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Abstract

Organizations face challenges in terms of costs and resistance when dealing with change. Global organizations face additional challenges with change when dealing with differences in national culture. The purpose of this thesis was to investigate organizational change in an international and multicultural environment. The aim was to discover how global companies can effectively drive change by analyzing perspectives, experiences, attitudes and values of change of employees of different nationalities and positions in a global company. Research questions such as: “What factors enable or prevent the implementation of organizational changes?”, “Which are the success factors for leading change in a global organization?”, “What are the challenges when it comes to leading change in a global organization?” and “Is there a difference in perspectives, attitudes, motivation and values towards change?” Were answered in this investigation. Semi-structured informant and respondent interviews as well as quantitative surveys were conducted. Analysis shows that factors affecting organizational change processes were dimensions of change, structure, time, support, change competencies, clarity and justifications for the change. Results showed that concern for human factors and global/local awareness were success factors when leading change. Challenges identified included the delivery of a complete communication across the organization, adapting change approach to all cultures and an eagerness to create organizational changes. At last, results showed that respondents differed in perspectives, experiences and motivation for change. Statistical analysis proved that these differences were attributed to nationality but also to age and position. Finally, a discussion of results highlights the importance for organizations to understand and solve the dilemma of doing both, managing and leading change.
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Introduction

“It must be considered that there is nothing more difficult to carry out, nor more doubtful of success, nor more dangerous to handle, than to initiate a new order of things.” - Niccolò Machiavelli (as cited in Kotter and Schelinger, 2008, p. 2).

Many companies face challenges such as increased competition and changing technological advances. In order to survive and maintain their competitive position, organizations must adjust their course as well as change themselves constantly (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). They must not only adapt to upgrades and new technology, they must also cope with restructuring, reorganizations, mergers, acquisitions and downsizing (Markovic, 2008). The problem is that the change process does not always work and even occasionally, backfires. This could, in part, be attributed to the management of many organizations and their tendency to take a one-size-fits-all approach, and rely on only one method for changing the organization (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008).

McKenna and Beech (2014) claim that 40% of organizations that start change processes fail in their goal to lead and manage change. This is consistent with a study by the Gallup Organization (2014) that argues that change initiatives made by different companies in Singapore in 2014 only had a 30% chance to be successful; this means that 70% out of the strategic initiatives to drive change were doomed to fail. According to the study, this represented 3.5 days per working week wasted on change efforts and activities (Tung, 2014). This is not only alarming in terms of the effectiveness of the change itself but also shows that ineffective change management can signify huge costs for organizations.

One common mistake that top management does lies in the process of decision-making. They underestimate the human factor by deciding on how changes should occur at a top management level and then pass it out to people on operational levels expecting them to carry out the task. Many organizations also think that they can get away with resistance by involving all employees in the design of their change initiatives. However, they forget that this only works when employees have all the information needed to make good and useful contributions. Many organizations also tend to forget to consider the speed of change and may apply a slow method when the situation demands quick changes and vice versa (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008).

The most important aspect of this problem is that most major change initiatives, regardless of type, from changes in technology to improvements in quality or changes to the company culture. They tend to produce small or non-significant results and many others tend to fail (Kotter, 2007). Change
signifies, other than an organizational challenge, also a psychological challenge. Models, tools and processes can certainly either facilitate or obstruct change but there are additional challenges when it comes to managing people in the change process. One of the biggest barriers within organizational change is people's resistance to change (Kotter, 1995).

**Problem Discussion**

Managing change can prove to be a major challenge, especially for large organizations. However, leading change in an environment characterized by high cultural diversity and that is surrounded by different national cultures can prove to be extremely difficult (Rao, 2014).

In 2001 Pettigrew, Woodman, and Cameron claimed in their article: "Studying organizational change and development: Challenges for future research" that the organizational change research was not sufficiently developed to understand the dynamics and effects of time, process and context, especially in a dynamic, complex and internationally conscious world. Generalizing processes in an environment that is so diverse and changing, does not work: "Generalizations are hard to sustain over time, and they are even tougher to uphold across international, institutional, and cultural borders." (Pettigrew et al., 2001, s. 697).

