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Commitment to change is considered to be one of most important factors for the successful implementation of change initiatives (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). The purpose of the present research was to identify stressors and facilitators that could potentially have a bearing on employees’ commitment to change as well as factors that could mitigate the negative effects of these stressors on commitment to change. The relationship between commitment to change and related behavior is also a focus of the present thesis. A secondary purpose of the present research was also to validate the Herscovitch-Meyer (2002) three component (affective, continuance and normative) model of commitment to change in Pakistan. Survey data were collected from four large Pakistani public sector organizations where organizational restructuring had been initiated, in order to cross validate the research model across multiple samples. The rate of response varied, depending upon the level of support and access provided to the researcher by the respective organizations for data collection. The response rate was 43%, 21%, 28% and 60% for Organization 1, 2, 3, and 4 respectively.

For the purpose of data analysis, exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis techniques were employed for validation of the Herscovitch-Meyer (2002) three component model of commitment to change. For testing hypotheses relating to the effect of stressors and facilitators on commitment to change, and for studying the effect of commitment to change dimensions on change related behavior, hierarchical multiple regression technique was used. Moderated multiple regression was used to test the effect of moderators on the relationship between stressors and commitment to change.
Hierarchical multiple regression technique was also used to determine the relationship between commitment to change and change related behavior.

The results provided support for the three component model despite some issues with the normative commitment to change scale. Job insecurity and role stressors were seen to be potent stressors having a negative relationship with affective and normative commitment to change and a positive relationship with continuance commitment to change. As expected, change related communication, employability and trust found support as facilitators of affective and normative commitment to change while their relationship with continuance commitment to change was observed to be negative. These facilitators were also seen to play a moderating role-albeit with limited support in present samples- in attenuating the negative relationship between stressors and affective/normative commitment to change and the positive relationship between stressors and continuance commitment to change.

The present study is important for commitment research as it is an effort towards the identification of factors which may have a bearing upon the employees’ attitude towards commitment to change. For managers, the present study has important implications in terms of creating an organizational climate which minimizes stress and uncertainties. This positive environment can be made possible by ensuring an exchange of communication between decision makers and employees, provision of opportunities for employee development and allowing trust to develop between employer and employees which will have a positive impact on employee commitment to change.

The results of the present study provide support for the generalizability of the Herscovitch-Meyer (2002) three component model of commitment to change in Pakistan.
There were however some issues concerning the reliability of normative commitment to change items due to which the analyses were performed after the removal of two items. Future research may be conducted on the construct employing cultural based items more suited to the Pakistani context. Future research may also explore the antecedents and consequences of commitment to change, taking stock of the limitations of the present study.
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CHAPTER I
Introduction

The organizational development literature is replete with research supporting change as the panacea for organizational success and survival (Drucker, 1988; Lines, 2004; Pfeffer, 1994; Piderit, 2000; Stace & Dunphy, 1991; Tushman, Newman, & Romanelli, 1986). This type of argumentation generally adheres to a systems theory view, in which a dynamic, and often hostile, environment poses continuous threats to organizations, and that organizations therefore need to constantly change themselves in order to adapt to their environments (Hirsch & Desoucey, 2006). The ever increasing pressure for organizations to change is necessitated by the rapid growth of global competition and the need for maintaining competitiveness. The style and method for undertaking change initiatives by public and private organizations may vary but the basic focus remains the same which is the enhancement of organizational efficiency and effectiveness (Burke, 2002; Huber & Glick, 1995). Although limited reorganization efforts are common within most work environments, many larger organizations commit themselves to fundamental restructuring processes, which often affect many of its employees significantly (Weick & Quinn, 1999).

Changes taking place in an organization may be planned and intentional or they may be unplanned and occurring by chance. Lippit, Watson and Westley (1958) define planned change as a well thought of initiative, implemented though a facilitating agent with a purpose to bring about modifications beneficial to an organization. A planned organizational change will therefore not surprise those affected by it as it is a deliberate
and pre-mediated action carried out usually by the management level employees of an organization who act as change agents. Change initiatives may be directed towards alterations in the structure, functions, goals or technology of an organization (Carnall, 1986). This places tremendous pressure on organizational members to adapt to the new circumstances and modify their behavior accordingly.

The organizational development and change management literature characterizes organizational changes as being expensive, difficult to accomplish and prone to failure. Several researchers (Beer & Nohria, 2000; Burnes, 2002) have warned that the failure rate of change programs could be as high as 70%, which is a formidable figure indicating a significant loss of resources and time. Despite the ominous threats to their success, planned changes are considered a panacea for the ailing and deteriorating organizations marked by inefficiencies. This is true especially of organizations in the public sector that have long been operating in the absence of competition as monopolies (Madsen, 1995), without much consideration for the quality of output or services rendered (Kearney & Hays, 1998). With the increasing demand for improvement in service quality, the public sector is undertaking massive changes like privatization and restructuring.

Public Sector Changes

The public sector plays a vital role in the growth and development of an economy by undertaking public service responsibilities at the national level. The efficient functioning of government machinery is imperative for the maintenance of social and economic order and progress of a country. The idea of an efficient public sector emerged in the 1980’s when developed nations like the US and the UK began to focus on the elimination of
inefficiencies and unresponsiveness from the public sector (Asquith, 1998). Public sector reform initiatives have been given various names such as “reinventing government, process reengineering, high performance planning, total quality management, the new public management or post bureaucracy” (Leavitt & Johnson, 1998, p. 73). But regardless of the term used, all such reform initiatives are directed towards making the government institutions more responsive to public needs by abandoning bureaucratic processes and adopting efficient and effective management systems (Barzelay, 1992). The strategies most commonly adopted in this regard to achieve the optimum level of organizational performance include organizational restructuring, outsourcing and privatization (Noblet, Rodwell, & McWilliams, 2006).

The present research focuses on organizational restructuring as an example of a planned change initiative undertaken for revamping public sector organizations and improving existing management practices. Mcinley and Scherer (2000) define organizational restructuring as “any major reconfiguration of internal administrative structure that is associated with an intentional management change program” (p. 736). Restructuring is considered a favorable option for achieving performance improvement and efficiency for organizations that have long been under strong bureaucratic control (Cascio, 1993). Similar to other planned interventions, organizational restructuring also involves significant changes to the structure and functions of an organization. Changes of such magnitude may prove to be a problem particularly for individuals working in the public sector who prefer to work for it due to the predictable nature of work and the associated benefits and long term job security (Cimons, 1996; Hyder, 2007). With radical changes taking place in strategies, structure and operations of the public sector all over
the world, the job security of the employees is compromised (Worral, Cooper, & Campbell-Jamison, 1998).

Restructuring is a process that affects employees at all levels in an organization. This process not only requires structural and functional changes in the organizations, but also a change in the mind-sets of the employees who are the major players in the success or failure of any change effort (Robertson, Roberts, & Porras, 1993). Despite the planned nature, changes of such magnitude may prove to be stressful and difficult especially for the employees in the public sector, which has traditionally been regarded as being keen on maintaining its status quo. Achieving the desired outcomes of change is therefore likely to be more challenging in the public rather than the private sector due to formal work settings, bureaucratic rules and physical settings (Robertson & Seneverante, 1995).

With the public sector being reorganized and restructured all over the world, Pakistan is no exception. In times of political change, organizational restructuring is – not surprisingly – common within public sectors. The main catalyst for public sector restructuring is often some form of budget cut or political decision to improve efficiency, but the motives for such restructuring may differ depending on country, however. During the past couple of decades, for example, social policy retrenchment has in many advanced capitalist societies replaced welfare state expansion, giving rise to a need for fundamental restructuring of relevant public sector organizations (Pierson, 1994). In contrast, in developing countries such as Pakistan, the implementation of economic reform programs over the past two decades – aiming to generate economic growth and reduce public sector inefficiencies – have also generated the need for fundamental public sector restructuring. In the 1990’s the Government of Pakistan in consultation with the
International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank (WB) and Asian Development Bank (ADB) undertook the restructuring of public sector organizations. These multilateral agencies tied the financial assistance provided to Pakistan with public sector restructuring. The ultimate goal of restructuring was to subsequently privatize these institutions which were causing heavy financial losses to the government due to their weak institutional set up, bureaucratic interference, lack of professionalism and poor management systems (Shah, 2003).

The Human Side of Organizational Change

Organizations experience a myriad of emotional responses from employees relating to change initiatives and the success of change initiatives depends upon the manner in which these reactions are handled (Huy, 1999). The decision makers cannot overlook the human factor in making any decisions pertaining to the organization as employees particularly at the management level are agents of change who translate strategic decisions into actions. Assessing the perceptions and attitudes of individuals related to change can be very valuable for an organization when it embarks upon a major change initiative as this information can help the managers devise appropriate strategies to cope with the change process and resulting uncertainty.

Traditionally, the organizational change literature has maintained a macro focus where the organization was considered the unit of study (Judge, Thoresen, Pucik, & Welbourne, 1999). Given the challenges for employees posed by changes in terms of new work demands recent research regarding organizational change (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Judge et al., 1999; Wanberg & Banas, 2000) has taken notice of this gap in the
literature, calling for a shift in research focus from groups or the entire organizations to individuals who are actually responsible for the implementation of change. This change in focus is the result of the realization that it is the implementation phase where most change plans fail (Brewer & Hensher, 1998) if the human and technical resources of an organization are not in line with the strategic objectives of the change initiative (Klein, 1996). In the words of Judge and colleagues (1999): “Because the success of change efforts lies in the abilities and motivation of individuals within the organization, an individual-level approach to managing change seems appropriate” (p. 118). Although strategic planning and the study of change at structural and systems level is important, Cascio, Young, and Morris (1997) warn that ignoring the human side of the restructuring process may have negative implications not only for the employee but for the organization as a whole in terms of the risk of failure of the initiative.

Based on the preceding discussion it may be argued that introducing change in organizations is one issue, winning the support and commitment of those involved in change implementation is another. Herold, Fedor, and Caldwell (2007) contend that one of the most important factors responsible for successful implementation of change is represented by the commitment of employees towards the initiative, which reflects not just a positive attitude towards the initiative but a willingness to ensure its success. This brings into focus the central idea of the present research, which is commitment to organizational change.
Commitment to change

The possibility of failure of even the best laid change strategies mentioned in the preceding discussion can mainly be attributed to the resistance shown by employees towards the change initiative (Chawla & Kelloway, 2004; Kotter, 1995; Waddell & Sohal, 1998). But the success of change lies not only in reducing resistance but gaining the support and commitment of those affected by the change (Piderit, 2000). Commitment to change represents an attitudinal readiness to work towards the success of a change effort rather than simply showing approval for it. It is not simply the lack of resistance but a positive attitude towards change. Commitment to change is a concept that has been a focus of discussion for the past two decades but was empirically tested for the first time by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002). In their three component model of commitment to change, Hercovitch and Meyer propose three different dimensions or attitudes an individual may hold towards a change initiative: affective (desire based), continuance (cost based) and normative (obligation based) commitment to change.

According to Herscovitch and Meyer (2002), commitment is one of the most important factors involved in employee support for change initiatives. It connects employees with organizational goals for change (Conner, 1992) by gaining their support for change. Researchers warn that wavering commitment among employees can lead to organizational inertia, ultimately leading to the failure of change (Conner & Patterson, 1982; Huy, 2002). Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) observe that commitment can “lead individuals to behave in ways that, from the perspective of neutral observers, might seem contrary to their own self-interest” (p. 301). According to the preceding statement, commitment to a cause can lead individuals to adopt a course of action beneficial to their
organization or any other focus of interest, even in the face of personal adversity. This attitude would assist individuals to tide over the difficulties and uncertainties posed by organizational change.

Given the importance of gaining employee support for the success of a change initiative, it becomes imperative to identify certain factors that will lead to the development of beliefs and attitudes towards change (Cordery, Sevastos, Mueller, & Parker, 1993). Commitment to change may ensure success of a change initiative but may be difficult to accomplish given the stressful nature of change. Organizational changes are a source of stress for the employees (Iverson, 1996), which may be attributed to a number of factors such as the requirement of new skill sets after change, perceived or real threat to economic security and lowering of social status (Dawson, 1994). According to Schabracq and Cooper (1998), when individuals are set in their daily jobs they develop skill sets necessary to deal with their everyday job requirements. This provides them with a sense of control which is disrupted by the initiation of a change program. The higher the adaptation requirement associated with change, the higher will be the stress. Employees facing such stressful situations marked with fear and uncertainty are unlikely to embrace change wholeheartedly (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999). Uncertainty in the organizational environment can lead to the perceptions of job insecurity (Greenhalgh & Sutton, 1991; Hartley, 1991).

Experiences of job insecurity generally arise when an organization is under competitive pressures to undertake changes like restructuring (Parker, Chmiel, & Wall 1997; Probst, 2003; Sims, 1994; Sverke & Hellgren, 2002). The fear of job loss may stem from the notion that major restructuring efforts generally result in job cuts for the
enhancement of economic performance (Beer & Nohria, 2000). This would especially be true for economies where employment opportunities are few and far between as the employee level of job insecurity has been found to be dependent upon the opportunities available in the labor market (Armknecht & Early, 1972). Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) and Hellgren, Sverke and Isaksson (1999) believe that it is not just the fear of job loss but also the fear of loss of job features aspect that may be a source of stress for individuals experiencing work place changes. Hellgren et al. (1999) defined fear of job loss as quantitative and fear of loss of job features as qualitative job insecurity. Both quantitative and qualitative aspects of job insecurity have been reported to have negative effects on employees (Hellgren et al., 1999). Change efforts are not likely to succeed if the employees do not “buy” into its proposed benefits due to ambiguity, stress and lack of commitment towards the initiative (Korunka, Scharitzer, Carayon, & Sainfort, 2003; Young, Worchel, & Woehr, 1998).

Besides job insecurity, another source of stress for employees during organizational change arises from the confusion and ambiguity regarding their previous job roles in the organization. Role stressors include role ambiguity, role conflict and role overload (Iverson, 1996). Research has shown these role stressors to be negatively related to attitudes towards change (Iverson, 1996, Vakola & Nikolaou, 2005; Yousef, 1999) which ultimately leads to resistance and lack of support for change programs.

**New Direction in Research on Commitment to Change**

As mentioned earlier, successful implementation of change would involve the identification of factors that impede or facilitate positive behavioral responses among
employees. In the midst of uncertainty and stress, expecting commitment from employees may seem paradoxical as the employees may feel reluctant to support an initiative that may threaten their employment. There has been a paucity of research regarding the factors that may lead to the development of commitment to change. The factors included in the present research are based on the suggestions by Meyer, Srinivas, Lal and Topolnytsky (2007) and the literature on public sector change. Meyer et al. (2007) have called for research on the antecedents of commitment to change and – extrapolating from literature on organizational change and commitment – identified several factors such as fairness in change implementation, trust in management, communication and effective leadership to be the possible antecedents of commitment to change.

In terms of literature on public sector change, Fernandez and Rainey (2006) have identified a number of factors that can lead to the successful implementation of public sector change. Firstly, the employees have to be educated about the need for change. A clear and practical plan of action has to be communicated. Building internal support or achieving “buy in” of the employees for the change initiative is imperative for its success as employees who believe that a particular change will have a more positive outcome, will be more committed to it (Novelli, Kirkman, & Shapiro, 1995). Top management support for the change also has to be communicated to all employee levels and adequate resources must be provided for change implementation. Communicating and institutionalizing change is therefore important in reducing the “shock” associated with changes.

Besides timely communication, employability or a person’s ability to secure new employment is another factor that is likely to garner employee support for change
(Fugate, Kinicki, & Ashforth, 2004). Individuals more confident about their abilities are likely to be more in control of uncertain or stressful situations and better able to cope with the challenges associated with change (Fugate, Kinicki, & Scheck, 2002). Similarly, employee trust in management can also lead to more positive attitudes towards change initiatives, as faith in the decisions taken by top management can provide a sense of control and the willingness to support the change (Albrecht & Travaglione, 2003).

Very few studies have identified factors that can potentially mitigate the negative effects of stressors on commitment to change (Sverke, Hellgren, Näswall, Göransson & Öhrming, 2008). The present research not only explores the main effects of communication, employability and trust in management that are expected to facilitate change, but also investigates whether such factors may mitigate or reduce the negative effects of change related stressors on commitment to change. Based on the above discussion it can be argued that organizational changes can be stressful for employees which, in turn, may have a negative impact on their support towards the change initiative. Efforts have to be directed towards reducing uncertainty associated with change, which will lead to positive behavioral outcomes.

The behavioral outcomes of commitment to change are also important as they provide an idea about the extent to which an individual is likely to support the change initiative based on the attitudes towards change. Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) in their three component model of commitment to change provided the behavioral outcomes of commitment to change – compliance, cooperation and championing – which are also explored as the consequences of commitment to change in the present research.
This thesis explores the relationship between commitment to change and the factors that impede or facilitate its development in the light of the cognitive-phenomenological theory of stress and coping (Lazarus, 1990; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), which highlights the importance of a person’s recognition of his or her personal ability in dealing with stressful situations. Brashers (2001) notes that when confronted with uncertainty, individuals feel a loss of control over the situation and search for ways to reduce uncertainty or regain control of the situation. The ability of an individual to deal with an uncertain situation would depend upon his or her self-efficacy (Bandura, 1977) in dealing with ambiguities. Individuals tend to react positively to situations that they consider more controllable and expected to yield positive results (Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975).

**General Aim of the Thesis**

Despite the acknowledged importance of garnering employee support and commitment to change, it is not a widely researched topic especially outside North America. Studies based on the development of commitment to change are few and far between. There is a dearth of literature especially on the attitudes of public managers towards organizational change, particularly in the context of commitment (Fernandez & Pitts, 2007). In the Pakistani context, Fatima (2002), stressing the need for indigenous research, warns that the implementation of western change management models without any consideration of their applicability to the local context will lead to the failure of change initiatives.

With regard to stressors like job insecurity, not much research is available on attenuating its negative effects (Probst, 2005). While some researchers (e.g., Meyer et al.,...
2007) have called for research on factors that lead to the development of commitment to change, others (e.g., Fedor, Caldwell, & Herald, 2006) have stressed for future research to consider the outcomes of change in order to better understand its impact on individuals.

The present research is an attempt to address the gaps in literature identified above by highlighting factors that are expected to impede or promote organizational change efforts in the public sector. The focus of this research are management level employees as managers at the middle and lower levels of the organizational hierarchy play an important role in the implementation of the decisions of the top management and act as “champions” of change (Fernandez & Pitts, 2007). They act as a bridge between the top level decision makers and the grass root level of the organization and help translate the words of policy makers into actions and practically implement their policies and decisions. It is therefore imperative to understand the factors that influence the attitudes of managers, especially those in the public sector (Fernandez & Pitts, 2007).

The thesis not only investigates how stressors relate to commitment to change but an attempt is also made to identify factors that would mitigate the negative effects of stressors on commitment to change and ultimately lead to behavior that ensures the success of change initiatives. Since limited research is available on the factors leading to the development of commitment to change in general, and the Herscovitch-Meyer (2002) three component model of commitment to change in particular (Herscovitch, 1999; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002), this research adds to the literature on commitment to change by exploring factors not previously addressed by researchers in the field. In the context of public sector organizations, factors affecting a public manager’s attitude
towards change remain an unexplored area not only in Pakistan but also in the west (Fernandez & Pitts, 2007). The present research thus helps provide insights into public managers’ change related behavior, which may be helpful in preparing future change initiatives.

In the context of Pakistan, empirical research on topics related to management or organizational behavior related topics is virtually non existent. An attempt has been made earlier to validate the Meyer and Allen (1991) organizational commitment measure in Pakistan (Tayyab & Riaz, 2004), but no literature is available on organizational change in general and commitment to change in particular. The present research was designed to fill this void and pave the way for indigenous management research in Pakistan. A secondary objective of this research is also to establish the generalizability of the Herscovitch-Meyer three component model of commitment to change in Pakistan. More specifically, the research focuses on the following research questions:

Q1. How do stressors such as job insecurity and role stressors relate to commitment to change?

Q2. Can factors such as change related communication, employability and trust in management facilitate commitment to change and also mitigate the negative effects of job insecurity and role stressors on commitment to change?

Q3. How is commitment to change related to behavioral outcomes?

The thesis is organized in the following order: Chapter I of this dissertation has presented an introduction to the study including the significance and purpose of study and research questions. Chapter II presents the literature review on the variables of the study.
Methodology utilized for data collection and analysis is presented in Chapter III. Chapter IV describes the results of the analysis. Chapter V presents the discussion of results, limitations, and recommendations for future research and conclusion.
Commitment to change reflects not just a positive attitude towards change but is conceptually distinct from readiness for change (Armenakis, Harris, & Mossholder, 1993), openness to change (Wanberg & Banas, 2000) and coping with change (Judge et al., 1999). It reflects an espousal of the spirit of change resulting in proactive behavior rather than an expression of tacit support or absence of resistance (Piderit, 2000).

Commitment to change has received notable attention from researchers in the past, giving rise to various definitions and models of change. Conner (1992) considers commitment to be a three-stage process. Commitment or resistance to change depends upon the level of involvement in the change process. The more a person is involved, the lesser the resistance and vice versa. According to this view, the three stages of commitment are preparation (how employees are exposed to change and their level of awareness), acceptance (the employee understanding and perception of change) and commitment (internalization of change).

Coetsee (1999) describes commitment to change as the final phase of acceptance of change. He believes it to be a product of knowledge about change, information about change, empowerment, rewards and recognition for changing and shared visions. The larger the product of the five components, the stronger will be the commitment to change.

Although both the models mentioned above provide suggestions regarding how commitment to change develops, neither has provided any measures to test the models
empirically. This issue was addressed by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) who were the first pair of researchers to empirically test their model of commitment to change.

**Three-component Model of Commitment to Change**

The Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) Three-component Model of Commitment to Change is based on the Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) general model of workplace commitment. Prior to this general model that advocated the application of commitment to workplace targets such as organizational change, the research on commitment had various foci such as commitment to organizations (Meyer & Allen, 1991) unions (Barling, Fullager, & Kelloway, 1992), professions (Meyer, Allen, & Smith, 1993), teams and leaders (Becker, 1992) and goals (Locke, Latham, & Erez, 1988).

In their model, Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) presented a multidimensional conceptualization of commitment to change which had earlier been regarded as unidimensional and defined it as “a mindset that binds an individual to a course of action deemed necessary for the successful implementation of a change initiative” (p. 475). According to the model, commitment to organizational change is comprised of three different dimensions which are similar to those that constitute organizational commitment. These three dimensions of commitment to change are affective, continuance and normative commitment to change. *Affective commitment to change* is “a desire to provide support for the change based on its inherent benefits” (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002, p. 475). This form of commitment is based on an individual’s willingness and desire to support a change initiative. *Normative commitment to change* is “a sense of obligation to provide support for the change” (p. 475) and is based on a sense of
obligation to support the change in exchange for the benefits received from the organization. *Continuance commitment to change* is “a recognition that there are costs associated with failure to provide support for the change” (p. 475). Continuance commitment to change is essentially a cost based commitment which arises out of the perceived consequences associated with non-compliance of the initiative instead of the willingness to support change.

Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) developed an 18-item scale to operationalize the three components of commitment to change with six items each for the affective (ACC), normative (NCC) and continuance commitment to change (CCC) constructs. An important result of the same study indicates that commitment to change is conceptually and empirically different from commitment to the organization and better explains the change related behavior than organizational commitment (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002).

Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) have also explained the conditions or factors that lead to the development of the three dimensions of commitment to change based on work place commitment literature. Affective commitment is likely to develop when individuals become involved in, realize the importance of and recognize the relevance of commitment to a certain entity with their own goals (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Strategies such as training, participation in planning the change initiative and empowerment have been identified as potential antecedents of affective commitment to change (Herscovitch, 1999). These particular strategies indicate that affective commitment greatly depends upon the information and clarity regarding the need and purpose of change and the ability to cope with these changes. Employees are more likely
to be affectively committed to a cause when they are able to foresee the associated benefits.

