakest and the finding showed that POS and PSS had little influence on NC2C. However, this could be interpreted as loyalty and duty are not necessarily toward change, rather towards the organization, the supervisor and the job responsibilities. While AC2C is seen as the most desirable mindset, research has noticed that POS could change employees’ mindsets to continue to work within the organization from a CC2C to an AC2C or an NC2C (Colakoglu et al., 2010).

Furthermore, the findings revealed that POS is more important in change initiatives than PSS within the MNC context. This could be interpreted that decisions concerning change is often taken on organizational level rather than supervisor level. Organizations therefore need to ensure that employees feels part of the change, emphasizing engagement. Claiming that crafting a good relationship between the employees and the organization should be of priority before the relationship between the employees and the supervisor.
7. Further Research and Limitations

The main limitation of this study was that all organizational changes vary in size and frequency. The respondents have different change experiences within the organization, thus making it hard to generalize the findings. This study acts as an introduction to understand the reasons behind the relationships between POS, PSS and the three C2C dimensions, indicating that further research should focus more on this framework.

Another limitation that could have affected the result as previously mentioned could be the misinterpretations of the survey questions, due to language barrier. To reduce this risk in coming research the questionnaire should be available in the subsidiaries native language.

The size and scope of this research is naturally a limitation, as only one MNC was investigated, the findings can only hint that similar experiences and relationships could exist within similar context. It would be beneficial for researchers to investigate reasons behind the different dimensions of C2C and their relationship to POS and PSS in a smaller setting. Perhaps they would be more influenced by the supervisor, due to closer relationships and less overall organization mentality. Future research should also look into external factors that could contribute to C2C, i.e. work-life balance, non-work relationships and colleges and supervisor relationships outside work.
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Appendix 1

Master Thesis on Commitment to Change

Dear Participant:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study of commitment to change. We are two students from Sweden who are studying Business Management at Uppsala University. This survey is part of an on-going study during the spring semester for our Master Thesis in management and business studies.

The general purpose of the research is to better understand what individuals think and feel about change and how those thoughts and feelings are related to support.

Your participation in this study is important for the overall success of the project, and we greatly appreciate your help! We assure you that complete confidentiality is guaranteed. As such, please do not put any identifying marks on the survey. Please read the instructions carefully, don’t leave any questions unanswered, and be as honest and open as possible.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us or our supervisor.

Maria Brambeck, Master Student, Department of Business Studies, Uppsala University, Sweden. Maria.Brambeck@gmail.com

Therese Savmyr, Master Student, Department of Business Studies, Uppsala University, Sweden. Therese.Savmyr@gmail.com

Henrik Dellestand, Ph.D. Associate Professor, Department of Business studies, Uppsala University, Sweden. Henrik.Dellestrand@fek.uu.se
Appendix 1

Survey

*Please tell us about yourself by circle or cross the most suitable alternative.*

**Gender:**

| Male | Female | Other |

**Age:**

| <25 | 25-35 | 36-45 | 46-55 | 56-65 | 66< |

**Your highest educational degree:**

| High school | Bachelor | Master | PhD |

**Which country do you work in?**

| Thailand | India | Singapore |

**Job Level:**

| Senior | Middle | First level |

**Expatriate or Local?**

| Expatriate | Local |

**Number of years within the organization**

| <1 | 1-5 | 6-10 | 11-15 | 16-20 | 21-25 | 26-30 | 31-35 | 36-40 | 41< |

*Using the scale below, please circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about how you might view or feel about a potential change*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Neither Agree/Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I believe in the value of change

2. Change is a good strategy for this organisation

3. I think that management is making a mistake by introducing change

4. Change serves an important purpose

5. Things would be better without change

6. Change is not necessary

7. I have no choice but to go along with change

8. I feel pressure to go along with change

9. I have too much at stake to resist change

10. It would be too costly for me to resist change

11. It would be risky to speak out against change

12. Resisting change is not a viable option for me

13. I feel a sense of duty to work toward change

14. I do not think it would be right for me to oppose change

15. I would not feel badly about opposing change

16. It would be irresponsible of me to resist change

17. I would feel guilty about opposing change

18. I do not feel any obligation to support change
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Using the scale below, please circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about how you might view or feel about perceived organizational support:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My organization cares about my well-being
2. My organization strongly consider my goals and values
3. My organization shows little concern for me
4. My organization cares about my opinion
5. My organization is willing to help me if I need a special favour
6. Help is available from my organization when I have a problem
7. My organization would forgive an honest mistake on my part
8. If given opportunity, my organization would take advantage of me