Global organizations face a bigger challenge than local organizations when it comes to leading change that extend across national and international cultures. Eroglu (2014) named the influence of different national cultures as the greatest challenge that global organizations and international human resource management have when trying to achieve organizational goals. Authors such as Hofstede (2001) argue that each national culture has a different set of values and priorities which play an important part when driving change. Differences in values, attitudes and behaviors suggests that leaders and organizations should take a different approach that is culture based when trying to manage and implement change (Wursten, 2008). On those grounds, it is therefore very interesting to explore how one could effectively lead change in global organizations.

Authors such as Kotter (2012) and Beer (2000) have developed models based on change management and leadership factors known to facilitate change. Based on that it would be interesting to investigate which factors enable and prevent the implementation of change.

Rafferty and Griffin (2006) as well as Kotter (1995) declare that some of the challenges when managing and leading change is to understand the cause of and deal with resistance towards change. Understanding the psychological and individual processes that individuals go through when dealing with change can therefore constitute a success factor. With this in mind, it would
be interesting to investigate the challenges as well as identify the success factors when leading change. Finally, and because authors like Hofstede (2001), Wursten (2008) and Eroglu (2014) claim that differences between national cultures exist; it would be interesting to explore whether there are differences in attitudes, perspectives, motivation and values towards change in a global organization.

**Aim**

The purpose of this study is to contribute to a better understanding of how to effectively lead change in global organizations. The aim is to investigate and define the success factors, challenges and attitudes that exist towards change in a multicultural and international environment.

**Research Questions**

1. What factors enable and prevent the implementation of organizational changes?
2. Which are the success factors for leading change in a global organization?
3. What are the challenges when it comes to leading change in a global organization?
4. Is there a difference in perspectives, attitudes, motivation and values towards change?

**Delimitations**

The study is limited to investigating change management and leadership in one global company. In order to study attitudes against change, a current decentralization process as well as previous reorganizations within the global company will be used.

The study will focus on literature dealing with change from a global and international perspective and not specifically from one dealing with size. The study bases on a combination of models that deal with the implementation and management of organizational changes as well as models that deal with the managing of national cultures and the psychological processes during the change. These will also form the basis for evaluation of change actions and processes at the presented organization.
Theoretical Framework

Part of the objective of this investigation is studying organizational change, because of this the term “organizational change” will be presented and used throughout this research report. More specifically, the focus of this investigation is that of studying how the implementation and leading of changes should take place in global organizations. On those grounds, this report will cover the area of change management, which will include terms such as leadership and reorganization.

Change Theories

Organizational change is today a part of the lives of all organizations occurring at both, the operational and the strategic level (Todnem, 2005). There are different types of organizational change, namely: developmental, transitional and transformational. Developmental change here relates to the growth and development forces within the organization, transitional to gradual and slow change processes and transformational to radical alterations (Wells & Walker, 2016). Today, the majority of organizations and major corporations have realized that they must make moderate changes at least once a year and major, more radical changes every four to five years (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). Given the importance of organizational change, its management has become an important and necessary skill throughout all organizations (Todnem, 2005). Change management is a topic that characterizes itself for containing a diversity of theoretical perspectives as well as differences in application (McKenna & Beech, 2014). For the purpose of this study, some practical theoretical perspectives will be presented.

The change theories chosen for this thesis were written by some of the most popular names within the field of change management. Kotter is a world acknowledged change expert and, now retired, professor at Harvard Business School and is one of the most recognized thinkers within the area of change management (Burden, 2016). His model for leading change is known to illustrate eight important success factors for effectively leading organizational transformations (Kotter 2007). Beer has been a Professor of Business Administration at Harvard Business School teaching in the areas of organizational change, human resource management and organization effectiveness (Beer & Nohria, 2000). He is best known for having developed a model that companies and organizations can use to assess and develop their own capability to implement strategy. His book “Breaking the Code of Change” was developed with the aim to provide an understanding of organizational change and to unlock the secret to manage it in the most effective way. The book is based on the experience of some of the experts in the field such as consultants and CEOs who have led successful transformations as well as scholars who have focused on the subject (ibid). The choice of these two
authors for this study lies on the simplicity and practicality of their change theories.