A study by Parish, Cadwallader and Busch (2008) focused on the role of employee commitment to change in the success of change initiatives in the United States. Data were collected from employees of a large non-profit organization. The test of their model- that sought to analyze the antecedents and consequences of commitment to change- revealed that vision, employee management relationship, autonomy in performing job and job motivation were positively related to commitment to change. Affective commitment to change specifically was found to have a positive relationship with organizational performance and the success of change implementation.

Continuance commitment to change develops when individuals make investments they cannot afford to lose due to the discontinuation of an activity and may also be related to lack of available alternatives (Meyer & Allen, 1997; Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001). Such individuals feel unable to deal with the changes either due to lack of clear cut information regarding the purpose of change and expected benefits or the perceived inability to deal with new challenges and requirements of change (Herscovitch, 1999). Individuals with high levels of continuance commitment feel trapped in their job roles and cannot contemplate leaving their jobs either due to lack of alternatives or the perceived investments made in the organization in the form of time and effort. Such individuals tend to apply themselves minimally to the change effort and although this form of commitment cannot be compared to resistance, simply complying with management directives without showing active support is likely to thwart change initiatives.
Normative commitment to change is a reciprocity based commitment which develops when employees internalize the norms of an organization, have received benefits from the organization and are obligated to reciprocate (Meyer & Allen, 1991). A recognition that the organization is fulfilling its obligations or honoring the psychological contract that exists between the two parties also leads to the development of normative commitment towards an entity (Herscovitch, 1999; Meyer, Allen, & Topolnytsky, 1998). The employees will be likely to exhibit normative commitment to a change program when they feel that they will not be abandoned by the employer as a result of change and in return they will extend their obligation based commitment to the organization.

Normative commitment is a higher level of support than continuance commitment but is not as beneficial to the success of a change program as affective commitment to change since in this case one does not fully recognize or embrace the value of change but supports it as an obligation to the organization. Normative commitment to change may also be present among those who support change in consideration of it being important to those in the upper echelons of the organization. Generally speaking, an individual’s commitment to change is dependent upon the extent to which his everyday work is affected by the change (Herold et al., 2007).

Despite the noted importance of the concept of commitment to change in the success of change initiatives, limited efforts have been made to test the generalizability of the Herscovitch-Meyer (2002) model outside North America. Among the few studies that do exist, Meyer et al. (2007) study replicated and extended the findings of the Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) model comparing a sample of Canadian and Indian employees undergoing planned change programs. They were able to provide evidence of
generalizability of the model outside North America. The present study is an attempt to fill the void that exists in literature by establishing the generalizability of the Herscovitch-Meyer model in non-western settings like Pakistan.

In order to establish the generalizability of the Herscovitch-Meyer (2002) model in Pakistan, the first step is to establish its validity.

**Hypothesis 1(a).** There are three distinguishable dimensions underlying the Herscovitch-Meyer (2002) commitment to change scale.

**Hypothesis 1(b).** The subscales representing the three dimensions demonstrate adequate levels of reliability.

**The Effect of Stressors on Commitment to Change**

The changes faced by organizations today may prove stressful for those affected by them. This is true especially for the employees of public sector organizations who are traditionally characterized as being accustomed to predictability and routine in their work. Coch and French (1948) argued that the negative attitudinal reactions to change result due to feelings of uncertainty, loss of control, and the likelihood of failure to deal with the new situation. Many prominent researchers have agreed with these observations in subsequent research (e.g., Ashford, Lee, & Bobko, 1989; Oreg, 2003). A lack of attention towards the psychological reactions of employees towards change can result in the failure of change (Kotter, 1995). On the other hand, it has been argued that adequate opportunities provided to the employees to adjust to the change process and its challenges lead to the acceptance and enthusiasm for the change initiative (Martin, Jones & Callan, 2005).
Any changes in the work environment may give rise to uncertainty, which has been described as a common outcome of organizational change (Allen, Jimmieson, Bordia, Irmer, 2007; Bordia, Hobman, Jones, Gallois, & Callan, 2004 a; DiFonzo & Bordia, 1998). Uncertainty has been defined as “an individual’s inability to predict something accurately” (Milliken, 1987, p. 136). It is this feeling of helplessness and loss of control over a situation which may cause job insecurity or role stress resulting in lack of trust in the organization (Schweiger & Denisi, 1991), lack of organizational commitment (Ashford et al., 1989) and decreased job satisfaction (Nelson, Cooper, & Jackson, 1995). The uncertainty regarding one’s future in the organization leads to resistance towards the change which may thwart the change process (Callan, 1993; Piderit, 2000). Sometimes the employees may feel uncertain about the purpose and the justification of a planned change initiative which causes uncertainty among them (Bordia et al., 2004 a).

Bordia et al. (2004, a) have provided a conceptualization of three types of uncertainties that may arise as a result of organizational changes, namely strategic, structural and functional uncertainties. Strategic uncertainties relate to ambiguity regarding the reasons behind changes and their outcomes. Structural uncertainties may arise due to changes in the reporting relationships and functions of work units. Job related uncertainties exist at a micro or individual level and arise due to ambiguities surrounding ones job security, position in the organization and future roles.

Uncertain work situations are likely to have deleterious effects on employee resolve to support change. There may be many factors causing uncertainty during organizational change but the most relevant, according to research in the public sector
context are considered to be job insecurity and role stress (Fernandez & Smith, 2006; Ferrie, Shipley, Marmot, Stansfield, Davey Smith, 1998; Härenstam, Bejerot, Leijon, Schéele, Waldenström & The MAO Research Group, 2004; Josserand, Teo, & Clegg, 2006; McHugh & Brennan, 1994; Worrall, Cooper & Campbell-Jamison, 2000). The rationale for conceptualizing uncertainty as insecurity and role stressors is provided below.

**Job Insecurity**

When an organization is under competitive pressures to undertake changes like restructuring, the long-term job security of employees is invariably threatened (Sims, 1994) due to changes in requirement for traditional skill sets. Employees feel ill at ease by the prospect of change, viewing it as a threat to their relationship at work, their financial security and to their daily routine (Nadler, 1987). Despite careful planning, a major change initiative may leave many questions unanswered in the minds of employees. This leads to the development of a climate of uncertainty in an organization even with the assurances by the management regarding job security (Cordery et al., 1993).

Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) were the first researchers to define job insecurity and elaborate on the potential causes, effects, and organizational consequences of the phenomenon. They defined job insecurity as a “perceived powerlessness to maintain desired continuity in a threatened job situation” (1984, p. 438) and argued that job insecurity is based on the individual’s perceptions and interpretations of the immediate work environment. Job insecurity commonly occurs in organizations undergoing restructuring (Parker et al., 1997).
The sense of powerlessness and lack of control over work related situations will cause feelings of insecurity among employees even if there exists no apparent threat to an individual’s employment (Sverke & Hellgren, 2002). Job insecurity is generally considered a subjective phenomenon where insecurity is a perception and its intensity varies among different individuals. Employees feeling insecure in their jobs will withdraw from participating in any change initiatives as change will be considered a cause of the potential loss of their jobs (Rosenblatt & Ruvio, 1996). A perceived threat is different from imminent threat as there are no clear and obvious reasons for feeling insecure. Job insecurity may therefore be considered an impending threat which in itself may be a stressor (Näswall, 2004). Roskies and Louis-Guerin (1990) argue that such uncertain situations give rise to an increase in the level of concern among employees. Although these stressors may only be based on employee perceptions, yet failure on part of the management in their timely redressal may lead to the collapse of a change initiative.

Rousseau and Tijoriwala (1999) argue that changes in the work environment can result in perceptions of a breach of the “psychological contract” between the employer and the employee as it threatens their job security. Psychological contract refers to an unwritten contract between an individual and his employer implicitly defining the terms of employment based on a mutually beneficial relationship (Kotter, 1973). Employees expect to keep their jobs as long as they believe they are performing well and experiencing a risk of losing one’s job may be perceived as a breach of contract. Employees experiencing a breach in psychological contract feel that the changes will
adversely affect their employment relationships which may be true especially in the public sector that has traditionally provided job security.

Several studies (Ashford et al., 1989; Greenhalgh, & Rosenblatt, 1984; Greenhalgh & Sutton, 1991; Hartley, 1991; Olson & Tetrick, 1988) including two meta analyses (Cheng & Chan, 2008; Sverke, Hellgren, & Näswall, 2002) consider job insecurity to be a potent stressor, which is associated with negative work attitudes, lower performance and stronger inclinations to turnover from the organization, as well as impaired well-being.

The main differences between and the two meta-analyses (Cheng & Chan, 2008; Sverke et al., 2002) are that that the negative association between job insecurity and job performance was significant in Cheng and Chan’s study (while it was only significant among blue-collar workers in Sverke et al.’s study) and that the relationship between insecurity and job involvement was somewhat weaker in the Cheng and Chan (2008) study. Sverke et. al.’s (2002) moderator analysis suggested that the use of single-item job insecurity measures may lead to an underestimation of the relationship between job insecurity and its outcomes and also that manual workers are more adversely affected by job insecurity than non-manual workers. The moderator analysis by Cheng and Chan (2008) showed that the positive association between job insecurity and turnover intention was stronger among younger, shorter tenured than among older, longer tenure employees. The negative associations between job insecurity and health outcomes were more severe among older, longer tenured employees than on among younger, shorter tenured employees. The relationship between insecurity and the criterion variables did not vary across gender.
Uncertain job situations lead to an increase in resistance to organizational change (Noer, 1993) and decreased levels of job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Ashford et al., 1989; Davy, Kinicki, & Scheck, 1997). Rosenblatt and Ruvio (1996) also found that job insecurity not only had an adverse effect on perceived performance and organizational support by the employees but it was also associated with an increased resistance to change. Insecurity gives rise to rigidity which is detrimental for the organizational change process. Job security on the other hand gives rise to openness to change (Chawla & Kelloway, 2004). Results of a longitudinal study by Probst (2003) showed notable decline in the job security of employees following the announcement of restructuring.

Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) identified two important aspects of job insecurity as the fear of total job loss and the fear of loss of job features. Hellgren et al. (1999) later identified these two aspects as quantitative job insecurity (worries about losing the job as such) and qualitative job insecurity (worries about losing important job features). Loss of important job features refers to a deterioration of working conditions, decrease in future salary development or negative impact on future career advancement. Hellgren et al. (1999) found that qualitative job insecurity was more strongly related to work attitudes while quantitative job insecurity showed stronger relationships with different aspects of health complaints. Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) argued that continued employment may be more important to employees than losing job features and although the threat of losing important job characteristics may cause insecurity, it is “less severe because organizational membership – and all that such membership means to the individual is not lost” (1984, p. 441). Reisel and Banai (2002), who also investigated
effects of different aspects of job insecurity, found that the job loss or quantitative component of job insecurity explained more variance in organizational commitment, trust, and job search behavior than the job features loss component. Moreover, there is research to suggest that quantitative and qualitative job insecurity predict well-being also after controlling for other stressors (De Witte, De Cuyper, Handaja, Sverke, Näswall, & Hellgren, in press).

Having established the stressful nature of job insecurity and its deleterious effects, similar effects may be predicted in the case of commitment to change. There is little empirical research available which shows the effects of job insecurity on commitment to organizational change. Herscovitch (1999) found perceived job insecurity to correlate most strongly with continuance commitment to organizational change. The same study showed lesser variance in affective and normative commitment due to job insecurity. Meyer, Irving, and Allen (1998) believe that continuance commitment is likely to develop in individuals who value job security. In a similar vein it can be argued that individuals experiencing job insecurity are likely to exhibit continuance commitment towards a change program as they are forced to maintain organizational membership due to lack of employment alternatives. A recent study by Sverke et al. (2008) showed job insecurity and commitment to change to be negatively correlated in two samples of hospital employees facing downsizing as a consequence of organizational restructuring.

A large scale change such as restructuring will alter the working conditions and status quo of an organization. Employees may perceive this as a deterioration of their working conditions leading to low affective commitment to change. Normative commitment to change may also be low if the employees view the change as a breach of
their psychological contract and violation of their interests. As continuance commitment relates positively to uncertainty avoidance (Clugston, Howell, & Dorfmann, 2000), it is expected that employees would exhibit this form of commitment to change when faced with a situation that does not guarantee employment security. The uncertainty inherent in job insecurity perceptions may influence employees to make efforts directed at not losing their job. Continuance commitment to change is associated with compliance to the change, and such compliance may be seen as a good strategy to remain employed. Indeed, employees experiencing job insecurity may show some support for the change initiatives just to retain their jobs for the fear that non-compliance may lead to loss of employment.

*Hypothesis 2 (a)*: Qualitative job insecurity (loss of job features) is negatively related to affective and normative commitment to change and positively related with continuance commitment to change.

*Hypothesis 2 (b)*: Quantitative job insecurity (loss of job) is negatively related to affective commitment and normative commitment to change, and positively related with continuance commitment to change.

**Role Stress**

Job or role stress is composed of at least three basic factors: role ambiguity, role conflict and role overload (Iverson, Deery, & Erwin, 1995). Role stress is generally assumed to lead to physiological, psychological and behavioral problems (Iverson, 1996).

Role ambiguity has been described as the situation where an individual does not have clear direction about the expectations of his or her role in the job or organization (Rizzo, House, & Lirtzman, 1970). This ambiguity or uncertainty will reduce the level
of satisfaction of an individual’s job and can reduce effectiveness in work. During organizational change, role ambiguity arises when there is a lack of clear explanation regarding the new roles to be assumed by individuals, leading to anxiety and dissatisfaction with their jobs. Swanson and Power (2001) argue that the formal communication channels in an organization are unable to operate effectively during the change process leading to uncertainty and ambiguity during times when there is a dire need for clarity and clear communication. A study by Korunka et al. (2003) suggests that since major organizational changes in the public sector challenge the organizational structure as well as the roles played by the organizational members, the clarity of an employee’s role holds prime importance in dealing with such changes.

The second component of job stress, role conflict, arises during organizational change when the expectations of the new organization are in direct contrast to the expectations of the old organization. Role conflict is viewed as incompatibility in communicated expectations that interfere with perceived role performance (Rizzo et al., 1970). Role conflict arises due to inconsistencies in work demands of the employees, when the concept of unity of command is violated and a person has to report to multiple superiors. Stress arising from such confusion can be counterproductive and may lead to lack of productivity. Ashford et al. (1989) consider both role ambiguity and role conflict to threaten an individual’s sense of control over a given situation.

Role overload can be defined as the extent to which the job performance required in a job is excessive. Role overload occurs when too many tasks are assigned to an employee in a limited time frame or when the present skills, abilities and knowledge of employees are not consistent with new work requirements. It is expected that externally
imposed organizational restructuring will result in a decrease in role clarity and increase in role overload (Olson & Tetrick, 1988; Tetrick & LaRocco, 1987). The greater the amount of job performance required, the greater the workload. Several researchers like Iverson et al. (1995) as well as Mathieu and Zajac (1990) in their meta-analysis have observed that high levels of role stress lead to the impairment of organizational commitment. The management level employees are generally more seriously affected by role stress than other levels (Luthans & Sommer, 1999; Srivastava, Hagtvet, & Sen, 1994). Margolis, Kroeg and Quinn (1974) found role stressors to be higher in public sectors in public sector organizations compared to private sector organizations due to bureaucratic control. These systems are a source of stress and create a mind set that does not allow personal initiative, thus viewing any change as a threat.

Herscovitch (1999) argued that in the context of organizational change, the employees who experience improvements in job scope and role clarity, and do not experience role conflict as a result of the introduction of a change initiative, would be more likely to perceive that the change was beneficial and of value. In accordance with this notion, these factors have been found to be positively associated with affective commitment to change. Iverson (1996) found role conflict to have a direct effect on the acceptance of organizational change i.e. the greater the role conflict of employees, the less the acceptance of organizational change.

Many individuals within public sector organizations perceive large scale organizational changes to be a cause of deep uncertainty regarding their future. This uncertainty may arise from a number of environmental factors which are beyond the control of individual employees. Individuals within such operating environments are
likely to experience stress brought about by increased work targets, threats of job losses, changes in job holders’ responsibilities and authority and shifts in the balance of power (McHugh & Brennan, 1994). All role stressors are expected to relate negatively with affective and normative commitment to change due to the uncertainty associated with these stressors. On the other hand, continuance commitment to change is likely to be positively related to these stressors as an increase in uncertainty would only lead to compliance towards a change initiative instead of whole hearted support. The relationship of stressors with continuance commitment to change is different from that with affective/normative commitment to change due to the nature of continuance commitment. Although continuance commitment does not tantamount to resistance, it is however the weakest form of commitment and is likely to thwart the change process especially at an early stage when active support is expected of the employees to set the change machinery in motion. The issue of stress and its management is therefore very important for the success of change efforts as the adverse effects of stress may act as an impediment to performance and to the change process. Based on the previous discussion, the following hypotheses are proposed:

Hypothesis 3(a). Role overload is negatively related to affective and normative commitment to change but positively related to continuance commitment to change.

Hypothesis 3(b) Role conflict is negatively related to affective and normative commitment to change but positively related to continuance commitment to change.

Hypothesis 3(c) Role ambiguity is negatively related to affective and normative commitment to change but positively related to continuance commitment to change.
Facilitators of Commitment to Change and Moderators of Stress

When an uncertain situation arises, the individuals tend to adopt measures to manage or reduce this state and try to make every possible effort to make sense of their present condition. According to the theory of uncertainty management (Brashers, 2001), uncertainty arises due to a perceived lack of information by individuals, which leads them to seek information that would consequently reduce uncertainty. But the reduction of uncertainty not only depends upon the amount but the validity of the information as well.

In the present research, facilitators refer to factors that may be considered to have positive direct effects and moderate the negative effects of stressors on commitment to change. The identification of factors may be undertaken under the purview of the cognitive-phenomenological theory of stress and coping (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). According to this theory, an individual’s reaction to stressful situations depends upon their appraisal of the situation and the personal and environmental resources available to deal with them. Lazarus and Folkman (1984) distinguish between two forms of appraisal: primary appraisal and secondary appraisal. During primary appraisal an individual determines the relevance or significance of an event to oneself. An individual first assesses the gravity of the matter to determine whether the situation is actually stressful. In case an event is not relevant to a person, it is considered insignificant. On the other hand if there is any value associated with the event, an assessment of its potentially positive or negative impact is made. The coping reactions come into motion depending on whether the event is perceived as a loss, a challenge or a threat. A loss is an event that has already occurred while opportunities and threats are impending events with perceived positive and negative outcomes respectively. The effort exerted towards dealing with an
opportunity or threat depends upon the importance a person attributes to a certain thing labeled as “commitments” by Lazarus and Folkman (1984). An important example of such a commitment may be one’s livelihood.

According to Lazarus and Folkman (1984), the next step after the identification of a threat calls for a secondary appraisal of the situation by a person in order to determine the strategies for dealing with the threat and the assessment of personal abilities to be able to deal or cope with the situation. A person’s perceived capability of dealing with a threatening situation – whether in terms of dealing with the emotional aspects or actually removing the cause of threat – can reduce the level of stress (Ashford, 1988). Conversely, the perceived inability to deal with threats would lead to an increase in stress (Bandura, 1977).

Although personal coping resources have received considerable attention in the literature, environmental resources which are relatively easier to alter (Burke, 1993) have received less attention despite their potential to facilitate adjustment during change (Martin, Jones, & Callan, 2005). It is an employee’s perception of these personal or environmental resources comprising the “psychological climate” of an organization, which are important in the management of planned change programs (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999). Psychological climate refers to the interaction between the organizational environment and individual’s interpretation of situational characteristics based on their experiences and perceptions of the environment (Jones & James, 1979; Michela, Lukaszwski, & Allegrante, 1995) which in turn is a means of explaining an individual’s reactions and adjustment towards change (Jones & James, 1979; Martin et. al., 2005; Parker, Baltes, Young, Huff, Altmann, Lacost, & Roberts, 2003). A study by Brown and
Leigh (1996) has shown that employee perception of a positive organizational environment allows them to identify with the organizational goals which leads to a greater effort exerted towards the achievement of those goals. Employees are more likely to respond favorably to those management initiatives which are more in line with their own personal values and over which they have control in terms of possession of relevant skills.

As established earlier, the negative outcomes of change are generally due to the perception of a lack of control over the stressful situation (Bordia, Hunt, Paulsen, Tourish, & DiFonzo, 2004, b; DiFonzo & Bordia, 2002). The ability to control potential threats leads to the attenuation of fears and establishment of control over an uncertain situation (Averill, 1973; Szpiler & Epstein, 1976; Terry, 1991). Kramer (1999) describes three types of responses that are likely to arise as a result of uncertainty and the level of control an individual has over the uncertain situation. These responses may be negative when change is considered a threat due to lack of control; positive when one has control over the situation due to which change is viewed as an opportunity; neutral when uncertainty is neither considered a threat nor an opportunity. The responses described by Kramer (1999) are in line with the responses to stress as explained by Lazarus and Folkman (1984).

Control over uncertain situations has been reported as a moderator variable in the stress literature (Karasek & Theorell, 1990; Terry & Jimmieson, 2003) as well as a mediator of relationship between uncertainty and anxiety or stress (Bordia et al., 2004, b; Difonzo & Bordia, 2002; Herzig & Jimmieson, 2006). Control is therefore the driving force behind reactions to change and has been defined by Greenberger and Strasser
(1986) as “an individual's beliefs, at a given point in time, in his or her ability to effect a change, in a desired direction, on the environment” (p. 165). This definition is in line with the concept of self-efficacy which is “the conviction that one can successfully execute the behavior required to produce the outcomes” (Bandura, 1977, p. 193).

In a given situation, it is the individual’s personal ability or perceived self-efficacy that leads to the enactment or avoidance of a certain behavior. The stronger the perceived efficacy, the stronger will be the effort exerted and vice versa. Jimmieson (2000) found self-efficacy to moderate the negative effects of work stress for workers who considered themselves capable of dealing with such situations.

The presence of uncertainty causing stressors cannot be denied in changing organizations but efforts can be made to mitigate their negative effects on the successful implementation of change and its desired outcomes. As established earlier, individuals demonstrating a greater ability to deal with uncertain situations are more capable of dealing with the challenges and the potentially negative effects of organizational changes. Research has shown that an individual’s control over the negative aspects of change will lead to greater commitment and acceptance of the change initiative (Cunningham, Woodward, Shannon, Macintosh, Lendrum, Rosenbloom, & Brown, 2002; Herold et al., 2007).

In the light of the preceding discussion the present research investigates the main and moderating effects of factors that are hypothesized to attenuate the negative effects of uncertainty creating factors like job insecurity or role stress on a critical factor associated with the success of change initiatives: employee commitment to organizational change. A moderator can be defined as “a qualitative (e.g., sex, race, class) or quantitative (e.g.,
level of reward) variable that affects the direction and/or strength of the relation between an independent or predictor variable and a dependent or criterion variable” (Baron & Kenny, 1986, p. 1174). The study of moderators of job insecurity and stress is deemed important for the employees to be able to cope with stressful situations that may hamper their productivity and effectiveness (Hartley, Jacobson, Klandermans, & Van Vuuren, 1991).

Given the importance of control or personal efficacy in mitigating the effects of change related stressors and extrapolating from extant literature on stress and organizational change, the potential moderators of the effects of stressors on commitment to change have been identified as change related communication, employability and trust in management. These three variables increase of control over uncertain situations which has been seen to lead to positive outcomes such as openness to change, acceptance of change and coping with change (Bordia et al, 2004, a; Judge et al., 1999; Wanberg & Banas, 2000). Communication and trust may increase perceived control whereas efficacy may be considered a component of employability. These potential facilitators of commitment to change are discussed in detail in the following sections.