Using the scale below, please circle the number that indicates the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements about how you might view or feel about supervisor support:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree/Disagree</th>
<th>Somewhat Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. My supervisor cares about my opinion
2. My work supervisor cares about my well-being
3. My supervisor consider my goals and values
4. My supervisor shows very little concern for me

Thank you so much for your participation!
Appendix 2

Interview guide

Title – Organization

Time and location of Interview

The purpose of this interview is to better understand the relationship between employees’ commitment profiles in accordance of Herscovitch and Meyers’ three component model (2002) and the support of treatment of the organization or supervisor. The interviews are aimed to shed light on why this relationship exists and how it influences employees in a corporate environment.

Theme Introduction:

- Describe your professional background at the corporation?
- Describe your tasks and responsibility at the corporation?

Theme C2C profile:

- Describe your perception of organizational change?
- What do you believe is positive with organizational change?
- What do you believe is negative with organizational change?
- How would you describe change process at your organization?
- Which factors makes you motivated to work towards organizational change?
- Which factors make you resist change?
- Which internal or external factors affect your perception of organizational change?

Theme Organizational Support:

- Can you describe your relationship with the overall organization?
- Which are the positive and negative aspects of the organizations change approach?
- How would you describe that your organization tackles changes?
- In your organization, what are the key factors for successful change implementations?
- Would you say that organizational changes are common and successful in the organization?
• What are the key factors within the organization that motivates change processes?

**Theme Supervisor support**

• What does your relationship with your supervisor look like?

• How does this relationship effect change related processes?

• Can you describe how your supervisor tackles organizational change?

• How would you say that your supervisor motivates change Processes?

**Theme Evaluation:**

• Can you describe how you would wish that the organization would handle organizational change?

• Can you describe how you would wish that the supervisor would handle organizational change?

*Thank you so much for your time and participation in this interview*
## Appendix 3

### Example made of Case 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview excerpt</th>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Subtheme</th>
<th>Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“We need to have the listening before we go to change”</td>
<td>Desire to have dialogue in order</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>AC2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>accept change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“ownership in the organization by creating ideas, suggestions”</td>
<td>Feeling part of the change</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>AC2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“we need to change, we need to adapt to the environment and political things”</td>
<td>Need to change to remain in the</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>CC2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“when company survive, if we support company then employee can survive as well.”</td>
<td>A need to survive in order to</td>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>CC2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>remain in the business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We need to prepare with the reasoning...when people understand we can get</td>
<td>Need for clear purpose behind the</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>AC2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involvement from everybody”</td>
<td>change to feel part of change</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It is a quiet top down, with some reason behind it”</td>
<td>Flow of information and sees a</td>
<td>Job condition</td>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>purpose with the change</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>AC2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“So it is not only the benefit to the company but benefit to myself”</td>
<td>See clear personal benefits with the</td>
<td>Personal Growth</td>
<td>NC2C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>change and wants to work towards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I feel valued within the organization, they know what I need and support me. It</td>
<td>Sense of personal value and</td>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is important for change”</td>
<td>contribution within the organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“support from the president”</td>
<td>Sense of being seen and valued from top-management level and organization representative.</td>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Communication, very important. It is also about the recognition...let people know they are valued”</td>
<td>Sense of being valued as an employee</td>
<td>Emotional bond</td>
<td>AC2C Organizational Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“My supervisor, she is like a mother...she can give me the recommendation and support”</td>
<td>Want to build emotional bonds, desire for support from close relationships within organization</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Support (supervisor), affects me positively. It is about encouraging”</td>
<td>Support is important for acceptance of change. Need to be encouraged to work towards change</td>
<td>Relationship</td>
<td>Supervisor Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Supporting (supervisor) and finding the way to go, together”</td>
<td>Belief that change processes are done by the organization as a whole and it is important to pursue together. Sense of loyalty to work together</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>AC2C Supervisor support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We (supervisor) need to have two-way communication”</td>
<td>Want to be involved and aid in order to bring on change initiatives</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>AC2C Supervisor Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“the organization the most, it can not only be the supervisor as we have to work with colleagues as well”</td>
<td>See support from supervisors and colleagues as part of the organizational support. Sense of loyalty to work together.</td>
<td>Fairness</td>
<td>Organizational support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>