**John P. Kotter’s Leading Change Model**

In order to successfully implement change, John P. Kotter has developed a model that includes eight stages which are associated with eight critical success factors. This model is based on eight fundamental errors that organizations do in their transformation efforts and which Kotter has studied in over 100 companies (Kotter, 2007).

Kotter (2007) felt that one of the most important lessons to be learned from these (referring to the successful cases) is that any change process must go through a series of phases and that each phase requires an amount of time to complete. Many organizations skip these stages and they realize that they have not established a solid ground from which to proceed. This obligates them to go back to earlier stages (McKenna & Beech, 2014). According to Kotter (2012) this is important because these stages fulfill specific functions. The first four steps, for instance, have the function of unfreezing the organization by challenging the status quo, stages five to seven introduce the new practices, they have the changing function. Finally, the last stage has a refreezing function and adheres the changes into organizational culture so that they can remain in the organization. Furthermore, Kotter (2012) means that all successful change follows these stages in a specific sequence and although one can operate at multiple phases at the same time, it is extremely important not to skip steps or advance too far in the change process, as this will only cause problems.

An important fact to point out in Kotter’s (2012) theory is that, as he himself expressed, all models (including his own) “...tend to oversimplify reality...” (p. 23). His model might seem overly simple and perhaps even contradict the argument that was raised at the beginning of this report about how a one size fits all approach is not the correct way to lead change.

However, as Kotter (2007) argues in his article “Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail”, his model grounds itself into the biggest mistakes that many companies make. Organizations can and will face many different kinds of surprises, problems and variations (since even the most successful change efforts do) when trying to implement change; however, by tackling the issues presented in his model, organizations will reduce the amount of errors in their change process and as he described: “…fewer errors can spell the difference between success and failure...” (Kotter, 2007, p.11).
The Eight-Stage Change Process

The model presented below has the stages needed to produce successful change of all magnitudes in the specific sequence in which it should occur. An oversimplified illustration of the already straightforward model is illustrated in Figure 1 below.

1. Establishing a sense of urgency
   - Examining the market and competitive realities
   - Identifying and discussing crises, potential crises, or major opportunities

2. Creating the guiding coalition
   - Putting together a group with enough power to lead the change.
   - Getting the group to work together like a team

3. Developing a vision and strategy
   - Creating a vision to help direct the change effort
   - Developing strategies for achieving that vision

4. Communicating the change vision
   - Using every vehicle possible to constantly communicate the new vision strategies
   - Having the guiding coalition role model the behavior expected from employees

5. Empowering broad-based action
   - Getting rid of obstacles
   - Changing systems or structures that undermine the change vision
   - Encouraging risk taking and nontraditional ideas, activities and actions

6. Generating short-term wins
   - Planning for visible improvements in performance, or “wins”
   - Creating those wins
   - Visibly recognizing and rewarding people who made the wins possible.

7. Consolidating gains and producing more change.
   - Using increased credibility to change all systems, structures and policies that don’t fit together and don’t fit the transformation vision
   - Hiring, promoting, and developing people who can implement the change vision
   - Reinvigorating the process with new projects, themes, and change agents

8. Anchoring new approaches in the culture
   - Creating better performance through customer- and productivity-oriented behavior, more and better leadership, and more effective management
   - Articulating the connections between new behaviors and organizational success.
   - Developing means to ensure leadership development and succession

Stage 1: Establish a sense of urgency. All successful change efforts start by managing to give a clear picture of why change is crucial and necessary for the organization (McKenna & Beech, 2014). By successfully convincing the organization that the current situation is unacceptable and that change is the only thing that will get the organization to survive and prosper, people will be motivated to get the transformation started. According to Kotter (2007), organizations can do this by focusing on potential threats to the organization (competition, market position, emerging markets, technological trends, etc.) and then choosing a way to communicate this in a broad and dramatic manner. If 75% or more of a company’s management is completely and totally convinced that current business is unacceptable then the urgency level is just right, anything below that can have awful consequences for the change process (Kotter, 2007).