**Change-related Communication.**

The uncertainty reduction theory by Berger and Calbrese (1975) assumes that there exists a drive in human beings to reduce uncertainty whenever they encounter such situations. Since organizational changes also have a certain level of uncertainty associated with them, it stands to reason that communication would play a major role in reducing uncertainty in this case as well. In order to reduce uncertainty individuals try to seek information from sources directly available to them by either asking a relevant person
directly, asking others about the relevant person or observing the relevant person involved in the change process (Berger & Calbrese, 1975). The consistency in messages from formal and informal sources of information is necessary for uncertainty reduction among individuals. This is the case when an organization is undergoing change; there may be a grapevine running parallel to the formal communication channels and providing counter information to that disseminated by the management.

There seems to be an agreement among management researchers on the importance of communication during planned organizational change (Adams & Roebuck, 1997; Albrecht & Hall, 1991; Cameron, Freeman, & Mishra, 1991; Covin, 1993; Fairhurst & Wendt, 1993; Lewis & Seibold, 1996; Lim, 1996; Schweiger & Denisi, 1991). The importance of timely and appropriate communication is considered vital for the success of change programs (Goodstein & Warner-Burke, 1991; Kotter, 1996).

The purpose of communication content in a change program is to spread a vision (Joffe & Glynn, 2002) which minimizes uncertainty (Klein, 1996), helps overcome barriers to change (Carnall, 1986) and gains employee commitment towards the initiative (Kotter, 1996). In other words, communication helps create readiness for change at a personal level by preparing the individual to face an unfamiliar situation (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Balogun & Hope-Hailey, 2003). At the organizational level, communication plays an important role in enabling change managers to challenge established cultural and structural norms (Lok & Crawford, 1999; Pinnington & Edwards, 2000) and challenge the status quo, which leads to the success of the change initiative (Balogun & Hope-Hailey, 2003).
A study by Conway and Monks (2008) on the relationship between Human Resource practices and affective commitment to change in three health sector organizations in Ireland found that communication and rewards had a positive relationship with affective commitment to change during the implementation of a change initiative. As far as the dimensions of commitment to change are concerned communication is likely to have a significant relationship with them (Meyer et al., 2007). Literature suggests that since affective commitment to change is based on the realization of the benefits associated with change (Herscovitch, 1999), timely change related communication is likely to have a positive relationship with affective commitment to change. Normative commitment to change is based on a sense of obligation towards the organization (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002), which may develop when the employee is not only able to see the benefits associated with change but also the realization that the change is in line with their personal goals (Herscovitch, 1999). Communication is therefore also expected to positively relate to normative commitment to change by clarifying the purpose of change and allaying any fears that may lead to the perceived breach of psychological contract.

Lack of communication on part of the senior management is likely to cause great stress and insecurity among employees regarding their future and results in the failure of change initiatives (Coulson-Thomas, 1997). Schweiger and Denisi (1991) believe that it is actually the uncertainty arising out of lack of communication rather than the change itself which leads to stress and resistance to change. Worrall et al. (1998) consider lack of communication and consultation to have a negative effect on the organizational change process in the public sector. Their study revealed that an ineffectively communicated
change was associated with a decrease in the morale, motivation, loyalty and perceived job security of the employees.

In the absence of effective and timely communication, rampant rumors can severely damage the change process by increasing uncertainty and developing negative attitudes towards change as well as reducing organizational commitment and employee morale (Burlew, Pederson, & Bradey, 1994). The control of “grapevine” information is critical in times of change to avoid the loss of management control over the information and results in the creation of worst case scenarios by the employees (Smeltzer & Zener, 1992). The resulting uncertainty can lead to reduced trust in management and all its initiatives. If lack of communication can lead to negative reactions towards change (Burlew et al., 1994) it may be argued that an effective communication strategy may have a negative relationship with continuance commitment to change and vice versa. This relationship is expected as continuance commitment to change develops when an individual is uncertain regarding the alternatives offered by a change initiative and they feel trapped in their jobs (Herscovitch, 1999).

This research is based on the premise that realistic communication helps the employees cope with the uncertainty of the situation so they can insulate themselves from stress (Schweiger & Denisi, 1991). Change must be clearly communicated to employees if it is expected to bring about any positive change in employee behavior (Elving, 2005; DiFonzo & Bordia, 1998). An effective communication strategy takes organizational justice into account, for instance by giving a notice of change ahead of time and clearly communicating the purpose of change and its consequences. The employees will be able to show greater commitment (affective and normative) towards the change process once
the element of job insecurity is removed and they are clear about what the future has in store for them. Communication helps remove any ambiguities that may develop as a result of a change initiative such as the fear of job loss (Johnson, Bernhagen, Miller, & Allen, 1996) and has therefore been identified as a moderator of relationship between stress and organizational change (Cunningham et al., 2002; Johnson, Brems, Mills, Neal, & Houlihan, 2005; Terry & Jimmieson, 2003). In the absence of communication, the insecurities and ambiguities related to the change process are likely to lead only to continuance commitment to change exhibiting minimal support.

The following hypotheses may be drawn based on the preceding argument:

**Hypothesis 4(a):** Change related communication is positively related with affective and normative commitment to change and negatively related with continuance commitment to change.

**Hypothesis 4(b):** Change-related communication moderates the relationship between qualitative job insecurity and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between qualitative job insecurity and affective/normative commitment to change is weaker when communication is high than low and the positive relationship between qualitative job insecurity and continuance commitment to change is weaker when communication is high than low.

**Hypothesis 4(c):** Change-related communication moderates the relationship between quantitative job insecurity and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between quantitative job insecurity and affective/normative commitment to change is weaker when communication is high than low and the
positive relationship between quantitative job insecurity and continuance commitment to change is weaker when communication is high than low.

*Hypothesis 4(d)*: Change-related communication moderates the relationship between role overload and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between role overload and affective/normative commitment to change is weaker when communication is high than low and the positive relationship between role overload and continuance commitment to change is weaker when communication is high than low.

*Hypothesis 4(e)*: Change-related communication moderates the relationship between role ambiguity and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between role ambiguity and affective/normative commitment to change is weaker when communication is high than low and the positive relationship between role ambiguity and continuance commitment to change is weaker when communication is high than low.

*Hypothesis 4(f)*: Change-related communication moderates the relationship between role conflict and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between role conflict and affective/normative commitment to change is weaker when communication is high than low and the positive relationship between role conflict and continuance commitment to change is weaker when communication is high than low.

*Employability*

Today’s businesses may not be able to offer long term employment to its employees. Instead they provide their employees with opportunities to develop themselves
professionally so that if they have to leave the organization, they can find alternate employment. Perceived employability can be defined as “a person’s perception of his or her ability to secure a new job” (Berntson, Sverke, & Marklund, 2006, p.225). Employees today are responsible for their own job security rather than relying on the employer for providing life long employment.

With changes taking place frequently in today’s work environment, the employees are also expected to cope with the new challenges (Bamber, 1990). A workforce which is able to alter their work behavior as and when required is essential for successful organizational change (Guest, 1992). Berntson et al. (2006) argue that during the process of organizational change, the employee’s self assessment of being able to find a new job becomes important. Employees feel more committed to the change process when they are able to see the associated benefits and are confident about their own importance for the organization. Kluyttmans and Ott (2001) argue that perceived employability is related to the willingness and ability of an employee to adapt to changes in the job contents and the extent to which their know-how and skills can be applied outside the organization.

Individuals who have high levels of employability are likely to be more adaptable. They are able to make the best of their situation by altering their attitudes and responses accordingly and by identifying opportunities for themselves in their internal and external environment. Such a pro-active work attitude leads to reduction in uncertainty caused by changing work situations by creating a sense of control (Fugate et al., 2004) and helps individuals survive the uncertainty of the organizational change process (Ashford & Black, 1996; Berntson et al., 2006). This control helps to create a positive attitude in
employees regarding change (Terry, 1994), like openness to the change initiative (Watson & Hubbard, 1996) and accepting it as a challenge rather than a threat (Stokes, 1996). It goes without saying that adaptability leads to greater employability as employees are able to remain attractive and productive to the employers even in the ever changing work environment (Chan, 2000). Based on previous commitment literature on organizational commitment, a meta analysis by Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch and Topolnytsky (2002) suggests that the employees who perceive their skills to be non-transferable to other organizations are more likely to experience continuance commitment. A similar relationship may be expected in the case of continuance commitment to change which may be increase if employability is low and vice versa. Employability can help assuage the effects of job insecurity during organizational change (Berntson, Bernhard-Oettel, & De Cuyper, 2007; Berntson & Marklund, 2007). A number of researchers have presented the idea of job dependency as moderating the effects of job insecurity on its outcomes (Fugate et al., 2004; Greenhalgh & Rosenblatt, 1984; Sverke & Hellgren, 2002).

Previous studies have suggested further research into the positive outcomes of employability, such as coping with organizational change (Fugate et al., 2004; Sverke, Hellgren, & Näswall, 2006). Berntson et al. (2006) have also suggested an investigation into the role of perceived employability as a moderator between role stressors and organizational change. Employability is expected to mitigate the negative effects of job insecurity and give rise to affective and normative commitment to change when the employees feel confident about their abilities. These individuals may have high employability but would not necessarily be willing to leave their jobs as a result of
changes as they view change as valuable (Cunningham, 2006; Meyer & Allen, 1991). As Meyer and Allen (1991) believe that lack of alternative employment opportunities gives rise to continuance commitment, it may be argued that similar conditions may lead to continuance commitment to change. Those exhibiting continuance commitment to change will be the ones with low employability who do not identify with the change or perceive it to be of value but are forced to comply with it due to the unavailability of alternatives. In line with this argument, there is research to suggest that employability may indeed reduce the negative effects of job insecurity (Silla et al., in press). It can therefore be argued that perceived employability is likely to both mitigate the negative effects of stressors like job insecurity and role stressors, and lead to the development of positive attitudes (affective and normative commitment) and reduction of negative attitudes (continuance commitment) towards change. The following hypotheses are proposed:

*Hypothesis 5(a):* Employability is positively related with affective and normative commitment to change and negatively related with continuance commitment to change.

*Hypothesis 5(b):* Employability moderates the relationship between qualitative job insecurity and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between qualitative job insecurity and affective/normative commitment to change is weaker when employability is high than low and the positive relationship between qualitative job insecurity and continuance commitment to change is weaker when employability is high than low.

*Hypothesis 5(c):* Employability moderates the relationship between quantitative job insecurity and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between
quantitative job insecurity and affective/normative commitment to change is weaker when employability is high than low, and the positive relationship between quantitative job insecurity and continuance commitment to change is weaker when employability is high than low.

**Hypothesis 5(d):** Employability moderates the relationship between role overload and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between role overload and affective/normative commitment to change is weaker when employability is high than low and the positive relationship between role overload and continuance commitment to change is weaker when employability is high than low.

**Hypothesis 5(e):** Employability moderates the relationship between role ambiguity and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between role ambiguity and affective/normative commitment to change is weaker when employability is high than low and the positive relationship between role ambiguity and continuance commitment to change is weaker when employability is high than low.

**Hypothesis 5(f):** Employability moderates the relationship between role conflict and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between role conflict and affective/normative commitment to change is weaker when employability is high than low and the positive relationship between role conflict and continuance commitment to change is weaker when employability is high than low.


Trust in Management

Trust is an important factor for garnering employee support for change. Albrecht and Travaglione (2003) define trust as “employee’s willingness to act on the basis of the words, actions, and decisions of senior management under conditions of uncertainty or risk” (p. 78). This definition implies that employees will only accept decisions and will be willing to take risks if mutual trust exists between the decision makers and those concerned with the implementation of these decisions. Even during uncertain situations, the employees are likely to support management initiatives if the element of trust exists between the management and employees (Elving, 2005; Rousseau & Tijoriwala, 1999). Trust in management therefore provides some level of control to an uncertain employee as they rely upon the management for their security and well being.

It may therefore be argued that trust is likely to have a positive relationship with affective and normative commitment to change as employees who trust their management will have the confidence that the decision makers are mindful of employee well being while undertaking any change related initiatives. Similarly, trust is likely to have a negative relationship with continuance commitment to change as employees who trust their management are less anxious about the outcomes of change (Bruhn, Zajac, & Al-Kazemi, 2001). Trust reduces resistance and enhances commitment to change which paves the way for the success of a change program (Albrecht & Travaglione, 2003; Fiorelli & Margolis, 1993). Dwivedi (1995) found trust to be negatively related with role stress.

Rousseau and Tijoriwala (1999) and Robinson (1996) found trust to be an important factor responsible for affecting attitudes towards change by studying its effects
as a moderator. Dirks and Ferrin (2001) also proposed that trust moderates the effect of work attitudes and behaviors on outcomes by assessing the future behavior or past actions of a trusted party, thereby reducing uncertainty. In the face of uncertainty resulting due to job insecurity and role stressors, the employee’s willingness to comply with seemingly risky expectations may depend upon the level of trust between the management and the employees. Stanley, Meyer, and Topolnytsky (2005) recently found a relationship between trust in management and employee resistance to change. It can therefore be expected that trust would mitigate the negative effects of stressors of change and positively relate to affective and normative commitment to change. Trust is also expected to mitigate the positive relationship which is expected to exist between stressors and continuance commitment to change, thereby having a negative relationship with the latter.

Based on the preceding discussion, the following hypotheses are proposed:

*Hypothesis 6(a):* Trust is positively related with affective and normative commitment to change and negatively related with continuance commitment to change.

*Hypothesis 6(b):* Trust moderates the relationship between qualitative job insecurity and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between qualitative job insecurity and affective/normative commitment to change is weaker when trust is high than low and the positive relationship between qualitative job insecurity and continuance commitment to change is weaker when trust is high than low.

*Hypothesis 6(c):* Trust moderates the relationship between quantitative job insecurity and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between quantitative job insecurity and affective/normative commitment to change is
weaker when trust is high than low and the positive relationship between quantitative job insecurity and continuance commitment to change is weaker when trust is high than low.

_Hypothesis 6(d):_ Trust moderates the relationship between role overload and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between role overload and affective/normative commitment to change is weaker when trust is high than low and the positive relationship between role overload and continuance commitment to change is weaker when trust is high than low.

_Hypothesis 6(e):_ Trust moderates the relationship between role ambiguity and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between role ambiguity and affective/normative commitment to change is weaker when trust is high than low and the positive relationship between role ambiguity and continuance commitment to change is weaker when trust is high than low.

_Hypothesis 6(f):_ Trust moderates the relationship between role conflict and commitment to change such that the negative relationship between role conflict and affective/normative commitment to change is weaker when trust is high than low and the positive relationship between role conflict and continuance commitment to change is weaker when trust is high than low.

**Consequences of Commitment to Change**

Empirical research has established commitment to change as the most important factor in the successful implementation of organizational change initiatives (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). Apart from the importance of factors that lead to the development of the three
components of commitment to change, the consequences of an individual’s commitment to change are equally important. The behavior adopted by an individual as a consequence of commitment to change will eventually determine the effort exerted towards the success of change. In the earlier models of organizational and occupational commitment (Allen & Meyer, 1990; Meyer et al., 1993) employee retention was mainly considered an outcome or consequence of such commitments, with attendance, organizational citizenship behavior and job performance as secondary outcomes (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). In their general model of workplace commitment, Meyer and Herscovitch (2001) have suggested more generalized behavioral outcomes of commitment, namely focal and discretionary behavior. Focal behavior refers to the actions that lead to the maintenance of employment with an organization. For the commitment to change model (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002), compliance is considered a focal behavior and the non-observance of such behavior may be deemed as resistance to an initiative.

Discretionary behavior on the other hand refers to actions that go beyond the mere maintenance of employment and involve exerting extra effort towards one’s specific focus of commitment. Discretionary behaviors have been identified as cooperation (or embracing the spirit of change) and championing (or exerting effort beyond expectations to achieve the objectives of change). Both cooperation and championing behaviors have an element of sacrifice associated with them, with championing behavior requiring more sacrifice than cooperation (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). Championing behavior can also be considered as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) which is the extra effort exerted by the employees that contributes to the effectiveness and efficiency of the organization (Organ & Ryan, 1995). The emphasis on OCB is provided by Katz (1964)
who argues that organizations are not able to survive without the enactment of OCB by
the employees. This may be true especially in the case of organizational change which
requires the employees to be pro-active in the adoption and support of change, despite the
problems associated with it.

Cunningham (2006) also considers championing behavior to be the highest form
of change related behavior which ensures the success of a change initiative. As
mentioned earlier, although continuance commitment to change does not reflect
resistance but limited support for change, its assumed corresponding outcome behavior is
compliance which may not result in the zeal and rigor required for the success of change.

Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) found that all three components of commitment to
the change correlated positively with compliance. This was due to the fact that
compliance is the basic prerequisite for maintaining organizational membership
(Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). Even those employees who only exhibit continuance
commitment will have to comply with the change effort if they are to hold their jobs. On
the other hand, only affective and normative commitment correlated positively with
cooperation and championing whereas continuance commitment correlated negatively
with both forms of discretionary behavior in the same study. Continuance commitment to
change behaving differently from affective/normative commitment in this case is due to
the reason that discretionary behavior depends on the willingness of individuals to engage
in certain actions. Both affective and normative commitment to change are based on the
realization of the benefits of change and the norms of reciprocity. Continuance
commitment to change is cost based and leads to minimum support for an initiative.

Based on previous literature it can be argued that:
Hypothesis 7. The three dimensions of commitment to change are associated with change related behavior such that (a) affective, continuance and normative commitment to change are positively related to focal behavior (compliance) (b) affective and normative commitment to change are positively related to discretionary behavior while continuance commitment to change is negatively related.

Conceptual Model

Based on the literature review, a conceptual model is presented below. Figure 1 shows that the qualitative and quantitative components of perceived job insecurity as well as and role stressors such as (role ambiguity, role overload and role conflict) are assumed to affect the three components of commitment to change. Factors such as change-related communication, employability and trust in management are expected not only to act as facilitators of commitment to change but also to mitigate the negative effects of stressors. Compliance, cooperation and championing behaviors are expected to be the resulting behavioral outcomes of the three dimensions of commitment to change.
Figure 1. A conceptual model of factors affecting commitment to change and its outcomes.
CHAPTER III
Methodology

Data for the present study were collected from four public sector organizations using a cross-sectional survey method. The same model was tested across four different samples for cross validation of results. Cross-sectional designs are useful and less expensive as they allow data to be collected from a large number of respondents in a lesser amount of time. For the present study, census sampling method was used as the population of interest was only the management level employees and not the whole organization. In census sampling, the entire population is used as a sample. The reason for choosing this procedure was to maximize the total number of respondents within the sampling frame. It is also advantageous because valuable information is not lost due to the potential exclusion of respondents using other sampling methods. As the organizations included in the present research were at various stages of the change process, the present study also served as an organizational audit to assess the employee support for change as advised by Kotter and Schlesinger (1979). Herscovitch (1999) has also considered the commitment to change measures useful in gauging the “readiness for change” of employees before the initiation or during the implementation of a change program.

Research Setting

Before beginning data collection, the context of organizational change had to be determined in order to approach the relevant organizations. The present study is based on planned organizational changes taking place in the public sector organizations in
Pakistan. As the Government of Pakistan is trying to revamp the public sector organizations to increase their efficiency and effectiveness, privatization and restructuring was considered the appropriate context in which organizational change could be studied in the public sector. The information regarding privatization and restructuring of the public sector organizations is available on the Privatization Commission website (www.privatization.gov.pk). At the time of data collection for the present study only a few organizations identified by the Privatization Commission had actually embarked upon privatization and restructuring programs. Fourteen organizations were found to suitable to be approached for research. Letters were sent by the researcher’s supervisor to these organizations on behalf of the researcher requesting permission for conducting research. These letters were addressed to the heads of the respective organizations and explained the purpose and importance of the research and also assured them of the confidentiality of the data and the anonymity of the respondents and the organizations in the researcher’s publications (see Appendix A).

Of the 14 organizations contacted, eight responded and expressed interest in the research. Four of the organizations later decided not to participate, on account of reasons like organizational policies, lack of time or not wanting to subject their employees to surveys of ‘sensitive’ nature that are based on employment security and stress related issues. The organizations that declined participation were undertaking privatization initiatives and were reluctant to participate in any research.

Out of the four organizations that finally concurred to the request for research only one had implemented the change program, two had formally announced but not implemented change while one was preparing to announce a major restructuring program.
In order to maintain the anonymity of the organizations, they will hereinafter be referred to as Organization 1, Organization 2, Organization 3 and Organization 4. Data collected from these four organizations were used to test the same hypotheses but after the first organization, changes were made to the survey in terms of the addition of a section and some changes to the normative commitment to change scale. It has been mentioned earlier that the population of interest are the management level employees of these organization. This is due to the nature of the questions in the survey relating to the decision making regarding the change program, which is usually expected of the management level employees. A close analysis of the managerial attitudes towards change is essential as managers are considered the key implementers and champions of the planned change initiatives of an organization (Fernandez & Pitts, 2007). As employees at the blue collar level will generally look up to the management for information and cues regarding the change, this forms the rationale of the selection of the management employees for the present study. The public sector organizations in Pakistan follow a system of grades in which employees are placed according to seniority. The grades range from 1-21. The entry level grade for management level is grade 17. Grade 17-21 therefore comprise of the management level. In order to make the grading system more understandable, the grades have been placed into low (Grade 17), middle (Grades 18 and 19) and top management (Grades 20 and 21).
Samples and Procedure

Interviews

Informal interviews were conducted at all four organizations at the outset of the data collection process before the administration of surveys. The purpose of these interviews was to gauge the employee reaction towards organizational change and to assess the relevance of the research model for a particular organization. Five to six management level employees were selected randomly at the identification of the Human Resources department of the respective organizations. The interviews were helpful in understanding the context and background of change in the organizations.

Organization 1

This is a large public sector organization with its operations all over Pakistan. It supports research activities of an important economic sector. The survey was conducted one month after the announcement of a major restructuring program which was supposed to involve revamping of the whole organization including structural and functional changes. This particular organization had no prior history of organizational change and restructuring was being carried out under the Asian Development Bank’s initiatives to improve the efficiency of the organization and streamline its operations. There was going to be merging of various offices spread all over Pakistan in order to cut unnecessary costs and reduce duplication of activities. As a result of restructuring, the performance evaluation criteria were going to be merit based which were earlier based on seniority. In
order to deal with overstaffing, there was going to be a ban on fresh hiring and the internal replacement of retiring employees.

Although the operations of Organization 1 are spread across Pakistan, the researcher was only provided support by the organization in collecting data from the head office and one regional office located in the same city. The survey was administered to the entire population of management level employees ($N=400$) with the help of the Human Resources department through their internal mail delivery system with a cover letter from the Personnel Manager introducing the researcher and explaining the purpose of research. The respondents were given one week to respond. After one week, a reminder mail-out was issued.

A total of 190 questionnaires were received. The final sample size after the elimination of blank or almost blank questionnaires was 172 for a response rate of 43%. Participants’ age ranged from 18 to 65, with the majority (45%) being in the 46-55 age category. Men made up the majority of the sample (92%), 60% had a postgraduate degree and 23% a doctorate. The average organizational tenure was 16 years ($SD=9$).

Organization 2

Organization 2 is also a large public sector organization with its operations spread all over Pakistan. The efficient functioning of this particular organization translates into economic growth and development for the country. The essential aspects and administration of this organization have remained unchanged for nearly three-quarters of a century. Recently, there have been initiatives by the organization to modernize the system under the directives of donor agencies like the IMF, which felt that administrative reforms were required in order to improve the operations of the organization.
Restructuring at Organization 2 is aimed at achieving fundamental changes in human resource management, business processes and use of technology.