Stage 2: Form a powerful guiding coalition. In all change efforts, an organization must build a very strong team that will be responsible for leading the process. The people within this team should be “key” employees that have the right power and influence to exert a strong leadership throughout the process (Kotter, 2007). Many times, organizations can appoint a person belonging to strategic planning or human resources as head of the team because they might seem the most appropriate option but what the organization might in reality need is a key line manager that has the employees trust. Kotter (2007) argues that this is especially important in the first stages of the change process. In small companies, this team can consist of three to five people but in large companies, the team might need from 20 to 50.

Stage 3: Create a vision and strategy for change. The next step requires the guiding coalition to design a vision that can be realistic and easy to communicate so that it can serve as a guide to those affected by the change. This vision should also appeal to their interests and concerns (McKenna & Beech, 2014). If the team does not manage to develop a sensible vision like this, the organization runs the risk of going nowhere or moving in the wrong direction (Kotter, 2007). According to Kotter (2007): “If you can’t communicate the vision to someone in five minutes or less and get a reaction that signifies both understanding and interest, you are not yet done with this phase of the transformation process” (p. 8).

Stage 4. Communicate the vision. Successful transformations use all existing channels of communication to spread the vision and strategy through a mixture of behaviors, words, and symbols (McKenna & Beech, 2014). Kotter (2007) argues that using every possible communication channel goes beyond holding a single meeting and sending out a single piece of information. Using all existing possible channels means; for instance, transforming newsletters
into innovative articles about the vision, making a ritual out of holding meetings to discuss the transformation, replacing common management training with training and education that focuses on the vision and business problems, etc. (Kotter, 2007). Communication is more than words; it translates into behavior (Kotter, 2007). If behavior is inconsistent with words, the organization will lose credibility in the change and without the understanding, support, heart and minds of the employees there will be no transformation efforts. According to Kotter (2007): “Employees will not make sacrifices, even if they are unhappy with the status quo, unless they believe that useful change is possible” (p.8). For this reason, is critical that besides using all exiting communication channels, the team also has a credible and congruent communication.

**Stage 5. Empowering and removing obstacles.** The following step is about removing barriers that keep the organization from implementing change. These impediments can best be divided into four groups: structures, skills, systems, and supervisors (Kotter, 2012). Removing irrelevant and unsuitable organizational structures (narrow job categories, performance systems that obligate employees to choose own interests, etc.), HRM techniques values and beliefs that are inconsistent with new ideas, and bosses and managers that make demands or refuse to change and some of the examples of the obstacles that the organization can face during a change process (Kotter, 2007). What this stage signifies is that by removing the obstacles, one creates the right atmosphere that gives employees the power to take action. This stage also implies that it is necessary to provide everyone affected by the change, as well as leading the change, the right competency skills and tools needed to go through with the process (Kotter, 2012). To understand what these obstacles might look like, see Figure 2 where Kotter (2012) has portrayed an image of the common impediments for employees during a change process.
Employees understand the vision and want to make it a reality, but are boxed in. A lack of needed skills undermines action.

Formal structures make it difficult to act.

Bosses discourage actions aimed at implementing the new vision.

Personnel and information systems make it difficult to act.


Stage 6. Planning for and creating short-term wins. The following stage includes two important actions: 1.) To produce visible signs of improvement and progress and 2.) To recognize and reward everyone involved in the process of making it happen (McKenna & Beech, 2014). This step is crucial for keeping motivation throughout the change process. As real authentic transformation takes a good amount of time, without any short-term goals and victories to meet and celebrate, most employees will surrender and perhaps even join the resistance. Moreover, an additional function of this stage is to keep an urgency level high which is done by the commitment to producing short-term results and victories (Kotter, 2007).