The restructuring efforts at Organization 2 have been underway for the past few years. Data collection took place when the restructuring program had entered its fourth year of implementation and all the phases were almost complete. Organization 2 is divided into 14 directorates spread all over Pakistan with a management population of 1600. Data were collected with the help of the human resource department and all the directorates were requested to participate through a letter sent by the head of Human Resources explaining the purpose of the study and introducing the researcher. Only seven directorates agreed to participate in the study. The total management population in these directorates was 700 and the survey was distributed to this entire population. The participants were given one week to respond to the survey after which a reminder was issued. Initially, 120 responses were received but the number did not increase despite repeated reminders. To improve the sample size the researcher personally administered and collected 40 more responses from the head office and a regional office. The total number of responses received was 160 and the total number of usable responses was 149 for a response rate of 21%.

Participants’ age ranged from 18 to 65, with the majority (35%) being in the 36-45 year age category. Men comprised majority of the sample (87%). 24% had graduate degree and 76% had postgraduate degrees. The average organizational tenure was 17 years ($SD=11$).
Organization 3

Organization 3 is one of the largest public sector organizations in Pakistan. The Government of Pakistan (GOP) is undertaking a major reform exercise to revitalize this organization due to its role within in the economic and social development of the country. It has been decided to restructure it in the process of developing a commercial approach and introducing professional management and private investment. As a result of restructuring, Organization 3 will focus on core businesses. The non-core business and entities will be managed through subsidiary public limited companies which shall be under the administrative control of the concerned ministry through a holding company. The Asian Development Bank (ADB) has provided Technical Assistance (TA) Loan to the GOP for institutional capacity building for infrastructure development of such public sector organizations.

The restructuring of Organization 3 has been on the government agenda for the past few years but it is recently that the efforts towards restructuring have gained momentum. Data collection took place after the change plans had been announced but not yet implemented. During interviews it was learned that changes had been announced at this organization in the past but had never been implemented. The survey was administered with the help of the concerned Ministry and the questionnaires provided by the researcher were sent to the entire population of management level employees (N=550) across Pakistan through the internal mailing system. The survey package was accompanied by a cover letter by the concerned ministry introducing the researcher and explaining the purpose of research. The participants were given one week to respond after which a reminder was issued by the ministry. However, even after several reminders the
response did not go beyond 70. In order to achieve a significant sample, the researcher with permission from the ministry approached the head of a local regional office in Rawalpindi. The survey was administered through this office to other offices in the North Pakistan region. A total of 100 responses were received collectively bringing the total responses to 170. The total usable responses were 154 for a response rate of 28%.

Participants’ age ranged from 18 to 65, with the majority (37%) being in the 46-55 age category. Men were the majority of the sample (94%). 34% had undergraduate degree, 44% graduate degrees and 14% had postgraduate degrees. The average organizational tenure was 22 years ($SD=13$).

**Organization 4**

This organization is responsible for the planning, development and maintenance services of a major city in Pakistan. In order to address the issues of declining efficiency and productivity, the management has embarked on an ambitious plan for reorganization and restructuring of the organization along- with a re-engineering of all the business processes which had remained unchanged for over four decades. The purpose of restructuring is to make Organization 4 more receptive to public needs and pro active in its development activities. In order to streamline its functions and processes to enable efficient and effective management of its scope of operations, Organization 4 intends to enhance its technological and human resources as well, increasing efficiency and transparency while lowering costs and delivery times.

The survey was administered after the decision of a major restructuring plan by the government which had not been formally announced to the employees of the organization at the time of data collection. Organization 4 is divided into 40 directorates
with a total management population of around 260. The Chairman Office granted permission for data to be collected at 30 of these directorates with a management population of around 200. Since there was no support for data collection from the Human Resources Department, the survey was administered by the researcher personally in two phases. In the first phase, the survey was administered at the directorates within the vicinity of the Chairman office, based on the names and designations of managers mentioned in the organization’s official directory. The total number of responses was 70. In the second phase, the survey was administered at directorates outside the vicinity of the Chairman office. The number of responses was 100. During both administrations, the researcher handed out the surveys personally and collected them back the following day. The total number of surveys collected was 170. The total number of usable responses was 156 for a response rate of 78%.

Participants’ age ranged from 18 to 65, with the majority (31%) being in the 26-35 year age category. Men were in majority (92%). 14% had undergraduate degrees, 41% had graduate degrees and 42% had postgraduate degrees. The average organizational tenure was 14 years (SD=13).

**Measures**

*Questionnaire Pre-test*

In order to test the readability, flow, order and timing of the questionnaire, a participative pre-test approach was adopted where randomly selected respondents were informed of the purpose of testing and their views were noted. Initially the questionnaire was administered to 15 randomly selected respondents with varying levels of English
language proficiency. In the next step, 10 randomly selected management level employees from Organization 1 were asked for their views on the questionnaire. Based on the suggestions from the 25 respondents, some modifications were made to the questionnaire.

The Survey

The survey package consisted of a cover letter by the researcher explaining the purpose of research to the respondents and providing assurance for maintaining the confidentiality and anonymity of the respondents (see Appendix B). The questionnaire consisted of six sections for Organization 1 and seven sections for Organization 2, 3 and 4 (see Appendix C). For Organization 1, the measures for of behavioral support for change were not included as during the initial distribution of the survey the employees did not consider these questions pertinent to the stage at which the change program was at the time of survey administration.

All the sections included in the questionnaire were based on established measures found in literature. The measures were used with due permission sought from the authors through email. In some cases, shorter versions of lengthy scales were used in order to reduce the length of the questionnaire as well as to ensure that the questions were relevant to the respondents. All items were measured on a 5-point response scale (1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree). In general, the Cronbach alpha reliabilities were satisfactory (see Tables 3-6, which also report means, standard deviations and variable intercorrelations for the four samples).
Demographic Variables

Age was measured in years using five categories; 1= 18-25, 2= 26-35, 3= 36-45, 4= 46-55, 5= 56-65. Gender was measured as 1= male, 2= female. Level of education was measured using four brackets; 1= under-graduate, 2= graduate, 3= post-graduate, 4= doctorate. Tenure was measured as years of service.

Commitment to Change

The 18-item Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) commitment to change scale was used to measure commitment to change. This scale has three sub dimensions: affective commitment to change (e.g., “I believe in the value of this change”), normative commitment to change (e.g., “I feel a sense of duty to work toward this change”) and continuance commitment to change (e.g., “I have no choice but to go along with this change”). Each sub-scale consisted of 6 questions. For Organization 3 and 4 the two negatively worded normative commitment to change items (“I would not feel badly about opposing this change” and “I do not feel any obligation to support this change”) were positively worded in an attempt to improve the clarity of the questions.

Stressors

Job Insecurity. Job insecurity was measured as two separate scales – qualitative and quantitative job insecurity. The qualitative aspects of job insecurity were measured using four items from the Hellgren et al. (1999) scale and one item from Ashford et al. (1989) scale was also added in order to clearly gauge the reasons behind the qualitative aspect of job insecurity. A sample item is “I feel worried about my career development within the organization”. The quantitative aspect of job insecurity was measured using two items.
from the three item Hellgren et al. (1999). The third item from the Hellgren et al. (1999) scale was dropped as translated from Swedish to English, it had similar wording which was confusing for the respondents during the questionnaire pre-test. A third item was added from the Ashford et al. (1989) scale to identify the reasons behind quantitative job insecurity. A sample item is “I am afraid I may lose my job”.

Role Stressors. Role overload was measured combining three items from the Beehr, Walsh and Taber (1976) scale (e.g., “It often happens that I have to work under a heavy time pressure”) and four items from the Sverke, Hellgren and Öhrming (1997) scale (e.g., “I feel unreasonable demands in my work”). Five items from a modified version of the Rizzo et al. (1970) scale were used to measure role conflict (e.g., “I receive incompatible requests from two or more people”). Role ambiguity was measured using a combination of four items (e.g., “There exist no clear, planned goals and objectives for my job”) drawn from the Rizzo et al. (1970) scale as well as the Caplan (1971) scale.

Facilitators of Commitment to Change

Change-related Communication. Organizational communication was measured using six items from a 25- item scale by Topolnytsky (2001). The six items were chosen to represent formal change related communication between the employer and employees. A sample item includes is “Employees have been given a detailed explanation for why the organization is being restructured”.
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Employability. Five items from the external employability scale by Näswall, Baraldi, Richter, Hellgren and Sverke (2006). Sample items include “I could get a similar (or better) job without having to relocate”.

Trust in management. This was measured using two items from the trust scale by Brockner, Siegel, Daly, Tyler and Martin (1997). Sample item includes “Management can be trusted to do what is good for me”.

Behavioral Support for Change

Behavioral support for change was assessed using a multi item behavioral support for change scale (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). This scale consists of three sub dimensions; compliance, consisting of three items (e.g., “I comply with my organization’s directives regarding the change”); cooperation, consisting of eight items (e.g., “I work toward the change consistently) and; championing, consisting of six items (e.g., “I encourage the participation of others in the change”). The responses to all the items were made on a 5-point Likert-type scale (1=strongly disagree; 5=strongly agree).

Analysis

It may be noted that data from the four organizations were analyzed separately considering the differences that existed in the stages of change and demographics of the organizations.
Treatment of Missing Values, Normality Issues and Outliers

Missing values were imputed for all data sets using the Expectation Maximization (EM) method using SPSS 15 as overall the data had small portions of missing values. This method has the advantage of avoiding over fitting or making the data look better than it is while providing realistic estimates of variance (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2001).

Conducting multiple regression assumes the fulfillment of certain assumptions including normality; each variable and its linear combinations are normally distributed, linearity; a straight line relationship between two variables and homogeneity of variance; variability in scores for one continuous variable being roughly the same as the other (Tabacknick & Fidell, 2001). All data sets were analyzed to check whether the aforementioned conditions were fulfilled. The regression analysis is however considered quite robust against violations of these assumptions (Keppel & Zedeck, 1989). For all data sets the scatter plots revealed that the assumption of normality had been met. Visual inspection of histograms also showed normally distributed variables. Although the affective commitment to change and cooperation variables were negatively skewed and the quantitative job insecurity variable was positively skewed, the analyses were carried out given the robustness of the technique.

Outliers can have a deleterious effect on the results in multivariate analysis. Tests for univariate outliers for dependent variables multivariate outliers for independent variables were conducted for all data sets as recommended by Tabachnick and Fidell (2001). Standardized z scores were calculated for dependent variables. Less than 2% of the observations were above the cut off point of 3.29 as suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2001). For detecting multivariate outliers, Mahalanobis distances were calculated.
and it was found that less than 1% of the observations met the $p < .001$ for the $\chi^2$ value criterion suggested by Tabachnick and Fidell (2001) for multivariate outliers. Given the small number of outliers it was decided to retain them for further analysis.

**Dimensionality and Reliability of Commitment to Change**

The dimensionality of the commitment to change measure was evaluated using exploratory as well as confirmatory factor analysis. Exploratory factor analysis was deemed necessary as the commitment to change scale has not been tested in Pakistan before and there was a need to check whether the item wordings worked out well before subjecting the retained items to confirmatory factor analysis for the actual testing of measurement properties. In a first set of analyses, for each dimension of commitment to change, its six items were subjected to principal axis factoring in SPSS 15. Using the criterion of eigenvalues greater than 1, and examining communalities and factor loadings, problematic items were deleted, if necessary.

In the second set of analyses, all retained items were subjected to confirmatory factor analysis using the robust maximum likelihood procedures of LISREL 8.8 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2001). The estimations of unknown parameters are based on observed asymptotic variance-covariance matrices for the present study. A subject-to-item ratio ranging between 5:1 and 10:1 has been recommended for analysis involving structural equation modeling (Bentler & Chou, 1987). All four samples in the present research comprised of approximately 150 or more subjects, thus fulfilling the adequate sample size requirement. The proposed three-factor model was contrasted with three other models: a baseline (null) model (assuming no relationships between items), a uni-factor model (assuming one single dimension of commitment to change), and three two-
factor models (each combining two different commitment dimensions to one). In the two- and three-factor models, the dimensions were allowed to correlate.

For confirmatory factor analysis, the models are assessed based on the absolute and comparative fit of the model (Kelloway, 1998). The absolute fit is based on the close reproduction of the original covariance matrix by the model. Comparative fit provides a comparison of two or more competing models in determining the best fit to the data (Kelloway, 1998).

LISREL 8.8 provides a number of goodness of fit statistics for model testing thus reducing reliance on only a single statistic which in the past had mainly been the chi-square test. Following conventional procedures (e.g., Hu & Bentler, 1995; Kelloway, 1998), overall model fit was determined using the Satorra-Bentler chi-square test and the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; Browne & Cudeck, 1993). A good fit to data is indicated by a non-significant chi-square which indicates no significant difference between the model and population covariance matrix. RMSEA is based on the analysis of residuals and a value of .08 or lower also indicates a good fit (Kelloway, 1998). The parsimonious fit indices provide the simplest solution of model fit and degrees of freedom. The Akaike information criterion measure (AIC; Akaike, 1987) is used for measuring a parsimonious fit, for which lower values and the chi-square difference test indicate a better model. The standardized root mean squared residual (SRMR) is the standardized form of the simplest fit index the root mean squared residual (RMR) provided by LISREL. Values of less than .05 are considered as indicating a good fit to the data (Kelloway, 1998). The comparative fit statistics are provided by the normed
fit index (NFI; Bentler & Bonett, 1980). NFI explains the percentage improvement in fit over the baseline model and values above .90 indicate good fit (Kelloway, 1998).

The internal consistency of the commitment to change dimensions (Hypothesis 1b) was addressed by computing Cronbach’s alpha (Cronbach, 1951). An alpha level of .70 was used as a criterion for adequate reliability (Nunnally, 1978).

**Analysis of Associations**

Several data analysis techniques were used to address the research questions and hypotheses. First, product-moment correlation coefficients (Pearson $r$) were calculated to provide an initial account of bivariate associations among the focal variables. Secondly, multiple hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to examine such relations in a multivariate context.

*Relationship of Stressors with Commitment to Change.* Hypotheses 2(a), 2(b), 3(a), 3(b) and 3(c), concerning the effect of stressors on the three commitment to change dimensions, were tested using hierarchical multiple regression analysis technique on data sets from all four organizations. Control variables (age, gender, level of education and tenure) were added in the first step, followed by the stressors (qualitative and quantitative job insecurity, role overload, role ambiguity and role conflict) in the second step.

*Relationship of Facilitators with Commitment to change.* Hypotheses 4(a), 5(a) and 6(a) tested the direct effects of communication, employability and trust on the three dimensions on commitment to change by again employing hierarchical multiple regression analyses technique on all four data sets. The control variables (age, gender,
level of education and tenure) were added in the first step. In the second step, the facilitators (communication, employability and trust) were added.

*Moderators of Stress.* Hypotheses 4(b, c), 5(b, c) and 6(b, c) involving interactions were tested by employing hierarchical moderated regression technique. The moderators were tested one at a time and not simultaneously as this was the first attempt to evaluate such moderation, which called for a departure from overly conservative methods of testing. As for the previous analyses, the data were analyzed using forced entry hierarchical regression analysis. Variables were entered in three steps. Demographic variables were entered in the first step to control for effects of gender, level of education, and organizational tenure on affective, continuance, and normative commitment to change. The main effects of all stressors and one moderator at a time were entered in the second step in order to examine the main effects of the stressors and that facilitator on the three components of commitment to change. The interaction term was added in the last step to test whether the specific facilitator moderated the effects of stressors on the three dimensions of commitment to change. Following the procedures described by Aiken and West (1991), the interaction term was created as the product of centered variables. Simple slope analysis was carried out to establish whether the slopes of the plotted lines (-1 SD and +1 SD) deviated from each other and from zero.

*Consequences of Commitment to Change.* Hypothesis 7, which concerns the effect of the three dimensions of commitment to change on change related behavior, was also tested by employing hierarchical multiple regression analysis technique. Demographic variables were entered in the first step to control for effects of gender, level of education, and
organizational tenure on the change-related behaviors. The affective, normative and
continuance dimensions of commitment to change were added in the second step to
analyze the relationship between the three components of commitment to change and
change related behavior.
CHAPTER IV

Results

This chapter reports the findings of the analyses conducted on data collected from the four public sector organizations. The dimensionality and measurement properties of the commitment to change measures are followed by the findings related to the tests concerning the antecedents and consequences of commitment to change.

Dimensionality and Measurement Properties of Commitment to Change

Hypothesis 1 concerned the dimensionality of Herscovitch and Meyer’s (2002) commitment to change measure. This section reports the results of the exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses conducted to investigate whether the three-dimensional representation (affective, normative and continuance commitment to change) could be replicated in the Pakistani setting, and reports on the Cronbach’s Alpha reliability of the three dimensions.

Exploratory factor analysis

For all four organizations, the exploratory factor analysis (principal axis) showed that all six affective commitment to change items formed one factor. In the case of Organization 1, the eigenvalue of the single factor was 3.50, thus accounting for 58% of the variance in the items. The factor loadings ranged between .67 and .83. For Organization 2, the single factor had an eigenvalue of 4.19, thus accounting for 70% of the variance in the items. The factor loadings ranged between .72 and .92. For Organization 3, an eigenvalue of 3.80 was obtained for the single factor, thus accounting for 63% of the variance in the items. The factor loadings ranged between .57 and .90. For Organization 4, the single
factor had an eigenvalue of 3.60, thus accounting for 60% of the variance in the items.
The factor loadings ranged between .71 and .83.

For Organization 1 and 2, the six continuance commitment to change items – after being subjected to principal axis factoring – resulted in a single factor. In case of Organization 1, this single factor accounted for 66% of the variance (eigenvalue = 3.34), and the factor loadings ranged from .41 to .89. For Organization 2, the factor accounted for 66% of the variance (eigenvalue = 3.98), and the factor loadings ranged from .73 to .88. For Organization 3 and 4, principal axis factoring resulted in two factors for the six items of continuance commitment to change. In the case of Organization 3, the items “I have no choice but to go along with the restructuring program” and “Resisting restructuring is not a possible option for me” loaded on the second factor; the four remaining items loaded on one factor which accounted for 53% of the variance (eigenvalue = 2.14) with factor loadings ranging from .43 to .86. Similarly, two factors for continuance commitment to change were also obtained for Organization 4. After removing two items with weak loadings, “I feel pressure to go along with the restructuring program” and “Resisting restructuring is not a possible option for me”, the remaining four items accounted for 50% of the variance (eigenvalue = 1.98) and factor loadings ranging from .58 to .85.

In terms of normative commitment to change, for all four organizations, the six initial items produced two factors. In the case of Organization 1 and 2, one item (“I would not feel bad about opposing this change”; reverse-coded) had weak, sometimes negative, correlations with other items and was therefore omitted from further analysis. The five remaining items formed a single factor but yet another item (“I do not feel any
obligation to support this change”; reverse-coded) was deleted due to a low factor loading. For organization 3, the original negatively worded items which were positively worded for the particular study (“I feel a sense of duty to work toward the restructuring program” and “I do not think it would be right of me to oppose restructuring”) had low factor loadings and were removed. The remaining four items loaded on a single factor which accounted for 55% of the variance (eigenvalue = 1.66), and the factor loadings ranging from .53 to .87. For organization 4, the six initial items produced two factors. One item (“I feel a sense of duty to work toward the restructuring program”) had a weak factor loading and was removed. The five remaining items formed a single factor accounting for 40% of the variance (eigenvalue = 1.99), and the factor loadings ranged from .53 to .87.

**Confirmatory factor analysis**

In order to maintain a consistency in the scales used for analysis, the CFA on all samples included 16 items: 6 affective commitment to change, 6 continuance commitment to change and 4 normative commitment to change items. The four normative commitment to change items were selected on the basis of EFA. For the continuance commitment to change dimension, although there were problematic items in Organization 3 and 4, for Organization 1 and 2 the results were satisfactory. All six items were therefore retained to maintain consistency in results. For the normative commitment to change scale, although the EFA results differed across the four samples, the items “I would not feel badly about opposing restructuring (R)” and “I do not feel an obligation to support restructuring (R)” were deleted from the Organization 1 and 2 samples and the same items from
Organization 3 and 4 samples for which these items had been positively worded to maintain consistency.

For all four samples, the 16 retained items were subjected to confirmatory factor analysis in LISREL 8.8 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2001). The robust maximum likelihood procedures indicated that the hypothesized three-factor representation of commitment to change provided a comparatively better solution than the other models (see Table 1). In terms of the goodness of fit statistics, although the chi-square test was significant in all samples but Organization 2, the remaining fit indicators suggest that the three-factor model provided a satisfactory (Organizations 1 and 2) or almost acceptable fit (Organizations 3 and 4). The RMSEA values were within the acceptable levels for Organization 1 and 2 but slightly above the cut off point for Organization 3 and 4. The AIC for all four samples was the lowest for the three-factor model compared to other models. The SRMR was higher than the cut off value for the three-factor model in all samples. The NFI for all three organizations was above the cutoff level with the exception of Organization 3 for which the NFI was slightly below the acceptable level. Of all the models tested, the three factor model provided the best fit to the data compared to the two-factor model, the uni-factor model and the structural null model.
Table 1. Fit statistics for the confirmatory factor analyses of affective (AC), continuance (CC) and normative (NC) commitment to change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Δdf</th>
<th>$\Delta\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Null model</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>1593.22</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>1625.22</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. One factor</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>399.78</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.129</td>
<td>463.78</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1 vs. 0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1193.44</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Two factors</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>176.84</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>242.84</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2a vs. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>222.94</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AC/NC; CC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Two factors</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>210.93</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>276.93</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>2b vs. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>188.85</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AC; NC/CC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Two factors</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>391.37</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>457.37</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2c vs. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.41</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AC/CC; NC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Three factors</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>163.38</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>233.38</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>3 vs. 2a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0. Null model</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2418.81</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td>2450.81</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. One factor</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>387.09</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>451.09</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1 vs. 0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2031.72</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a. Two factors</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>192.17</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>258.17</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>2a vs. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>194.92</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AC/NC; CC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b. Two factors</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>218.52</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>284.52</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2b vs. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>168.57</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AC; NC/CC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c. Two factors</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>380.69</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>446.69</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>2c vs. 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AC/CC; NC)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Three factors</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>146.73</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>216.73</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>3 vs. 2a</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45.44</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 1. (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>AIC</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>Model comparisons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Δdf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organization 3**

0. Null model  
100 120 1344.89 .00 .258 1376.89 .43 .40 -- -- -- --
1. One factor  
104 287.16 .00 .107 351.16 .91 .87 1 vs. 0 16 1057.73 .00
2a. Two factors (AC; NC/CC)  
103 209.55 .00 .082 275.55 .95 .91 2a vs. 1 1 77.61 .00
2b. Two factors (AC/NC; CC)  
103 231.51 .00 .090 297.51 .94 .90 2b vs. 1 1 55.65 .00
2c. Two factors (AC/CC; NC)  
103 284.41 .00 .107 350.41 .92 .87 2c vs. 1 1 2.75 Ns
3. Three factors  
101 204.41 .00 .082 274.41 .95 .91 3 vs. 2a 2 5.14 Ns

**Organization 4**

0. Null model  
120 1344.89 .00 .258 1376.89 .43 .40 -- -- -- --
1. One factor  
104 287.16 .00 .107 351.16 .91 .87 1 vs. 0 16 1057.73 .00
2a. Two factors (AC; NC/CC)  
103 209.55 .00 .082 275.55 .95 .91 2a vs. 1 1 77.61 .00
2b. Two factors (AC/NC; CC)  
103 231.51 .00 .090 297.51 .94 .90 2b vs. 1 1 55.65 .00
2c. Two factors (AC/CC; NC)  
103 284.41 .00 .107 350.41 .92 .87 2c vs. 1 1 2.75 Ns
3. Three factors  
101 204.41 .00 .082 274.41 .95 .91 3 vs. 2a 2 5.14 Ns

-- = not applicable

ns = non-significant
Table 2 presents the factor loadings for the three-factor solution, for each sample. The table reveals that the loadings for the six affective commitment to change items on their factor were significant and high (> .70) with a few exceptions. In the case of continuance commitment to change, three items (3, 4 and 5) were significant and of high magnitude for all four samples while two items (2 and 6) in Organization 3 and 4 which failed to reach significance. Item 1 was significant but fairly low across all samples except Organization 2 where it was found to be relatively higher. As mentioned earlier, four items were retained for the normative commitment to change construct for the confirmatory analysis in order to maintain consistency in results across all four samples. The factor loadings for normative commitment to change items were significant for Organization 1 and 2 but fairly low for Organization 3 and 4.

For all samples there was a strong negative relationship between affective and continuance commitment to change dimensions. A strong positive relationship was found between affective and normative commitment to change dimensions in all samples except in Organization 1 where the relationship was non-significant. There was a negative relationship between continuance and normative commitment to change dimensions in all samples except in Organization 1 which showed a weak positive relationship between the two dimensions.

The analyses revealed that hypothesis 1a, considering the three dimensions of commitment to change as distinguishable constructs, was partially supported as two items from normative commitment to change scale had to be dropped to arrive at the three component model of commitment to change.
Table 2. Factor Loadings: Multi-group confirmatory factor analysis (16 items)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Organization 1</th>
<th>Organization 2</th>
<th>Organization 3</th>
<th>Organization 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective commitment to change (A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1. I believe in the value of this change</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2. This change is a good strategy for this organization</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3. I think that management is making a mistake by introducing this</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4. This change serves an important purpose</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5. Things would be better without this change (R)</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6. This change is not necessary (R)</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance commitment to change (C)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1. I have no choice but to go along with the restructuring program</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2. I feel pressure to go along with this change</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.13ns</td>
<td>.32ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3. I have too much at stake to resist this change</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4. It would be too costly for me to resist this change</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5. It would be risky to speak out against this change</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6. Resisting this change is not a viable option for me</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.08ns</td>
<td>-.02ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative commitment to change (N)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N1. I feel a sense of duty to work toward the restructuring program</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.02ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2. I do not think it would be right of me to oppose this change</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4. It would be irresponsible of me to resist this change</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.08ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5. I would feel guilty about opposing this change</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.01ns</td>
<td>-.10ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inter-factor correlations</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-C</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>-.63</td>
<td>-.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-N</td>
<td>.20ns</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-N</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.42</td>
<td>-.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ns = non-significant parameter estimate; for all other estimates \( p < .05 \).

R = reverse-coded item

* Items “I would not feel badly about opposing restructuring (R)” and “I do not feel an obligation to support restructuring (R)” were removed from the normative commitment to change scale in all samples

Hypothesis 1b concerned the internal consistency reliability of the three components of commitment to change. In accordance with predictions, the reliability was within acceptable standards for the six-item affective commitment to change measure for all samples: Organization 1 (\( \alpha = .86 \)), Organization 2 (\( \alpha = .91 \)), Organization 3 (\( \alpha = .88 \)) and Organization 4 (\( \alpha = .87 \)). For continuance commitment to change (six items) the
reliability values were within acceptable limits for Organization 1 (α = .83) and Organization 2 (α = .90) but was below the acceptable limit for Organization 3 (α = .61) and Organization 4 (α = .61). Despite the removal of two items from the original six-item normative commitment to change scale, this measure failed to reach acceptable standards for the retained four items in all samples (α = .54, .61, .49 and .61 for the four organizations respectively). Based on the results it can be seen that hypothesis 1b was partially supported as only the affective commitment to change dimension reached the acceptable level of reliability in all four samples, whereas the reliability of continuance commitment to change was acceptable in only two samples and the normative commitment to change dimension had reliability estimates below .70 in all four samples.

**Associations among variables**

Although there are no hypotheses based on descriptive statistics like means, standard deviations and correlations, these statistics were calculated prior to conducting the test of hypotheses in order to determine the relationships between the study variables. The results are presented in tables 3-6 below. Tables 3-6 above provide findings for the relationships between the commitment to change dimensions and demographic variables, stressors, facilitators of commitment to change and the change related behaviors.

Affective commitment to change was unrelated to most demographic variables, with a few exceptions where a negative correlation was found with age and tenure for Organization 1, 3 and 4 and a positive correlation with level of education in the case of Organization 4. Affective commitment was found to be negatively correlated with the stressors in all four samples, with a few exceptions where the relationship was non-
significant. Where facilitators were concerned, a positive correlation was found between
them and affective commitment to change across all samples with the exception of a few
non-significant relationships. Affective commitment was found to be significantly and
positively correlated with change related behaviors (compliance, cooperation and
championing) in Organization 2, 3 and 4.

Continuance commitment to change was found to be uncorrelated with
demographic factors in all samples with the exception Organization 1 where a positive
correlation was found with organizational tenure. Mostly positive correlations were found
between continuance commitment to change and stressors across all four samples.
Continuance commitment to change was also found to be significantly and negatively
correlated with change facilitators like communication, employability and trust in
management for the four samples. In terms of change related behavior, continuance
commitment to change was generally negatively correlated or uncorrelated.
Table 3. Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities and Correlations between study variables: Organization 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Inter-item correlation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</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>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen (f)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (ql)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (qn)</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acch</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ccch</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>-.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ncch</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .000,  *p < .01,  *p < .05. Cronbach’s Alpha for the scales are presented on the diagonals in parentheses

Note: Gen (f) = Gender (Female); Edu = Education; Ten = Tenure; JI (ql) = Job insecurity (qualitative); JI (qn) = Job insecurity (quantitative); RO = Role overload; RA = Role ambiguity; RC = Role conflict; Com = Communication; Emp = Employability; Tr = Trust; Acch = Affective commitment to change; Ccch = Continuance commitment to change; Ncch = Normative commitment to change

Age: 1 = 18-25, 2 = 26-35, 3 = 36-45, 4 = 46-55, 5 = 56-65; Gender: 1 = Male, 2 = Female; Education: 1 = Under-graduate, 2 = Graduate, 3 = Post-graduate, 4 = Doctorate; Tenure = Years of service
Table 4. Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities and Correlations between study variables: Organization 2

|    | Mean | Inter-item correlation | SD  | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9   | 10  | 11  | 12  | 13  | 14  | 15  | 16  | 17  | 18  |
|----|------|-----------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 1. Age | --   | 3.48                  | .97 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 2. Gen(f) | --   | --                   | --  |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 3. Edu | --   | 2.77                  | .43 | -.14| .07 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 4. Ten | --   | 16.83                 | 10.80 | .80 | .08 | .06 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 5. JI (ql) | .44  | 2.74                  | .88 | -.24 | -0.03 | .17 | -.19 | (.80) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 6. JI (qn) | .56  | 2.29                  | .83 | -.20 | -.08 | -.08 | .00 | .03 | .70 | (.79) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 7. RO | .37  | 2.99                  | .71 | -.06 | -.03 | .00 | -.04 | .51 | .47 | (.92) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 8. RA | .47  | 2.28                  | .74 | -.08 | -.08 | -.01 | -.04 | .39 | .37 | .37 | (.78) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 9. RC | .45  | 2.90                  | .79 | -.13 | .03 | .11 | -.12 | .58 | .58 | .66 | .38 | (.82) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 10. Com | .65  | 3.12                  | .92 | .28 | -.14 | -.13 | .22 | -.50 | -.31 | -.33 | -.36 | -.38 | (.92) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 11. Emp | .55  | 3.60                  | .61 | -.07 | -.09 | -.07 | -.11 | -.10 | -.10 | -.17 | -.01 | -.02 | (.86) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 12. Tr | .82  | 3.50                  | 1.05 | .20 | -.08 | -.12 | .13 | -.48 | -.36 | -.24 | -.34 | -.48 | .52 | -.03 | (.90) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 13. Cmp | .74  | 4.08                  | .64 | .12 | .01 | -.08 | .14 | -.26 | -.20 | -.19 | -.31 | -.06 | .21 | .25 | .07 | (.89) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 14. Cop | .58  | 3.99                  | .67 | .17 | -.03 | -.03 | .17 | -.38 | -.27 | -.28 | -.41 | -.16 | .33 | .31 | .21 | .79 | (.91) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 15. Chm | .67  | 4.08                  | .64 | .16 | -.02 | -.05 | .12 | -.42 | -.34 | -.29 | -.45 | -.31 | .36 | .33 | .30 | .66 | .87 | (.93) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 16. Acch | .63  | 4.05                  | .79 | .01 | .00 | .02 | -.03 | -.48 | -.45 | -.33 | -.34 | -.24 | .25 | .32 | .23 | .56 | .67 | .66 | (.91) |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 17. Ccch | .59  | 2.70                  | .91 | -.01 | -.01 | .15 | .09 | .51 | .44 | .34 | .42 | .36 | -.29 | -.17 | -.34 | -.33 | -.49 | -.53 | -.59 | (.90) |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| 18. Ncch | .53  | 3.59                  | .72 | .17 | -.02 | .07 | .20 | -.25 | -.23 | -.22 | -.35 | -.11 | .29 | .23 | .15 | .46 | .46 | .44 | .45 | -.18 | (.61) |     |     |     |     |     |

*p < .000, a p < .01, c p < .05. Cronbach’s Alpha for the scales are presented on the diagonals in parentheses

Note: Gen (f) = Gender (Female); Edu = Education; Ten = Tenure; JI (ql) = Job insecurity (qualitative); JI (qn) = Job insecurity (quantitative); RO = Role overload; RA = Role ambiguity; RC = Role conflict; Com = Communication; Emp = Employability; Tr = Trust; Cmp = Compliance; Cop = Cooperation; Chm = Championing; Acch = Affective commitment to change; Ccch = Continuance commitment to change; Ncch = Normative commitment to change

Age: 1 = 18-25, 2 = 26-35, 3 = 36-45, 4 = 46-55, 5 = 56-65; Gender: 1 = Male, 2 = Female; Education: 1 = Under-graduate, 2 = Graduate, 3 = Post-graduate, 4 = Doctorate

Tenure = Years of service
Table 5. Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities and Correlations between study variables: Organization 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Inter-item correlation</th>
<th>SD</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>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gen(f)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>21.22</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>JI (ql)</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>(.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>JI (qn)</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.73b</td>
<td>(.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>(.57)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>RA</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17c</td>
<td>(.63)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.51b</td>
<td>.26b</td>
<td>(.74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.23b</td>
<td>-.16c</td>
<td>-.24b</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.19c</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Emp</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.17c</td>
<td>-.23b</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.21b</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>(.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.20c</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.23b</td>
<td>.38b</td>
<td>.17c</td>
<td>(.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cmp</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.22b</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.18c</td>
<td>-.27b</td>
<td>-.24b</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.17c</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>(.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Cop</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.20c</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20c</td>
<td>-.22b</td>
<td>-.25b</td>
<td>-.33b</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.19c</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.59b</td>
<td>(.80)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chm</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>-.18c</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.24b</td>
<td>-.32b</td>
<td>-.31b</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.17c</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.16c</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.62b</td>
<td>.79b</td>
<td>(.84)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Acch</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.24b</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.22b</td>
<td>-.41b</td>
<td>-.34b</td>
<td>-.20c</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.30b</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.19c</td>
<td>.25b</td>
<td>.27b</td>
<td>.17c</td>
<td>(.87)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ccch</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.64b</td>
<td>.58b</td>
<td>.29b</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.25b</td>
<td>-.22b</td>
<td>-.20c</td>
<td>-.16c</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.17c</td>
<td>-.21b</td>
<td>-.43b</td>
<td>(.61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Ncch</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.19c</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.34b</td>
<td>.18c</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .000, b p < .01, c p < .05. Cronbach’s Alpha for the scales are presented on the diagonals in parentheses

Note: Gen (f) = Gender (Female); Edu = Education; Ten = Tenure; JI (ql) = Job insecurity (qualitative); JI (qn) = Job insecurity (quantitative); RO = Role overload; RA = Role ambiguity; RC = Role conflict; Com = Communication; Emp = Employability; Tr = Trust; Cmp = Compliance; Cop = Cooperation; Chm = Championing; Acch = Affective commitment to change; Ccch = Continuance commitment to change; Ncch = Normative commitment to change

Age: 1= 18-25, 2 = 26-35, 3 = 36-45, 4 = 46-55, 5 = 56-65; Gender: 1= Male, 2 = Female; Education: 1 = Under-graduate, 2 = Graduate, 3 = Post-graduate, 4 = Doctorate

Tenure = Years of service
Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities and Correlations between study variables: Organization 4

|   | Mean | Inter-item correlation | SD  | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   | 16   | 17   | 18   |
|---|------|-----------------------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1 | Age  | --                    | 2.94| 1.28 | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 2 | Gen (f) | --                   | --  | --   | -.23b| 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 3 | Edu  | --                    | 2.30| .72  | -.34b| .15  | 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 4 | Ten  | --                    | 14.16| 12.79| .88b | -.23b| -.46b| 1    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 5 | JI (ql) | .34                 | 2.74| .76  | -.05 | -.06 | .00  | -.03 | (.90)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 6 | JI (qn) | .57                | 2.25| .83  | .01  | .03  | -.10 | -.02 | .60b | (.79)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 7 | RO   | .24                   | 3.15| .64  | -.16c| -.03 | .03  | .23b | .133 | (.75)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 8 | RA   | .28                   | 2.25| .56  | -.11 | .24b | -.06 | -.10 | .33b | .22b | .14  | (.74)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 9 | RC   | .36                   | 3.10| .73  | -.10 | -.08 | .08  | -.12 | .37b | .20c | .49b | .27b | (.55)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|10 | Com  | .60                   | 2.58| .90  | -.20c| .11  | -.00 | -.21b| -.28b| -.05 | -.12 | -.13 | -.24b| (.90)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|11 | Emp  | .60                   | 3.65| .77  | -.20c| -.04 | .16c | -.23b| -.05 | -.27b| .21b | .09  | .16  | .14  | (.88)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|12 | Tr   | .82                   | 3.48| .99  | -.18c| -.02 | .06  | -.14 | -.20c| -.08 | -.13 | -.18c| -.13 | .45b | .19c | (.89)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|13 | Cmp  | .55                   | 3.97| .55  | .07  | .00  | .15  | .04  | -.27b| -.23b| .06  | -.17c| -.04 | .19c | .19c | -.04 | (.77)|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|14 | Cop  | .27                   | 3.75| .46  | .04  | .09  | .08  | .01  | -.23b| -.19c| -.02 | -.08 | -.14 | .16c | .18c | .05  | .61b | (.73)|      |      |      |      |      |      |
|15 | Chm  | .46                   | 3.87| .54  | -.12 | .10  | .19c | -.11 | -.20c| -.27b| .06  | -.16c| .03  | .19c | .33b | .17c | .58b | .70b | (.84)|      |      |      |      |      |
|16 | Acch | .52                   | 3.87| .72  | -.18c| .11  | .31b | -.23b| -.26b| -.48b| .10  | .02  | .17c | .35b | .04  | .53b | .47b | .52b | (.88)|      |      |      |      |      |
|17 | Ccch | .21                   | 2.99| .61  | .14  | -.12 | -.22b| .16c | .30b | .35b | -.05 | -.06 | .10  | -.02 | -.28b| -.13 | -.10 | -.08 | -.16c| -.36b| (.61)|      |      |      |      |
|18 | Ncch | .19                   | 3.46| .65  | -.01 | -.08 | -.05 | -.01 | -.08 | -.14 | -.02 | .05  | .16c | .08  | .09  | -.01 | .28b | .24b | .30b | .37b | .16  | (.40)|      |      |      |

Note: Gen (f) = Gender (Female); Edu = Education; Ten = Tenure; JI (ql) = Job insecurity (qualitative); JI (qn) = Job insecurity (quantitative); RO = Role overload; RA = Role ambiguity; RC = Role conflict; Com = Communication; Emp = Employability; Tr = Trust; Cmp = Compliance; Cop = Cooperation; Chm = Championing; Acch = Affective commitment to change; Ccch = Continuance commitment to change; Ncch = Normative commitment to change

Age: 1= 18-25, 2 = 26-35, 3 = 36-45, 4 = 46-55, 5 = 56-65; Gender: 1= Male, 2 = Female; Education: 1 = Under-graduate, 2 = Graduate, 3 = Post-graduate, 4 = Doctorate

Tenure = Years of service
Normative commitment to change was found to be uncorrelated with all demographic variables and stressors in all samples except Organization 2, where it was positively correlated with age and tenure. For Organization 3 and 4 normative commitment to change was positively correlated with role conflict, but unrelated to all other stressors. Normative commitment to change was also uncorrelated with all change facilitators. Normative commitment to change was found to correlate positively with all three behavioral outcomes of commitment to change: compliance, cooperation and championing only for Organization 2 and 4 samples.

**Effect of Stressors on Commitment to Change**

The results of the hierarchical regression analyses used to test the hypotheses dealing with the effect of stressors on commitment to change (Hypothesis 2a, 2b, 3a, 3b, 3c) are reported in Table 7.

The first step, which included the demographic characteristics (age, gender, level of education and organizational tenure), accounted for significant proportions of the variance only in affective commitment to change for Organization 1 and Organization 4. In the second step, the stressors contributed between 20 and 31 percent to the explained variance for affective commitment to change and between 21 to 43 percent variance for continuance commitment to change. For normative commitment to change the variance was 16 percent for Organization 2 only. In total, the model variables accounted for 31, 32, 31 and 36 percent of the variance in affective commitment to change for Organization 1, 2, 3 and 4, respectively, and a somewhat larger proportion of the variance in continuance commitment (36, 38, 45 and 36 percent, respectively). However, while the
model variables accounted for 21 percent of the variance in normative commitment for Organization 2, they did not explain significant proportions of the variance in this commitment dimension in the other three organizations.

Hypothesis 2(a) concerned the relationship between qualitative job insecurity and commitment to change dimensions. The results in Table 7 show that, after the demographic characteristics have been taken into account, higher levels of qualitative job insecurity were associated with lower affective commitment to change in Organization 2 and 3, while it evidenced a non-significant relationship in Organization 1 and 4. In accordance with predictions, qualitative job insecurity was positively related to continuance commitment to change in three samples (Organization 2, 3 and 4) while it failed to predict this commitment dimension in Organization 1. Contrary to Hypothesis 2(a), the relationship between qualitative job insecurity and normative commitment to change was non-significant in any of the four samples. Hypothesis 2(a) was partially supported as it found support for affective and continuance commitment to change in two samples each but was not supported in the case of normative commitment to change.

As stipulated in Hypothesis 2(b), quantitative job insecurity was negatively related to affective commitment to change in Organization 1, 2, and 4 whereas the relationship was found to be non-significant in Organization 3. The hypothesis also received partial support with respect to continuance commitment to change as quantitative job insecurity was positively related with this commitment dimension in three samples (Organization 1, 3 and 4) but the relationship was found to be non-significant in Organization 2. Quantitative job insecurity did not predict normative commitment to change in any of the four samples. Hypothesis 2(b) was also partially
supported as it received support for affective and continuance commitment to change in three samples each but was not supported in the case of normative commitment to change.

Hypothesis 3(a) dealt with the relationship between role overload and the commitment to change dimensions. The results (Table 7) show that role overload predicted affective commitment to change in two samples. While the relation, as hypothesized, was negative for Organization 3, it was positive in Organization 4. For the remaining samples the relationship was found to be non-significant. The results for continuance commitment to change followed a similar pattern. While role overload was positively related to this commitment to change dimension in one sample (Organization 3), the relation was non-significant in two samples (Organization 1 and 2). For Organization 4 the relationship was significant but contrary to the expected relationship. The relationship between role overload and normative commitment to change was found to be non-significant in all four samples. Hypothesis 3(a) was partially supported as the hypothesized relationship was found significant in one sample in the case of affective commitment to change and in two samples in the case of continuance commitment to change. No support was found for normative commitment to change.

Hypothesis 3(b) related to the relationship between role ambiguity and the commitment to change dimensions. The postulated negative relationship between role ambiguity and affective commitment to change was found in only one sample (Organization 2) while the regression coefficient failed to reach significance in the other three samples. Role ambiguity evidenced the hypothesized positive association with continuance commitment only in Organization 2, whereas the relation was of opposite
sign in Organization 4 and non-significant in the other two samples. There was limited support for Hypothesis 3(b) also with respect to normative commitment to change; the hypothesized negative effect of role ambiguity received support in Organization 2, while the relation was non-significant in the remaining samples. Hypothesis 3(b) on the relationship between role ambiguity and commitment to change was supported as the relationship was found to be significant in the case of affective, continuance and normative commitment to change in one sample each.

The results regarding Hypothesis 3(c), which was about the relationship between role conflict and the commitment to change dimensions, show that of the four samples, role conflict predicted affective commitment to change only in Organization 2 and 3 samples but contrary to the hypothesized relationship. As expected, role conflict had a positive relationship with continuance commitment to change in Organization 1 and 4 but was unrelated in Organization 2 and 3. Role conflict was positively related to normative commitment to change in Organization 2, 3 and 4 but contrary to the hypothesized relationship. The relationship was non-significant for Organization 1. Hypothesis 3(c) was partially supported as only the relationship between role conflict and continuance commitment to change found support in two samples.
Table 7. Multiple regression analysis with stressors as predictors of affective (ACCH), continuance (CCCH) and normative (NCCH) commitment to change (standardized regression coefficients from the last step).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization 1</th>
<th>Organization 2</th>
<th>Organization3</th>
<th>Organization4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCH</td>
<td>CCCH</td>
<td>NCCH</td>
<td>ACCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1: Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen (f)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ΔR²</strong></td>
<td>.11a</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2: Stressors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (ql)</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.34b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (qn)</td>
<td>-.21b</td>
<td>.36a</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.22c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.18c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.20c</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.25c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ΔR²</strong></td>
<td>.20a</td>
<td>.32a</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.31a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model R²</td>
<td>.31a</td>
<td>.36a</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.32a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a p < .000, b p < .01, c p < .05

Note: Gen (f) = Gender (Female); Edu = Education; Ten = Tenure; JI (ql) = Job insecurity (qualitative); JI (qn) = Job insecurity (quantitative); RO = Role overload; RA = Role ambiguity; RC = Role conflict; ACCH = Affective commitment to change; CCCH = Continuance commitment to change; NCCH = Normative commitment to change

Age: 1 = 18-25, 2 = 26-35, 3 = 36-45, 4 = 46-55, 5 = 56-65; Gender: 1 = Male, 2 = Female; Education: 1 = Under-graduate, 2 = Graduate, 3 = Post-graduate, 4 = Doctorate

Tenure = Years of service
Effect of facilitators on commitment to change

The results of the hierarchical regression analyses used to test the hypotheses dealing with the effect of facilitators on commitment to change (Hypothesis 4a, 5a, 6a) are reported in Table 8. The demographic control variables (age, gender, level of education and organizational tenure) entered in the first step accounted for significant proportions of the variance only in affective commitment to change for Organization 4. In the second step, the facilitators contributed between 11 and 20 percent to the explained variance for affective commitment to change, between 7 and 17 percent for continuance commitment to change. For normative commitment to change the variance was 10 and 13 percent for Organization 1 and 3 respectively. In total, the model variables accounted for between 18 and 31 percent of the variance in affective commitment to change and between 13 and 20 percent for continuance commitment to change. The model variables accounted for 11 and 18 percent of the variance in normative commitment for Organization 1 and 2 respectively.

The results concerning Hypothesis 4(a), on the relationship between communication and commitment to change dimensions, indicates that as expected, communication was positively related to affective commitment to change in Organization 1, 2 and 3 but the relationship was non-significant in Organization 4. For the relationship between communication and continuance commitment to change, the relationship was found to be negative in the case of Organization 1, 2 and 3 while the relationship was not significant for Organization 4. Communication had a positive relationship with normative commitment to change only in the case of Organization 2 while the relationship was non-
significant for the other three organizations. Hypothesis 4(a) received fairly strong support in three organizations in the case of affective and continuance commitment to change and in one organization in the case of normative commitment to change.

Hypothesis 5(a) which concerned the relationship between employability and commitment to change showed that employability had a positive relationship with affective commitment to change in Organization 1, 2 and 4 but had a non-significant relationship in Organization 3. Employability significantly predicted continuance commitment to change in Organization 2 and 4 but the relationship was not significant in the case of Organization 1 and 3. A positive relationship was found between employability and normative commitment to change in Organization 1 and 2 but the relationship was non-significant in Organization 3 and 4. The support for Hypothesis 5(a) was also strong in three organizations for affective commitment to change and in two organizations each in the case of continuance and normative commitment to change.

The results relating to Hypothesis 6(a) on the relationship between trust and commitment to change revealed that trust positively predicted affective commitment to change in Organization 1 but had a negative relationship in Organization 3. This relationship was not found significant in Organization 2 and 4. A negative relationship between trust and continuance commitment to change was found in the case of Organization 1 and 2 and 3 but was non-significant in the case of Organization 4. Trust had a positive relationship with normative commitment to change in Organization 1 but was unrelated in Organization 2, 3 and 4. Hypothesis 6(a) received marginal support in one organization each in the case of affective and normative commitment to change but the support for hypothesis was strong in the case of continuance commitment to change.
Table 8. Multiple regression analysis with facilitators as predictors of affective (ACCH), continuance (CCCH) and normative (NCCH) commitment to change (standardized regression coefficients from the last step).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1: Control variables</th>
<th>Organization 1</th>
<th>Organization 2</th>
<th>Organization 3</th>
<th>Organization 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCH</td>
<td>CCCH</td>
<td>NCCH</td>
<td>ACCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen (f)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>-.25c</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ R²</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 2: Facilitators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization 1</th>
<th>Organization 2</th>
<th>Organization 3</th>
<th>Organization 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCH</td>
<td>CCCH</td>
<td>NCCH</td>
<td>ACCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com</td>
<td>.24a</td>
<td>-.25b</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.18c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp</td>
<td>.24a</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.20c</td>
<td>.32a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>.23b</td>
<td>-.25b</td>
<td>.25b</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ R²</td>
<td>.20a</td>
<td>.16a</td>
<td>.10a</td>
<td>.17a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model R²</td>
<td>.31a</td>
<td>.20a</td>
<td>.11a</td>
<td>.18a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .000, b p < .01, c p < .05

Note: Gen (f) = Gender (Female); Edu = Education; Ten = Tenure; Com = Communication; Emp = Employability; Tr = Trust; ACCH = Affective commitment to change; CCCH = Continuance commitment to change; NCCH = Normative commitment to change
Age: 1 = 18-25, 2 = 26-35, 3 = 36-45, 4 = 46-55, 5 = 56-65; Gender: 1 = Male, 2 = Female; Education: 1 = Under-graduate, 2 = Graduate, 3 = Post-graduate, 4 = Doctorate; Tenure = Years of service
The Effect of Moderators on the Relationship between Stressors and Commitment to Change

This section deals with the effect of moderators on commitment to change (Hypotheses 4b, 4c, 5b, 5c, 6b, 6c). The results are reported in three sub-sections dealing with the effect of one moderator at a time (change-related communication, employability and trust) in the relations between stressors and the three dimensions of commitment to change.

Change-related communication

The results concerning Hypothesis 4, which specified that change-related communication moderates the effects of stressors on commitment to change, are presented in Table 9. The control variables entered in Step 1 accounted for 1–12 percent of the variance in the outcomes, the main effects (Step 2) added between 4 and 43 units to the variance explained and the interaction terms (Step 3) an additional 0–10 units. As can be seen from Table 9, after controlling for demographics and the main effects of the stressors, communication evidenced a positive main effect on affective commitment to change in two of the samples (Organization 1 and 3) while it was non-significant in the other organizations (Hypothesis 4a). For continuance commitment to change, communication had a negative effect in Organization 1 and in the case of normative commitment to change a positive relationship was found for Organization 3.
Table 9. Communication as moderator (standardized regression coefficients from the last step).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Organization 1</th>
<th>Organization 2</th>
<th>Organization 3</th>
<th>Organization 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCH</td>
<td>CCCH</td>
<td>NCCH</td>
<td>ACCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong> (Control variables)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen (f)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.11a</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong> (Main effects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (ql)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.39c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (qn)</td>
<td>-.19c</td>
<td>.38a</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.24b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.17c</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.21c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com</td>
<td>-.24a</td>
<td>-.24a</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.25a</td>
<td>.37a</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.31a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong> (Two-way interactions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (ql) x Com</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.27c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (qn) x Com</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO x Com</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.24c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA x Com</td>
<td>-.16c</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC x Com</td>
<td>.19c</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.24c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.10a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model R²</td>
<td>.41a</td>
<td>.42a</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.42a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .000, b *p < .01, c *p < .05.

Note: Gen (f) = Gender (Female); Edu = Education; Ten = Tenure; JI (ql) = Job insecurity (qualitative); JI (qn) = Job insecurity (quantitative); RO = Role overload; RA = Role ambiguity; RC = Role conflict; Com = Communication; ACCH = Affective commitment to change; CCH = Continuance commitment to change; NCCH = Normative commitment to change.

Age: 1 = 18-25, 2 = 26-35, 3 = 36-45, 4 = 46-55, 5 = 56-65; Gender: 1 = Male, 2 = Female; Education: 1 = Under-graduate, 2 = Graduate, 3 = Post-graduate, 4 = Doctorate; Tenure = Years of service.
Hypothesis 4(b) dealt with the effect of change related communication as a moderator between qualitative job insecurity and commitment to change. Communication was found to moderate the negative effect of qualitative job insecurity on affective commitment to change in Organization 2 (see Figure 2), but not in the other samples. In accordance with predictions, simple slope analysis showed that when communication was low, the negative relationship between qualitative job insecurity and affective commitment to change was strong (β = -.57, p < .05) while it was non-significant for high levels of communication (β = -.13, ns).

Figure 2. Communication as moderator between qualitative job insecurity and affective commitment to change (Organization 2).

Also in accordance with Hypothesis 4(b), the interaction between qualitative job insecurity and communication was significant for continuance commitment to change (β = -.26, p < .05) in one of the four samples (Organization 2). Simple slope analysis (see Figure 3) revealed that in accordance with the hypothesis, when communication was low, the positive relationship between qualitative job insecurity and continuance commitment
to change was strong ($\beta = .62, p < .05$) while the slope representing high level of communication was non-significant ($\beta = .12$, ns). No significant interaction between change-related communication and qualitative job insecurity was found for normative commitment to change in any of the samples. Hypothesis 4(b) was partially supported in the case of affective and continuance commitment to change in one sample each.

Figure 3. Communication as moderator between qualitative job insecurity and continuance commitment to change (Organization 2).

Hypothesis 4(c) which concerned the change-related communication as a moderator of the relationship between quantitative job insecurity and commitment to change dimensions did not find support. The interaction term failed to reach significance in all four samples.

Hypothesis 4(d) dealt with the role of communication as a moderator between role overload and commitment to change dimensions. As can be seen from Table 9, the role overload * communication interaction was only significant in one sample (Organization 2) and for one commitment to change dimension (affective) ($\beta = -.24, p < .05$). The
simple slope analysis presented in Figure 4 shows that, contrary to predictions, in the presence of high level of communication, the negative relationship between role overload and affective commitment to change was moderately strong ($\beta = -0.37, p < .05$) while the slope representing low levels of communication was found to be non-significant ($\beta = 0.10, \text{ns}$).

Figure 4. Communication as moderator between role overload and affective commitment to change (Organization 2).

Hypothesis 4(e) dealt with the interaction between role ambiguity and change-related communication. The results show that for Organization 1, although the interaction between role ambiguity and communication had a significant relationship with affective commitment to change, simple slope analysis (see Figure 5) revealed that both the slopes for high ($\beta = -0.13, \text{ns}$) and low ($\beta = 0.25, \text{ns}$) levels of communication were non-significant. No significant relationships were found in any samples in the case of continuance and normative commitment to change. Hypotheses 4(c), 4(d) and 4(e) were not supported in any sample.
Hypothesis 4(f), which concerned communication as a moderator between role conflict and commitment to change dimensions, also received partial support. The interaction term was significant in three of the four samples in the case of affective commitment to change and in one sample for normative commitment to change, whereas no significant relationship was found in the case of continuance commitment to change in any sample. As concerns the significant interaction for affective commitment to change in Organization 1 ($\beta = .19, p < .05$), the simple slope analysis (see Figure 6) revealed that, in accordance with the hypothesis, when communication was low, the negative relationship between role conflict and affective commitment to change was strong ($\beta = - .36, p < .05$) while the slope representing high levels of communication was non-significant ($\beta = .06, \text{ns}$).
For Organization 2, role conflict also had a significant interaction with communication on affective commitment to change ($\beta = -0.24, p < 0.05$). However, contrary to expectations, the simple slope analysis (see Figure 7) revealed that when communication was low, the relationship between role conflict and affective commitment to change was strong and positive ($\beta = 0.46, p < 0.05$) while the slope representing high level of communication was non-significant ($\beta = -0.03$, ns).
Also for Organization 3, the interaction between role conflict and communication had a negative relationship with affective commitment to change ($\beta = -.27, p < .05$). Higher levels of communication were associated with stronger affective commitment to change when role conflict was low. Again, however, contrary to what was hypothesized, the simple slope analysis (see Figure 8) revealed that when communication was low, the relationship between role conflict and affective commitment to change was strong and positive ($\beta = .77, p < .05$). The slope representing high level of communication was non-significant ($\beta = .16$, ns).
Figure 8. Communication as moderator between role conflict and affective commitment to change (Organization 3)

For Organization 2, role conflict also had a significant interaction with communication with a negative effect on normative commitment to change ($\beta = -.27$, $p < .05$). Simple slope analysis (see Figure 9) revealed that, contrary to what was hypothesized, when communication was low, the relationship between role conflict and normative commitment to change was strong and positive ($\beta = .48$, $p < .05$) while the slope representing high level of communication was non-significant ($\beta = -.01$, ns). Hypothesis 4(f) was partially supported in the case of affective commitment to change in one sample.
Employability

The results concerning Hypothesis 5 about employability moderating the effects of stressors on commitment to change are presented in Table 10. Step 1 showed that the control variables accounted for 0-11 percent of the variance in the outcomes. The main effects (Step 2) added between 0 and 43 units to the variance explained and the interaction terms (Step 3) an additional 0–35 units. After controlling for demographics and the main effects of the stressors, employability evidenced a positive main effect on affective commitment to change in two of the samples (Organization 1 and 2) while it was non-significant in the Organization 3 and 4. For continuance commitment to change, the relationship was non-significant while a positive relationship was found in the case of normative commitment to change for Organization 1 and 2.
Hypothesis 5(b) dealt with employability as a moderator between qualitative job insecurity and commitment to change dimensions. No significant interactions were found in any of the samples between qualitative job insecurity and employability.

The results concerning hypothesis 5(c) dealing with employability as a moderator between quantitative job insecurity and commitment to change dimensions also showed no significant interactions in any of the four samples.

The results of hypothesis 5(d) predicting the interaction between role overload and employability revealed some significant interactions only for the Organization 3 sample. The interaction between role overload and employability had a negative relationship with affective commitment to change ($\beta = -.22$, $p < .05$). Simple slope calculation (Figure 10) revealed that contrary to the hypothesized relationship when employability was high, the negative relationship between role overload and affective commitment to change was strong ($\beta = -.80$, $p < .05$). Simple slope analysis also showed that the slope representing low level of employability was non-significant ($\beta = -.17$, ns).
Table 10. Employability as moderator (standardized regression coefficients from the last step)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization 1</th>
<th>Organization 2</th>
<th>Organization 3</th>
<th>Organization 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCH</td>
<td>CCCH</td>
<td>NCCH</td>
<td>ACCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong> (Control Variables)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen (f)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong> (Main effects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (ql)</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (qn)</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emp</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong> (Two way interactions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (ql) x Emp</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (qn) x Emp</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO x Emp</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA x Emp</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC x Emp</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model R²</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .000, a p < .01, c p < .05.

**Note:** Gen (f) = Gender (Female); Edu = Education; Ten = Tenure; JI (ql) = Job insecurity (qualitative); JI (qn) = Job insecurity (quantitative); RO = Role overload; RA = Role ambiguity; RC = Role conflict; Emp = Employability; ACCH = Affective commitment to change; CCH = Continuance commitment to change; NCCH = Normative commitment to change.

Age: 1 = 18-25, 2 = 26-35, 3 = 36-45, 4 = 46-55, 5 = 56-65; Gender: 1 = Male, 2 = Female; Education: 1 = Under-graduate, 2 = Graduate, 3 = Post-graduate, 4 = Doctorate; Tenure = Years of service.
For Organization 3, the interaction between role overload and employability also had a positive relationship with continuance commitment to change ($\beta = .26$, $p < .05$). Simple slope calculations (Figure 11) revealed that contrary to the hypothesized relationship, when employability was high, the positive relationship between role overload and continuance commitment to change was moderately strong ($\beta = .32$, $p < .05$) and that the slope representing low level of employability was non-significant ($\beta = -.17$, ns). No significant relationship was found for normative commitment to change in any of the four samples. Hypothesis 5(b), 5(c) and 5(d) were not supported in any of the four samples.
Hypothesis 5(e) dealt with the interaction between role ambiguity and employability and its relationship with the commitment to change dimensions. Results revealed that the interaction had a significant relationship with continuance and normative commitment to change only in the case of Organization 3. In the case of continuance commitment to change ($\beta = .28, p < .05$) simple slope analysis (see Figure 12) showed that contrary to the hypothesis, when employability was high, the positive relationship between role ambiguity and continuance commitment to change was moderately strong ($\beta = .24, p < .01$) and when employability was low, the relationship was weaker ($\beta = -.23, p < .05$).
Figure 12. Employability as moderator between role ambiguity and continuance commitment to change (Organization 3).

For normative commitment to change the interaction between role ambiguity and employability had a significant effect ($\beta = .28$, $p < .05$). Simple slope analysis (see Figure 13) showed that in accordance with the hypothesized relationship, when employability was high, normative commitment to change was high despite high levels of role ambiguity ($\beta = .30$, $p < .05$) and also shows that the slope representing low level of employability was non-significant ($\beta = -.21$, ns). No significant relationship was found in the case of affective commitment to change in any of the four samples. Hypothesis 5(e) was partially supported in one sample for normative commitment to change.
Hypothesis 5(f) dealt with the interaction between role conflict and employability. Results show that the interaction had a significant relationship with continuance commitment to change ($\beta = -.20$, $p < .05$) only in the case of Organization 3. Simple slope analysis (Figure 14) showed that in accordance with the hypothesized relationship, when employability was low, the positive relationship between role conflict and continuance commitment to change was moderately strong ($\beta = .21$, $p < .01$) and also shows that the slope representing high level of employability was non-significant ($\beta = -.05$, ns). No significant relationships were found in the case of affective and normative commitment to change in any of the four samples. Hypothesis 5(f) also received partial support only in the case of continuance commitment to change in one sample.
Trust in management

The results of Hypothesis 6 about trust moderating the effects of stressors on commitment to change are presented in Table 11. The control variables accounted for 1-12 percent of the variance in the outcomes in Step 1. In Step 2 (main effects) between 7 and 35 percent of the variance was explained (Step 3) while Step 3 accounted for between 2–16 percent of the variance. After controlling for demographics and the main effects of the stressors, trust evidenced a positive main effect on affective commitment to change in two of the samples (Organization 1 and 4) while it was non-significant in the Organization 2 and 3. For continuance commitment to change, a significant negative relationship was found in Organization 1 and 3 while the relationship was non-significant in Organization 2 and 4. For normative commitment to change, the relationship was significant only for Organization.
### Table 11. Trust as moderator (standardized regression coefficients from the last step).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization 1</th>
<th>Organization 2</th>
<th>Organization 3</th>
<th>Organization 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCH</td>
<td>CCCH</td>
<td>NCCH</td>
<td>ACCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Control variables)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen (f)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta R^2 )</td>
<td>.11^a</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Main effects)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (ql)</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (qn)</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta R^2 )</td>
<td>.23^a</td>
<td>.35^a</td>
<td>.11^b</td>
<td>.31^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Two way interactions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (ql) x Tr</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JI (qn) x Tr</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO x Tr</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA x Tr</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC x Tr</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Delta R^2 )</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model R²</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^ap < .000, ^bp < .01, ^cp < .05.

**Note:** Gen (f) = Gender (Female); Edu = Education; Ten = Tenure; JI (ql) = Job insecurity (qualitative); JI (qn) = Job insecurity (quantitative); RO = Role overload; RA = Role ambiguity; RC = Role conflict; Tr = Trust; ACCH = Affective commitment to change; CCH = Continuance commitment to change; NCCH = Normative commitment to change.

Age: 1 = 18-25, 2 = 26-35, 3 = 36-45, 4 = 46-55, 5 = 56-65; Gender: 1 = Male, 2 = Female; Education: 1 = Under-graduate, 2 = Graduate, 3 = Post-graduate, 4 = Doctorate; Tenure = Years of service.
Hypothesis 6 (b) dealt with the moderating effect of trust on the relationship between qualitative job insecurity and the commitment to change dimensions. Results in Table 11 showed that the interaction was significant for continuance commitment to change only for the Organization 3 sample. Simple slope analysis (see Figure 15) revealed that in line with the hypothesis the positive relationship between qualitative job insecurity and continuance commitment to change was stronger for those individuals reporting low level of trust ($\beta = .34, p < .05$) while the slope was high level of trust was non-significant ($\beta = .08, \text{ns}$). No significant relationships were found for affective and normative commitment to change in any of the four samples. Hypothesis 6(b) was partially supported in the case of continuance commitment to change in one sample.

![Figure 15. Trust as moderator between qualitative job insecurity and continuance commitment to change (Organization 3).](image)

The results concerning hypothesis 6(c) dealing with the interaction between trust and quantitative job insecurity on commitment to change dimensions showed that the relationship in Organization 2 and 4 was significant, which had a positive relationship
with affective commitment to change. For Organization 2, simple slope analysis (see Figure 16) in accordance with the hypothesized relationship showed that when trust was low, the negative relationship between affective commitment to change and quantitative job insecurity was strong ($\beta = -.51, p < .05$) but showed that the slope representing high level of trust was non-significant ($\beta = .05, \text{ns}$).

![Figure 16](image_url)

Figure 16. Trust as moderator between quantitative job insecurity and affective commitment to change (Organization 2).

For Organization 4, simple slope analysis (Figure 17) showed that in accordance with the hypothesis, when trust was high the negative relationship between affective commitment to change and quantitative job insecurity was weaker ($\beta = -.30, p < .05$) than when trust was low ($\beta = -.56, p < .05$). No significant relationship was found for continuance and normative commitment to change in any of the four samples. Hypothesis 6(c) was partially supported only in the case of affective commitment to change in two samples.
The results of hypothesis 6(d) concerning the effects of role overload on the commitment to change dimensions reveal that the relationship was significant for affective commitment to change in Organization 1 ($\beta = .18, p < .05$), Organization 2 ($\beta = -.34, p < .01$) and Organization 3 ($\beta = .26, p < .05$). Simple slope analysis for Organization 1 (Figure 18) showed that in accordance with the hypothesis, when trust was low, the negative relationship between affective commitment to change and role overload was stronger ($\beta = -.40, p < .05$) but the slope representing high level of trust was non-significant ($\beta = .04$, ns).
Figure 18. Trust as moderator between role overload and affective commitment to change (Organization 1).

For Organization 2, simple slope analysis (Figure 19) showed that contrary to the hypothesized relationship, when trust was high the negative relationship between affective commitment to change and role overload was strong ($\beta = -.48, p < .05$) but the slope representing low level of trust was non-significant ($\beta = .14, \text{ns}$).
Figure 19. Trust as moderator between role overload and affective commitment to change (Organization 2).

For Organization 3, simple slope analysis (Figure 20) showed that in accordance with the hypothesized relationship, when trust was low, the negative relationship between affective commitment to change and role overload was fairly strong ($\beta = -.72, p < .05$) but showed that the slope representing high level of trust was non-significant ($\beta = -.11$, ns).
Figure 20. Trust as moderator between role overload and affective commitment to change (Organization 3).

For Organization 3 the interaction between trust and role overload was significant ($\beta = -.20, p < .05$), which had a negative effect on continuance commitment to change. Simple slope analysis (Figure 21) showed that in accordance with the hypothesized relationship, when trust was low, the positive relationship between continuance commitment to change and role overload was moderately high ($\beta = .23, p < .05$) but the slope representing high level of trust was non-significant ($\beta = -.09$, ns). No significant relationship was found in the case of normative commitment to change in any sample. Hypothesis 6(d) was also partially supported for affective commitment to change in two and for continuance commitment to change in one organization.
Figure 21. Trust as moderator between role overload and continuance commitment to change (Organization 3).

The results of hypothesis 6(e) dealt with the interaction between trust and role ambiguity and its relationship with the commitment to change. Results showed that for Organization 4, the interaction between trust and role ambiguity was significant ($\beta = -.22$, $p < .05$), which had a negative relationship with affective commitment to change. Simple slope analysis (Figure 22) showed that contrary to the hypothesized relationship, when trust was low affective commitment to change was high at a high level of role ambiguity ($\beta = .30$, $p < .05$) and also showed that the slope representing high level of trust was non-significant ($\beta = -.16$, ns).
The results were also significant ($\beta = .21, p < .05$) for Organization 3, which had a positive relationship with continuance commitment to change. Simple slope analysis (Figure 23) showed that contrary to the hypothesized relationship, when trust was high, the positive relationship between continuance commitment to change and role ambiguity was moderately strong ($\beta = .28, p < .05$) and also showed that the slope representing low level of trust was non-significant ($\beta = -.12$, ns).
Significant results were found for normative commitment to change in the case of Organization 2 ($\beta = .20, p < .05$). Simple slope analysis (see Figure 24) revealed that in accordance with the hypothesis, when trust was low, the negative relationship between normative commitment to change and role ambiguity was strong ($\beta = -.44, p < .05$) but also showed that the slope representing high level of trust was non-significant ($\beta = -.09, ns$). Hypothesis 6(e) was partially supported only for normative commitment to change in one organization.
Hypothesis 6(f) dealt with the interaction between trust and role conflict and its relationship with the dimensions of commitment to change. The results revealed that in the case of affective commitment to change, the relationship was significant for Organization 2 ($\beta = -.39, p < .05$) and 3 ($\beta = -.41, p = .05$). Simple slope analysis for Organization 2 (see Figure 25) showed that contrary to the hypothesized relationship, when trust was low, affective commitment to change was high despite the high levels of role conflict ($\beta = .59, p < .05$) and also showed that the slope representing high level of trust was non-significant ($\beta = -.02$, ns).
Figure 25. Trust as moderator between role conflict and affective commitment to change (Organization 2).

Simple slope analysis for Organization 3 (see Figure 26) again showed that contrary to the hypothesized relationship when trust was low, affective commitment to change was high even when role conflict was high ($\beta = .67, p < .05$) and also showed that the slope representing high level of trust was non-significant ($\beta = -.04$, ns).
The interaction between trust and role conflict had a significant relationship with normative commitment to change for Organization 2 ($\beta = -.29, p < .05$). Contrary to the hypothesized relationship, simple slope analysis (see Figure 27) showed that when trust was low, the relationship between normative commitment to change and role conflict was positive instead of negative ($\beta = .41, p < .01$) which indicated that normative commitment to change was high despite the high level of role conflict. Results also revealed that the slope representing high level of trust was non-significant ($\beta = .01, \text{ns}$). No significant relationships were found in the case of continuance commitment to change in any of the four samples. Hypothesis 6(f) was not supported in any sample.
Consequences of commitment to change

Hypothesis 7 dealt with the associations of commitment to change with its postulated outcomes. The results presented in Table 12 showed that the control variables accounted for 2-8 percent of the variance in the outcomes in Step 1. In Step 2 between 6 and 49 percent of the variance was explained. Overall the model accounted for 39, 11 and 32 percent of variance in compliance for Organization 2, 3 and 4 respectively. For cooperation the variance was 52, 14 and 26 percent while it was 52, 14 and 30 percent for championing for Organization 2, 3 and 4 respectively.

Hypothesis 7(a), dealt with the relationship of affective, continuance and normative commitment to change with compliance (focal behavior). Results showed that as expected, affective commitment to change was positively related to compliance in the two of the three samples (Organization 2 and 4) where data on change-related behavior
were available (data is not available for org 1) after controlling for demographic variables. Normative commitment to change was also found to be positively related to compliance in one sample (Organization 2) in accordance with the hypothesis. Contrary to the hypothesized relationship the results showed that continuance commitment to change was unrelated to compliance in all three samples. Hypothesis 7(a) was therefore partially supported.

Hypothesis 7(b) concerned the relationship between the three dimensions of commitment to change and change related behavior. The results showed that as expected, affective commitment to change was positively related with both cooperation and championing dimensions of discretionary behavior in Organization 2 and 4. For normative commitment to change this relationship was according to the hypothesized relationship in Organization 2 and 3. In the case of continuance commitment to change a negative relationship was found as hypothesized in Organization 2, while the relationship was significant only for championing behavior in the case of Organization 3. Hypothesis 7(a) was also supported.
Table 12. Multiple regression analysis predicting behavioral support for change from affective, continuance and normative commitment to change (standardized regression coefficients from the last step)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Organization 3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Organization 4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Championing</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Championing</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen (f)</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edu</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.22^c</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.32^c</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08^c</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step 2: Commitment to change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCH</td>
<td>.44^a</td>
<td>.49^a</td>
<td>.43^a</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.55^a</td>
<td>.51^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCCH</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.18^c</td>
<td>-.25^c</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.26^b</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCCH</td>
<td>.24^b</td>
<td>.17^c</td>
<td>.17^c</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.20^a</td>
<td>.21^c</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.36^a</td>
<td>.49^a</td>
<td>.49^a</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06^c</td>
<td>.07^e</td>
<td>.28^a</td>
<td>.24^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model R²</td>
<td>.39^a</td>
<td>.52^a</td>
<td>.52^a</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.14^e</td>
<td>.14^e</td>
<td>.32^a</td>
<td>.26^a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a p < .000, ^b p < .01, ^c p < .05.

Note: Gen (f) = Gender (Female); Edu = Education; Ten = Tenure; ACCH = Affective commitment to change; CCH = Continuance commitment to change; NCCH = Normative commitment to change.

Age: 1 = 18-25, 2 = 26-35, 3 = 36-45, 4 = 46-55, 5 = 56-65; Gender: 1 = Male, 2 = Female; Education: 1 = Under-graduate, 2 = Graduate, 3 = Post-graduate, 4 = Doctorate; Tenure = Years of service.
CHAPTER V
Discussion

Organizational change is a significant event in the life of private and public sector organizations of the twenty first century. In today’s rapidly changing business environment, organizations are faced with the challenging task to either adapt to the changes or to perish altogether. Employees play a pivotal role in the success of an organization which brings into focus the importance of their commitment towards any developmental or change related initiatives.

The goals of the present study were to examine the construct of commitment to change in terms of its factor structure and outcomes, and to examine how job stressors and insecurity affect commitment to change and how resources may moderate this relationship. The major objective of the present study was to determine the factors that impede and facilitate the development of commitment to change – a factor critical responsible for the success of any change program. The potential role of communication, employability and trust as potential moderators of the negative effects of stressors on commitment to change was also studied. A secondary yet important purpose of the present study was to establish the generalizability of the Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) three component model of commitment to change in Pakistan as these measures can provide an opportunity to conduct a readiness and commitment audit of the attitudes of employees towards the change programs that are currently taking place.

For the purpose of testing the model proposed for the present study, data were collected from four public sector organizations in Pakistan, which were at various stages
of organizational restructuring. The same hypotheses were tested for all four organizations but several changes were made to the survey after collecting data from the first organization. The first study was essentially carried out as a pilot study to assess the response of individuals towards the change taking place at their organization. The second study was carried out as a replication of the first study and an additional measure was added to the survey measuring the behavioral outcomes of commitment to change. The third and fourth studies were similar to the second as far as the measures were concerned but the only difference was that some items used to measure the normative commitment to change scale were rephrased (positively worded) in these surveys in order to overcome problems that had been identified. A number of hypotheses were developed to address the above issues and the following sections will present a discussion on the results pertaining to these hypotheses.

**Generalizability of the Three-component Model**

Despite the noted differences that exist between cultures, the behavioral sciences literature has a western flavor, which holds true also for the commitment literature (Wasti, 2002). In the case of literature on commitment to change, there have been very few attempts to test the only empirical model- the Herscovitch-Meyer (2002) model of commitment to change- outside North America. One exception in the South Asian case is the Meyer et al. (2007) study, which was basically a comparison between Canadian and Indian managers. Research has shown that commitment to change is a multidimensional construct comprising of three dimensions (Chen & Wang, 2007; Herscovitch & Meyer,
Given the dearth of research on the three-component model and to determine its validity in a non-western setting, two hypotheses were tested. Hypothesis 1(a), which stipulated that the three factor representation of commitment to change are distinct constructs, received fairly good support in all four samples for affective commitment to change and for continuance commitment to change at least in Organization 1 and 2 samples with the help of confirmatory factor analysis. The only exception to this general finding concerned normative commitment to change, for which two reverse coded items proved problematic in Organization 1 and 2. The factor loadings did not improve despite positively wording the items for Organization 3 and 4 surveys and remained low. The results of the present study are in line with previous findings (Chen & Wang, 2007; Meyer et al., 2007) and provide evidence of the generalizability of the commitment to change model outside North America. Especially in the case of normative commitment to change, these findings support the results of the Indian study by Meyer et al. (2007) in which the normative commitment to change construct was observed as being comparatively more problematic to establish as a distinct construct than affective and continuance commitment to change as certain items loaded onto the affective commitment to change scale.

A strong negative relationship was found between affective and continuance commitment to change in all four samples in line with previous research (Chen & Wang, 2007; Cunningham, 2006; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Meyer et al., 2007). Affective commitment to change is a positive attitude based on the willful acceptance of change while continuance commitment to change reflects a negative attitude based on costs
associated with leaving the organization, thereby resulting in a negative relationship between the two dimensions.

A positive relationship was found between continuance and normative commitment to change in Organization 1, which supports the findings by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) as well as the findings of the Indian sample in the Meyer et al. (2007) study. For Organizations 2, 3 and 4, the relationship between continuance and normative commitment to change was negative which is similar to the relationship in the Indian sample of the Meyer et al., 2007 study, although in that case the relationship was non-significant. The relationship between continuance and normative commitment to change depends upon whether normative commitment takes the moral imperative or indebted obligation form as described by Gellatly, Meyer and Luchak (2006). The moral imperative form relates more closely with cost based attitudes, thus resulting in a positive relationship between normative and continuance commitment to change as evident by the results of Organization 1 where there was a non significant yet positive relationship between the two dimensions. The indebted obligation form of normative commitment to change relates closely to affective commitment to change resulting in a negative relationship between continuance and normative commitment to change as reflected by the results of Organization 2, 3 and 4.

A positive relationship was found between affective and normative commitment to change in all but Organization 2 sample, in line with previous research (Chen & Wang, 2007; Cunningham, 2006; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Meyer et al., 2007). Pakistan, according to Hofstede (2002), has a collectivist culture, where a higher correlation between affective and normative commitment to change is expected (Chen & Francesco,
Individuals in collectivist cultures generally exhibit strong attachment, loyalty and pride towards their families and work places and are more accepting of the power distance that exists in these societies in terms of authority and status differences than in individualistic cultures (Hofstede, 2002; House, Hanges, Javidan, Dorfman, & Gupta, 2004). Unlike the individualistic culture where employment is considered a mutually beneficial contract between the employer and the employee, in collectivist culture, this relationship is based on moral obligations as well as mutual benefit, resulting in the strong relationship between affective and normative commitment dimensions in cultures outside North America (Wasti, 2002). Affective commitment combined with normative commitment leads to the enactment of positive citizenship behaviors making the individual strive towards the achievement of organizational goals (Gellatly et al., 2006).

Hypothesis 1(b) concerned the reliability of the commitment to change dimensions. In general, the results showed that the reliabilities were acceptable for the affective commitment to change scale in all four samples. While continuance commitment to change evidenced a satisfactory reliability in two samples, the reliability was below .70 in the other two. The normative commitment to change scale did not reach the accepted reliability level despite dropping two items from the scale. Some of the normative items may not have been relevant for the Pakistani work environment which calls for the development of emic (culture based) items for a re-conceptualization of the construct in a non-western setting (Suliman & Iles, 1999; Wasti, 2002, 2005). A perceived breach of psychological contract may also have reduced the moral imperative and raised the level of indebted obligation. The factor analysis of the normative
commitment to change items in all samples indicated that the respondents related more closely to items reflecting “moral imperative” rather than “indebted obligation” – the two faces of normative commitment to change identified by Gellatly et al. (2006). As is expected of collectivist cultures (Wasti, 2002), employees feel that they have to support any initiative by their attachment and loyalty towards their organization and therefore respond more to items that reflect a moral obligation.

Effects of Stressors on Commitment to Change

It has been noted earlier in this thesis that organizational changes may be a source of stress for those affected by them (Swanson & Power, 2001). Given the dearth of research regarding the antecedents or the factors that affect commitment to change, it therefore becomes important to study those factors which would potentially thwart the change process. Based on previous literature and the context of change, job insecurity and role stressors were considered the major factors that could negatively effect commitment to change in the present research.

Hypotheses were developed in order to ascertain the effect of stressors on commitment to change. Job insecurity was considered an important stressor in relation to organizational change and it is important to ascertain whether it is the quantitative (total job loss) or qualitative (loss of job features) dimension which affects commitment to change more. Results revealed that the quantitative (total job loss) dimension showed a stronger relationship with affective and continuance commitment to change compared to the qualitative (loss of job features) dimension. This finding is in line with the research by Greenhalgh and Rosenblatt (1984) that continuity of employment is a prime concern.
for individuals and although the anticipated loss of valued job features may be stressful, but not as much as total job loss. As hypothesized, the results revealed a negative relationship between job insecurity and affective commitment to change. This supports the contention by Rosenbaltt and Ruvio (1996) that uncertain and insecure job situations will reduce employee motivation to actively participate in change. The positive relationship between job insecurity and continuance commitment to change supports Clugston et al. (2000) argument that high aversion to risk along with the feeling of job insecurity leads to continuance type commitment. Change efforts are unlikely to succeed if those involved in their implementation are not fully on board and only show half hearted support just to retain their employment.

Role stressors have been identified in earlier research as factors that lead to reduced employee support for change (Iverson, 1996). The hypotheses relating to role stressors generally pointed to a negative relationship between the role stressors and affective/normative commitment to change. For continuance commitment to change this relationship was proposed as being positive.

The results for the hypothesis on the relationship between role overload and commitment to change indicated that role overload had a negative relationship with affective commitment to change and positive relationship with continuance commitment to change in organization 3 where restructuring has been formally announced but not initiated, thereby indicating that role overload was present prior to the implementation of change. These findings are in line with stress literature which suggests that work overload leads to reduced employee well being and lower morale (Swanson & Power, 2001) which would in turn lower the affective reactions towards change and increase continuance type
commitment due to the lack of will to support change (Herscovitch, 1999). Contrary to the hypothesis, the relationship was opposite for the organization where restructuring had not been formally announced as in the case of Organization 4. This finding supports the argument by Beehr et al. (1976) that in certain conditions, role overload increases the motivation to work if it taken as a challenge rather than a threat consequently resulting in positive attitudes towards work. Gilboa, Shirom, Fried and Cooper (2008) note that role overload is perceived as a challenge by employees of an organization which is in the growth rather than decline stage. In the case of Organization 4, it was perhaps the expectation of better future working conditions by over worked employees that led to a positive relationship between role overload and affective commitment to change. As the basic purpose underlying organizational changes such as restructuring is the enhancement of efficiency and growth of the organization, work overload in such case may provide the impetus to support change.

For the relationship of role ambiguity with commitment to change, the results supported the hypotheses that suggested a negative relationship between role ambiguity and affective/normative commitment to change and a positive relationship with continuance commitment to change. For the negative relationship of role ambiguity with positive work attitudes, the present results support the contention by Beehr et al. (1976) that role ambiguity reduces the expectation of performance leading to valued outcomes thus reducing the motivation to work. Role ambiguity reduces the motivation to work due to unclear objectives which in turn may negatively influence an individual’s willingness to work towards the success of a cause (Hackman & Oldham, 1975). These findings also
support Lazarus and Folkman’s (1984) contention that individuals view a situation as being potentially threatening or beneficial based on their ability to deal with it.

It is interesting to note that out of the four samples, the relationship with role ambiguity was significant and in the predicted direction only for Organization 1, where change had already been formally announced. Even without the implementation of change, there was a fair amount of role ambiguity present in the system which was negatively related to affective commitment to change. Gilboa et al. (2008) argue that in comparison to other stressors, role ambiguity has a more adverse effect and there are not many resources that may mitigate its negative effects. When faced with a high level of ambiguity, the individual feels incapable of completing job assignments. Therefore, when ambiguity is high, the individual faces the difficulty of pursuing job assignments because of an inability to understand what is expected of them and the processes and procedures to be followed (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984).

The results regarding the relationship between role conflict and commitment to change revealed that as predicted there existed a significant relationship between role conflict and continuance commitment to change in two samples. This result again supports the contention (Swanson & Power, 2001) that role conflict decreases employee morale which would lead to a half hearted cost based support for a change initiative (Herscovitch, 1999; Iverson, 1996). In the case of affective commitment to change, the relationship was positive which was contrary to the hypothesized relationship. It should be noted that the bivariate correlation between role conflict and affective commitment to change was negative at least in Organization 2 sample, the regression effect, once taking into account other model variables, became positive. This may be due to suppressor
effect and the results must be interpreted with caution. For normative commitment to change the relationship was positive in Organization 2, 3 and 4 samples which was again contrary to the hypothesized relationship. In this case, an analysis of bivariate correlations revealed similar relationship at least in Organization 3 and 4 samples. These results support the argument by Hedberg, Nystrom and Starbuck (1976) that sometimes role conflict and role ambiguity can actually help an organization adapt to organizational change by challenging traditions and status quo. Lepine, Lepine and Jackson (2004) distinguished between hindrance stress and challenge stress in having a motivating and de-motivating effect respectively, on an individual’s learning performance. In the present study, the results reflect that the employees faced with role conflict may have perceived role conflict as a challenge stress, thereby showing a positive effect on normative commitment to change dimensions.

**Effects of Facilitators on Commitment to Change**

For the present research, the facilitators of commitment to change were chosen on the premise that an organization which keeps employees informed during changes, provides opportunities for training and growth and allows trust to flourish between employers and employees is more likely to experience positive reactions towards change. This research has therefore taken into account communication, employability and trust in management as factors that were considered the potential antecedents or facilitators of commitment to change as suggested by previous research by Meyer et al. (2007).

It was hypothesized that all facilitators would have a positive relationship with affective/normative commitment to change while in the case of continuance commitment
to change, this relationship would be negative. The results showed that communication, employability and trust in management were positively related with affective and normative commitment to change and negatively related with continuance commitment to change as expected. It has been noted earlier that affective and normative commitment to change are based on the realization of benefits of change and the assurance of job security and continuance commitment to change is based on the costs associated with change (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). The positive relationship between communication and affective commitment to change supports the contention by Robertson et al. (1993) that organizational change depends upon the change that occurs in employee behavior which in turn is dependent upon the level of communication regarding change. The purpose of communication has been explained by Goodman and Truss (2004) as to: “obtain individual buy-in, obtain commitment to the change, minimize resistance, reduce personal anxiety, ensure clarity of objectives, share information/vision, challenge the status quo, obtain clarity and minimize uncertainty” (p. 226). Communication makes way for the development of commitment to change and reduces uncertainties and resistance associated with change (Lippit, 1997) thereby having a positive relationship with affective and normative commitment to change and a negative relationship with continuance commitment to change.

In terms of employability, the results of the present study reveal a positive relationship between employability and affective commitment to change – a dimension of commitment to change that depends upon the whole hearted acceptance and championing of the cause of the change program. The results show that in line with Fugate et al.
(2004), a sense of employability creates a proactive disposition towards the acceptance and support of change.

For continuance commitment to change, which is based on costs associated with leaving a job and a lack of available employment opportunities (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002), the results of the present study again support this argument by showing a negative relationship of employability with continuance commitment to change. People with high levels of employability remain with their jobs willingly rather than feeling trapped due to lack of alternatives. Continuance commitment to change does not indicate resistance to change but is nevertheless the most undesirable form of commitment (Herscovitch, 1999). Self confidence and a perception of being able to retain one’s job would lead to reduced levels of continuance commitment to change.

The positive relationship between employability and normative commitment to change also shows that being employable within an organization supports the psychological contract that exists between the employer and the employee. This is in line with the argument by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) that for the development of normative commitment to change, maintaining organizational membership and retention of job is important as it is based on the reciprocity norm between the employer and employee. A sense of being able to retain one’s current job and being employable within the organization has a positive relationship with normative commitment to change.

Trust as a facilitator was found to have a positive relationship with affective and normative commitment to change and a negative relationship with continuance commitment to change. These results generally support the argument by Dirks and Ferrin (2001) that in an organizational environment rife with uncertainty, trust will help create
an environment conducive to the development of positive attitudes towards commitment towards change. As trust has been shown to be positively related to affective commitment and negatively with continuance commitment and change related cynicism (Albrecht & Travaglione, 2003), the results of the present study point towards similar outcomes. In the case of normative commitment to change, the results provide support for Mishra and Spreitzer’s (1998) argument that a high level of trust combined with low level of empowerment leads to an obliging response. Trust between the employees and management helps reduce cynicism and encourage positive attitudes towards change. The higher the trust the more accepting the employees are of the change initiatives. Kotter and Schlesinger (1979) consider trust to be an important factor that can help overcome resistance to change and affect the attitudes towards change. If employees trust the management they will support the actions of the management regarding change and show support for it and vice versa (Mishra & Spreitzer, 1998). Trust creates a willingness to support management decisions and develops a belief in the management motives for change (Rousseau & Tijoriwala, 1999).

Facilitators as Moderators of the Relationship between Stressors and Commitment to Change

It is important not only to explore the factors that may inhibit or facilitate change but also to identify factors that may help moderate or reduce the negative effects of stressors on employee commitment to change. Factors like communication (Johnson et al. 1996), employability (Berntson et al., 2006) and trust (Albrecht & Travaglione, 2003) are expected to mitigate stress and lead to more positive attitudes towards change. It may be
stressed that the research regarding moderators in the present thesis may be considered exploratory in nature due to the paucity of literature available on commitment to change. These results may therefore be interpreted with caution. The analysis of moderated regression results also reveals that most of the results were significant in the case of Organization 2, which was the only organization that had actually implemented the change program and for Organization 3, where change was announced and it had a history of change attempts that did not materialize. Results were scattered for the remaining two organizations, of which, change had been formally announced at Organization 1, while it was about to be announced at Organization 4 at the time of data collection.

The results pertaining to the hypotheses on the moderating role of communication between stressors and commitment to change revealed that communication did moderate the relationship between stressors and commitment to change at least in the case of qualitative job insecurity and role conflict. For organization 2 where change had been implemented and communication channels regarding change were more established than in other organizations, the negative relationship between qualitative job insecurity and affective commitment to change was reduced by change related communication. Similarly the positive relationship between qualitative job insecurity and continuance commitment to change was also reduced by communication. These findings are in line with the arguments found in literature which suggest that communication helps overcome barriers to change by removing uncertainties from the minds of individuals thus paving the way for the acceptance and commitment to change (Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Balogun & Hope-Hailey, 2003; Carnall, 1986; Johnson et al. 1996; Klein, 1996; Kotter,
1996). The negative relationship between role overload and affective commitment to change was not mitigated by high level of communication, thereby indicating that the stress associated with undertaking additional work related responsibilities may lead to lack of support for the change initiatives. Research by McHugh (1997) and McHugh and Brennan (1994) suggests that a two-way communication process between employees and decision makers is necessary if the employees are expected to embrace their new responsibilities a challenge rather than a threat. Top-down communication with no participation by those affected will not be instrumental in alleviating stress related with performance related stress. Communication did not emerge as a moderator of stress for the organizations where change had not been implemented in the present thesis. This finding indicates that change related communication may act as a moderator of stress only for individuals who have actually experienced change and require information to deal with their new work roles.

For the role of employability as a moderator, the results revealed some significant interactions only for Organization 3 where change had been formally announced but not implemented. The employees did however have some prior experience of change initiatives that were mostly abandoned later. Contrary to expectations, employability was not able to mitigate the negative relationship between role overload and affective commitment to change in the Organization 3 sample. The positive relationship of both role overload and role ambiguity with continuance commitment to change was also not weakened even in the presence of high levels of employability. This finding is in line with the McHugh’s (1997) assertion that the employees need to be “sensitized” to the need of change through training and communication. Employees experiencing work
overload prior to the initiation of change are unlikely to support change efforts if the organization ignores the human adjustment needs and adheres to strict work schedules (McHugh, 1997). In accordance with the hypothesized relationships, the negative relationship between role ambiguity and normative commitment to change was mitigated by high levels of employability. Similarly, the positive relationship between role conflict and continuance commitment to change remained significant when employability was low. These finding supports Folkman, Lazarus, Gruen, and DeLongis’s (1986) contention that coping can help reduce or minimize any situation that may be stressful for an individual. Self perceived efficacy in dealing with a situation gives rise to positive attitudes which will lead to the enactment of positive behavior Fishbein and Ajzen (1975). The perception of self efficacy or control may be positively affected by information sharing and the creation of an environment that supports employee control. Those who are able to effectively cope with change realize its benefits and are able to relate to its need and importance.

Trust was also found to moderate the relationship of stressors and the commitment to change dimensions in some cases. The positive relationship between qualitative job insecurity and continuance commitment to change was found to remain strong when trust was weak in Organization 3 sample. Similarly, when trust was low the negative relationship between quantitative job insecurity and affective commitment to change was found to be strong in Organization 2 and the relationship was found to be weak when trust was high in Organization 4. In Organization 1 and 3, the negative relationship between role overload and affective commitment to change remained strong in the case of low level of trust. For Organization 2, the negative relationship between
normative commitment to change and role ambiguity was strong in the case of low level of trust. These findings support the meta analysis conducted by Dirks and Ferrin (2001), which revealed that during the initial stages of organizational change when the environment is highly unstable, trust is more likely to have a main effect which may lead to positive attitudes towards change. As the environment starts to become more stable, trust plays a moderating role in relieving stress and helping to achieve a desired outcome like support for organizational change. Dirks and Ferrin (2001) also proposed that high level of trust would result in cooperation from the employees for the support of organizational decisions only if they are able to foresee benefits associated with such action while low levels of trust would only give rise to the competitive motive where the employee is not willing to extend cooperation towards organizational initiatives but secures his own interests when faced with uncertainty.

These findings also support Dwivedi’s (1995) contention that trust is essential for the attainment of objectives in a collectivist culture such as India while distrust thwarts such efforts. Given that Pakistani culture is very similar to Indian culture (Hofstede, 2002) the importance of trust as shown by the results, supports Dwivedi’s (1995) claim. Contrary to expectations, in Organization 2 sample, where change had been implemented, the negative relationship between role overload and affective commitment to change remained strong in the presence of high level of trust. High levels of trust did not mitigate the positive relationship between role ambiguity and continuance commitment to change in the case of Organization 3 as well. Also for Organization 4, the negative relationship between affective commitment to change and role ambiguity remained weak in the presence of weak levels of trust. For Organization 2, the negative relationship between
normative commitment to change and role conflict was weak in the presence of weak level of trust. In the case of Organization 2 and 3, the negative relationship between role conflict and affective commitment to change was weak even when trust was weak. These results suggest that trust did not act as a moderator in any of the above cases. As mentioned earlier, Dirks and Ferrin (2001) have argued that trust may assume the role of a moderator when the change initiative has been established well and the employees can relate to the benefit of supporting change. It may be argued that trust did not emerge as a moderator of some stressors for Organization 3 and 4 as change had not been implemented yet. But for Organization 2 where change had been implemented, the explanation for lack of support for the hypothesis may be the strenuous nature of role stress. Individuals experiencing role stress may experience the actual deterioration of their working conditions and they may not be able to cope with uncertainty even during the presence of high levels of trust.

In general, the results of the facilitator and the moderated analysis draw attention to the findings by Herold et al. (2007) that the inability to deal with the demands of change negatively affects commitment towards the change initiative while those more adept in dealing with changing situations are more committed (Terry & Callan, 2000). The results of the present thesis can be presented in the light of the cognitive phenomenological theory of stress and coping by Lazarus and Folkman (1984) and the theory of reasoned action by Fishbein and Ajzen (1975). According to Fishbein and Ajzen (1984), individuals make systematically use the information available to them in order to arrive at decisions. This systematic appraisal has been defined as primary and secondary appraisal by Lazarus and Folkman (1984). As the present study has been
carried out under as stress perspective, it may be argued that employees of organizations where change had not been implemented were not able to relate to change related stress or its consequences on commitment to change. This assumption may be supported by the concept of unconflicted inertia given by Jacobson (1985, as cited in Klandermans, van Vuuren, & Jacobson, 1991) where in the absence of a credible threat to their employment, the employees will not fear organizational change and will continue to carry out their routine work.

It can be inferred that the employees of Organization 1, 3 and 4 were in the primary appraisal stage where they were assessing the magnitude of the potential problem whereas for organization 2 the employees were actually in the secondary appraisal stage, drawing upon their coping resources to deal with change. This finding suggests that the stage at which change is studied may have an effect on the determination of moderators.

Fedor et al. (2006) are also of the view that changes which directly affect an individual’s job have a greater impact on the change-commitment relationship rather than ones that take place at a distal level having no direct effect on an individual’s working. The mere announcement of change may not elicit any significant response towards the initiative as the process of change unfolds over time (Devos, 2002; Isabella, 1990; Meyer et al., 2007; Paterson & Cary, 2002; Piderit, 2000; Smollan, 2006). It is actually after implementation of the change initiative that the employees may be able to use their immediate past as a point of reference in order to deem change as beneficial or damaging for them (Oldham, Nottenburg, Kassner, Ferris, Fedor, & Masters, 1982).

Past experiences of change can also impact attitudes towards change depending upon the degree of success or failure of the previous initiatives (Armenakis & Bedeian,
Three out of the four organizations studied in this research had never implemented change with the exception of Organization 3 which had a history of abandoned change initiatives. It is likely that the respondents were not able to relate to the questions related to change and to stress related factors per se as these changes had not started to affect prevailing work practices.

**Consequences of Commitment to Change**

It is important to consider the outcomes of commitment to change or change related focal and discretionary behaviors (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001) as these determine the extent to which the change initiative will be espoused by the individuals affected by it.

In the present research, affective, continuance and normative commitment to change were expected to relate positively with focal behavior (compliance). The results provided support for the hypothesis in the case of affective and normative commitment to change. Although the non-significant relationship of continuance commitment to change with compliance was contrary to the hypothesized, the results were in complete agreement with those of Meyer et al.’s (2007) Indian sample in which no relationship was found between continuance commitment to change and compliance while the relationship was significant for affective and normative commitment to change. It may be noted that the same relationship has been found to be positive in North American samples (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Meyer et al., 2007). The non-significant relationship between continuance commitment to change and compliance may indicate that
individuals exhibiting continuance or cost based commitment may not even comply with the directives related to change, thereby adversely affecting the change process.

The results concerning the hypotheses on the relationship between commitment to change dimensions and discretionary behavior (cooperation and championing) revealed a positive relationship between affective/ normative commitment to change and discretionary behavior. This relationship was found to be negative for continuance commitment to change. These findings are again in line with previous studies (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Meyer et al., 2007) at least for the relationship of affective/ normative commitment to change with discretionary behavior. For continuance commitment to change, the findings were in line with the Indian sample of the Meyer et al. (2007) study. The results provide support to Meyer and Herscovitch’s (2001) contention that when commitment is accompanied by a willingness to support a cause, the behavioral consequences are more diverse as evident by the relationship of affective and normative commitment to change with focal as well as discretionary behavior. Employees will go above and beyond what is expected of them if the outcome of an event is perceived to be favorable. Conversely, when commitment is accompanied by the consideration of costs, one is not willing to exert themselves beyond what is required of them, thus resorting to minimal effort or compliance (Meyer & Herscovitch, 2001).

**Limitations**

Like any study, the present thesis has some limitations that need to be addressed. One such notable consideration is the cross-sectional nature of the data which does not allow any assumptions about causality (Bollen, 1989). Despite the fact that the results of the
present thesis are consistent with theoretical notions, a longitudinal design should be adopted in future research as it would be a useful contribution to literature in general. Although it is not possible to determine causal associations with longitudinal studies (Bollen, 1989), change is nevertheless a dynamic process and its impact can only be captured over time, allowing for a better understanding of change-commitment relationship and its consequences (Fedor et al., 2006; Piderit, 2000).

The use of self-report measures of behavior leading to common method bias is another limitation. Since common method variance inflates the relationships between constructs (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986), positively and negatively worded items were used in most of the measures to reduce this inflationary effect (Gordon & Ladd, 1990). Multi-source data may be obtained to overcome the issue of common method bias in future research. Consistency bias is not reflected from the results as the relationships between the commitment to change dimensions were generally consistent with previous research (Chen & Wang, 2007; Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Meyer et al., 2007).

The issue of self-report bias may also be considered where participants generally under-report behaviors considered inappropriate by researchers or other observers, and they tend to over-report behaviors considered to be appropriate (Furst, 2004). This reporting bias possibly leads to inflated relationships between constructs (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986; Spector, 1994, 2006). Self-report bias is particularly likely in organizational behavior research because employees often believe there is at least a remote possibility that their employer could gain access to their responses. Future research may overcome this problem by obtaining multi-source data. However, for the present research, survey method was considered most appropriate as the study intended to capture the perceptions
of employees which can only be obtained through self report (Finegan, 2000; Meyer et al, 1998).

Additionally, two considerations should be made that were associated with situational settings of the present research. First, the response rate was modest, which could bias the conclusions drawn from its results (cf. Magnusson & Bergman, 1990). This low participation rate in some samples may be due to the reason that organizational surveys are not very common in Pakistan and the respondents are usually reluctant to respond to questions of pertaining to their views on “sensitive” topics like job insecurity and stress. The reluctance of organizations to participate in stress related surveys also limited the researcher’s choice in selecting organizations to be studied. Change was actually underway only at one of the four organizations studied. The results of the present research would have provided a clearer idea of the change related attitudes of employees had the data been collected from organizations where change had already been implemented.

Furthermore, the survey employed measures developed in the west of which some items may not have been culturally suitable to be administered to a Pakistani sample. This calls for the development of emic (culture based) items for a re-conceptualization of the construct in a non-western setting (Suliman & Iles, 1999; Wasti, 2002, 2005). Hence, the development of culturally suitable items may be necessary in order to deal with the problems of comprehension. The non responsiveness of organizations did not allow the researcher to choose the organizations to be selected for analysis for the present thesis. All organizations are from different industries and vary in size and functions so only a
general comparison can be drawn in terms of the attitudes of public sector employees towards organizational change.

The moderator analysis was carried out with one moderator at a time which may be a limiting factor as in reality they do not operate independently of one another. Future studies may incorporate all moderators simultaneously in a study.

The present research focused only on the managerial level employees. Future research may benefit from including employees at all hierarchical levels in order to determine the generalizability of results across the entire organization.

**Research implications**

Although the present research provides evidence for the generalizability of the Herscovitch-Meyer (2002) three component model of commitment to change in Pakistan, much remains to be explored especially relating to the development of affective and normative commitment to change. As affective commitment to change has been deemed the most favorable form of commitment (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002) researchers can explore the development of this form of commitment over time. The results of the present study support Wasti’s (2005) contention for the need to conduct further research on normative commitment as an understanding of the normative commitment construct is important for collectivist cultures (Meyer & Allen, 1997). Most of the research on commitment has originated in North America, where behavior is based on individualism and cost-benefit calculations (Triandis, 1995).

The present research highlights the fact the stressors may have a negative effect on positive attitudes towards change and thus merit further research as suggested by
McHugh (1997) who insisted that stress management should be included in the change management initiatives. Armenakis and Bedeian (1999) considered stress to be an impediment to change and underscored the need for including stress, cynicism, resistance and commitment as important variables in the study of change implementation.

Efforts must also be directed towards identifying the antecedents of the three commitment to change dimensions as this area remains largely unexplored to date (Meyer et al., 2007). Although the present study is an attempt to address the paucity of research regarding commitment to change, the results should be considered exploratory in nature and further replication of the research model at various hierarchical levels must be undertaken. A study comparing the change related attitudes of public and private sector employees may also be undertaken to draw a comparison between the two sectors.

An in depth analysis of the formal and informal communication channels existing in organizations and their effect on commitment to change must be analyzed. Employability, which has been an important predictor of commitment to change in the present study may further be tested employing the internal and external employability dimensions by Groot and van den Brink (2000). Internal employability is the perceived ability of an employee to secure employment within the same organization. External employability is the perceived ability of the employee to secure employment outside the organization as well. These two dimensions may provide a clearer picture of the mechanisms underlying the development of commitment to change.

Participative decision making is another potential antecedent of commitment to change that may be explored in future research. Earlier research has shown a positive relationship between participation and employee acceptance of change (Bruhn et al.,
2001; Nurick, 1994; Nutt, 1992). Organizations implementing change must ensure employee participation in change related decisions in order to develop a sense of control over the seemingly stressful situation (Martin et al., 2005). Future research may also focus on the outcomes of commitment to change and whether change related behavior like championing and cooperation may lead to the enhancement of organizational efficiency and effectiveness.

An important avenue to be explored in future research is the mediating role of commitment to change on the relationship between job stressors and change related behavior, which would add to the extant literature on commitment to change.

Managerial Implications

The present thesis has important practical implications for managers and practitioners. The results highlight the importance of developing affective commitment to change as it is positively related to both cooperation and championing behaviors. Likewise, the negative relationship between continuance commitment to change and cooperation and championing behaviors reinforces previous findings (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002; Meyer et al., 2007) that although this type of commitment does not indicate active resistance, yet it is counterproductive for an organization. Although the development of affective and normative commitment to change is time consuming, managers must avoid supporting the development of continuance commitment to change as a “strategy of default” (Meyer et al., 2007).

Because communication has emerged as a significant determinant of commitment to change in the present research, it suggests that senior management should
communicate to allay the fears and uncertainty relating to major organizational changes while the immediate bosses and supervisors can help reduce the ambiguities regarding structural and job related changes (Bordia et al., 2004, a). When changes are initiated, there is a need for new channels of formal and informal communication when changes involve structural or staffing related issues (Ashford, 1988; Swanson & Power, 2001). The role of immediate supervisors is extremely important during change implementation as they can provide the relevant information which can influence employee attitudes towards change and improved change self efficacy (Larkin & Larkin, 1996). Employees who believe that their leaders are enthusiastic about change implementation develop more positive attitudes towards change (Martin et al., 2005).

Dealing with change related stress is important for the successful implementation of change programs but it requires carefully developed strategies both at the individual as well as organizational levels and identification of those factors that lead to stress during organizational change. Providing employees an opportunity to solve their own problems during change and empowering them to take action regarding the removal of ambiguities and stress is likely to lead to more effective change implementation (Callan, 1993). Role ambiguity and other related stressors can be reduced by establishing and communicating clear goals and expectations regarding a change and by providing the necessary tools and training to employees in order to function effectively (Gilboa et al., 2008). Organizations must ensure training and counseling of employees so as to prepare them to deal with and manage stressful situations. Training increases the self efficacy of employees in dealing with uncertain situations which lead to resistance and withdrawal of support for change (Michela & Burke, 2000). This will enable the employees to objectively view the need
for change, thereby allowing them to make positive contribution towards the initiative (Mchugh & Brennan, 1994).

Porras and Robertson (1992) are of the opinion that in deciding upon a model for change more suited to public sector organizations, consistent incremental change efforts are likely to be more successful in the public sector as opposed to sudden transformational changes. Martin et al. (2005) also believe that the incremental approach to change in line with Bandura’s (1977) concept of enactive mastery would enhance self-efficacy and reduce the stress of dealing with unfamiliar situations and requirements (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999).

The rapidly changing business environment requiring employees to be adaptable calls for more innovation in the Human Resource Management practices of organizations, especially where hiring is concerned (Callan, 1993). In order to ensure an adaptable workforce, the public sector can also ensure the recruitment of individuals who can be trained and prepared to accept change as a challenge and cope effectively with the requirement to remain adaptable. Ivancevich, Mattison, Freedman and Phillips (1990) call for the training of a “cross cultural” type of manager who is adaptable to the challenges of change and shows interest and involvement in the process. Innovative Human Resource strategies can help in recruiting adaptable career-oriented professionals in organizations who will prove more productive and efficient in meeting the adaptability demands posed by organizational changes (Von Glinow, 1988, cited in Callan, 1993).
Conclusion

The present research provides an insight into the factors that impede or facilitate commitment to organizational change. It is a contribution to the study of organizational change in general and commitment to change in particular which is a little researched topic despite its noted importance. The findings suggest that change-related communication, employability and trust in management not only act as antecedents or facilitators of change but also may mitigate the negative effects of change related stressors on commitment towards the change initiative. This research is useful for researchers as it helps in understanding the mechanism of the development of commitment to change from a stress perspective. Managers and practitioners can benefit from the results of the present study by developing their human resource policies by taking account of the factors that facilitate change and reduce stress that hampers change efforts.

There are a number of contributions that the present research has made to the literature on organizational change:

Firstly, the present thesis represents an attempt to understand the development of commitment to change which is a little researched topic despite its noted importance. As mentioned earlier, all research relating to commitment to change has originated in the west and limited effort has been made to explore the phenomenon in a non-western setting (Meyer et al., 2007). In the Pakistani context, empirical research relating to management related issues is virtually non-existent. The present study is an attempt to pave the way for indigenous research in Pakistan by validating the Herscovitch-Meyer
(2002) three component model of commitment to change in the Pakistani public sector which has not received any research attention in the past.

Secondly, there exists a gap in literature regarding the antecedents of commitment to change (Meyer et al., 2007). The present research has attempted to identify certain factors that were considered to be potential antecedents and proved empirically that change related communication, employability and trust in management do have a significant relationship with the commitment to change dimensions.

Thirdly, the development of commitment to change was studied under the influence of stressors and factors identified as antecedents of commitment to change were used as moderators of the effect of stressors on commitment to change. The findings suggest that besides having a direct relationship with commitment to change dimensions, communication, employability and trust also mitigate the negative effects of job insecurity and role stressors on commitment to change.

The present research may therefore be considered an important investigation into the development of commitment to change and is helpful in devising strategies that may reduce change related stress and promote commitment to change. By keeping the channels of communication open, developing skills among employees that help them cope with the challenges posed by changes and creating a trusting environment conducive to the acceptance of change, the change managers can achieve what Abrahamson (2000, p.75) describes as “change without fatal pain”.
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Appendix A: Request Letter

Mr. XYZ
Chairman
ABC
Islamabad.

Subject: Request for Conducting Research at ABC

Dear Sir,

NUST Institute of Management Sciences (NIMS) is amongst the first national institutes to have started a Ph.D. Program in Business Administration. Besides providing quality education through its academic programs, the Institute is utilizing the expertise of its faculty and doctoral students for undertaking quality research on topics of special interest to the corporate sector in Pakistan.

Mrs. Hina Jawaid Kalyal is a Ph.D. student at NIMS whose research is based on the major organizational changes currently taking place in the public sector organizations in Pakistan, with a focus on an individual employee’s attitude towards organizational change. The study will generate highly useful information for improving the commitment of employees to their organization, and if recommended actions implemented, contribute to an enhancement of the overall productivity. The research findings can also be utilized for designing policies that will help garner employee support for the organizational change initiatives by reducing the possible causes of resistance.

The study is based on both secondary and primary data. The primary data is to be collected from major national organizations that are currently going through the process of organizational restructuring.

The main parameters of the study include: (i) job insecurity; (ii) work stressors; (iii) commitment to organizational change and related behavior; (iv) change related communication; (v) employability; (vi) job satisfaction; and (vii) organizational commitment.
Data on the above mentioned parameters will be collected through interviews of employees (in different categories) as well as focus group discussions. Primary data will be exclusively used for the purpose of study and at no stage shared with any other researcher or outside agency. All reports based on this research will maintain the anonymity of the individuals and organizations participating in the study. The summary findings of the study will also be shared with the participating organizations.

We are considering to include, subject to your concurrence, ABC in the list of organizations to be studied. Your participation in this study will contribute towards the generation of knowledge on important management issues and help in policy and program formulation. It will also help pave the way for indigenous research in the field of human resource management in Pakistan.

Mrs. Hina Kalyal is keen to start data collection as soon as possible.

Hoping to receive your favorable consideration of our request.

Kind regards,

Sincerely yours,
Dr. Dilawar Ali Khan
Dean and Director General,
NIMS
Appendix B: Cover Letter

Dear Sir/Madam,

This survey is being conducted as a part of my Ph.D. thesis to study the effects of organizational changes on employee behavior. The questions in this survey are based on your perception of the changes that have or will occur in your organization as a result of the restructuring process. Please keep these changes in mind while answering questions.

Kindly follow the instructions below to complete the survey:

- Please DO NOT SIGN YOUR NAME anywhere on the questionnaire.
- All the questions in this survey can be answered by circling the number that best represents your views.
- Please do not circle more than one number as a response to a question.
- Kindly complete all sections of the survey including the demographic section.

Note: Your response to the questionnaire will remain anonymous. The information gathered through this survey will be used for academic purpose only and will remain confidential with the researcher.

Thank you very much for your participation and cooperation.

Hina Jawaid Kalyal
Ph.D. Candidate
NUST Institute of Management Sciences
Rawalpindi
Appendix C: Survey

Demographic Information

Please tick the appropriate option

1) Please indicate the range of your age:

☐ 18-25 years -------

☐ 26-35 years -------

☐ 36-45 years -------

☐ 46-55 years -------

☐ 56-65 years -------

2) Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female

3) Level of Education: ☐ Under-graduate ☐ Graduate

☐ Post-graduate ☐ Doctorate

4) Length of Service ☐  years
### Section 1: Change-related Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please consider how much you agree or disagree with the following statements as they relate to your perceptions of restructuring</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Employees have been given a detailed explanation of why the organization is being restructured.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Management explains to employees how restructuring will affect them personally.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Management provides opportunities for employees to ask questions regarding restructuring.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Management provides good answers to employee questions regarding restructuring.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Employees are given both positive and negative information of what restructuring would involve.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Employees are given satisfactory notice about when upcoming changes will take place.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 2: Job-related Concerns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with the following statements in the light of the restructuring process taking place at your organization</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I worry about getting less interesting work tasks in the future</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 I worry about my future wage development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I am afraid I may lose my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 I think my future prospects within the organization are good</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 I feel worried about my career development within the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 I am worried that I will be given notice of termination</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 I worry about being pressured to accept early retirement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 I am worried about losing the status that comes with my position in the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 3: Attitude Towards Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements keeping in mind the restructuring process</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 I believe in the value of restructuring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Resisting restructuring is not a possible option for me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 I feel a sense of duty to work toward the restructuring program.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Restructuring is a good strategy for the organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel pressure to go along with the restructuring program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>I do not think it would be right of me to oppose restructuring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>I think that management is making a mistake by restructuring</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>I have too much at risk to resist restructuring.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>I would not feel badly about opposing restructuring*.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Restructuring serves an important purpose</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>It would be too damaging for me to resist restructuring.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Restructuring is not necessary.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Things would be better without restructuring.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>It would be risky to speak out against restructuring.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I would feel guilty about opposing restructuring.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>It would be irresponsible of me to resist restructuring.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>I have no choice but to go along with the restructuring program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>I do not feel any obligation to support restructuring**.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 4: Change-related Behavior***

Please consider any specific change that may have affected your work as a result of the restructuring process and indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I comply with my organization’s orders regarding the change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I accept job changes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I adjust the way I do my job as required by this change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I work toward the change constantly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I speak positively about the change to outsiders</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I remain positive about the change even during difficulties</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I engage in change-related behaviors that seem difficult in the short-term but are likely to have long-term benefits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I seek help concerning the change when needed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I don’t complain about the change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I try to keep myself informed about the change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I tolerate temporary disturbances and/or uncertainties in my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I encourage the participation of others in the change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I speak positively about the change to co-workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I avoid previous work practices, even if they seem easier</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I continue with the change to reach organizational goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I try to overcome co-workers’ resistance toward the change</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>I try to find ways to overcome change-related difficulties</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 5: Role Characteristics

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am given enough time to do what is expected of me in my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>It often happens that I have to work under a heavy time pressure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I often have too much to do in my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel unreasonable demands in my work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I consider my responsibilities as unreasonable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I have work demands that are difficult to accomplish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>My work contains moments that demand too much of me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I receive opposing requests from two or more people</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I have to do things that in my view should be done differently</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I have to go against a rule or policy in order to carry out an assignment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I do things that are accepted by one person and not accepted by others</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>It often happens that I receive an assignment without enough resources and materials to carry it out</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I know exactly what is expected of me in my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>There is clear explanation of what has to be done</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I know what my responsibilities are</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>There are no clear, planned goals and objectives for my job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 6: Employability

**Please consider how much you agree or disagree with the following statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am aware of other employments where I could make use of what I have learnt in my current job</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>With my work qualifications I can find new work relatively quickly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The work qualifications I offer are in demand by other employers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I could get a similar (or better) job without having to relocate to another place</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>With my experience I can find new work relatively quickly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Section 7: Relationship with Management
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Management can be trusted to do what is good for me</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I trust the management to treat me fairly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The item was positively worded for Organization 3 and 4 surveys

** The item was positively worded for Organization 3 and 4 surveys

*** Section 4 was not included in Organization 1 survey