Stage 7. Consolidating improvements and producing still more change. What this stage signifies is an adherence to the change process. It is important for the organization to hold on to the work with change and not surrender when the situation becomes too difficult (McKenna & Beech, 2014). Equally important as sticking to the process is not to declare achievements and victories too soon (ibid). Very easily, teams and individuals might become overly enthusiastic by seeing clear signs of victories and progress; however, the problem with premature celebrations is that tradition sets in and the momentum needed to tackle problems of a greater magnitude washes away (Kotter, 2007).
Step 8. Institutionalizing new approaches. To consolidate the new changes into the organization so that they become an accepted practice it is necessary to make them a part of the corporate culture (McKenna & Beech, 2014). This is crucial because if the new attitudes, processes and behaviors are not deeply rooted in organizational culture, they will deteriorate when pressures to change disappear (Kotter, 2007). In order to do this, it is fundamental to link results of the change process to improved performance. It is essential here to accurately show how change has transformed attitudes, processes, behaviors and approaches and improved them (McKenna & Beech, 2014). Leaving people on their own to make their connections can result in them attributing improved performance to the success of an inaccurate event/action/process (Kotter, 2007). During this stage, it is also important to ensure that future leaders adopt the new approach and that succession planning fulfills the criteria of the new model (Kotter, 2007). This is essential because according to Kotter (2007): “one bad succession decision at the top of an organization can undermine a decade of hard work” (p.11).

Management vs Leadership

In his book, Kotter (2012) dedicates a section to place importance on the differences between management and leadership and its significance for the change process. Figure 3 shows an illustration of the how the two differ.

According to Kotter (2012) one problem is that all too many organizations see the issue with change as being a management matter and not one of leadership. This is attributed to the long tradition of management among companies that has plagued the twentieth century when management was essential for meeting the needs of organizing large organizations during their rapid development. Today, many large organizations fail or have problems in their transformation processes because of the lack of leadership (ibid).

Change and especially change on a bigger scale such as transformational change requires not only sacrifice, effort and dedication but also creativity (Kotter, 2012). These aspects cannot be produced with force and coercion but with leadership. Leadership motivates and inspires individuals to meet their goals despite adversities; it constructs and illustrates the future; it focuses on the vision and aligns people thereof (ibid).
Management
- **Planning and budgeting:** Establishing detailed steps and timetables for achieving needed results, then allocation the resources necessary to make it happen.
- **Organizing and staffing:** Establishing some structure for accomplishing plan requirements, staffing that structure with individuals, delegating responsibility and authority for carrying out the plan, providing policies and procedures to help guide people, and creating methods or systems to monitor implementation.
- **Controlling and problem solving:** Monitoring results, identifying deviations from plan, then planning and organizing to solve these problems.

Leadership
- **Establishing direction:** Developing a vision of the future – often the distant future – and strategies for producing the changes needed to achieve that vision.
- **Aligning people:** Communication direction in words and deeds to all those whose cooperation may be needed so as to influence the creation of teams and coalitions that understand the vision and strategies and that accept their validity.
- **Motivation and inspiring:** Energizing people to overcome major political, bureaucratic, and resource barriers to change by satisfying basic, but often unfulfilled, human needs.

- Produces a degree of predictability and order and has the potential to consistently produce the short term results expected by various stakeholders (e.g., for customers, always being on time; for stockholders, being on budget)
- Produces change, often to a dramatic degree, and has the potential to produce extremely useful change (e.g., new products that customers want, new approaches to labor relations that help make a firm more competitive)

**Figure 3. Management vs Leadership based on Kotter, J.P. (2012[1996]).**

Nonetheless, management still fulfills a very important function in today’s organizations. Management is responsible for controlling, planning, budgeting, organizing, problem solving among others (Kotter, 2012). So, what is then the solution to the dilemma on how to deal with change? According to Kotter (2012) the answer lies in combining both by splitting up a ration where 70 to 90% lays on leadership and 10 to 30% on management. This is especially true in cases where transformational change is needed; whether this applies to all types of change is not something that Kotter names in his book. However, this does apply to whichever change, big or small, that characterizes itself for inviting resistance. As Kotter (2012) describes, management is necessary but to fight off resistance leadership is crucial:

Managing change is important. Without competent management, the transformation process can get out of control. But for most organizations, the much bigger challenge is leading change. Only leadership can blast through the many sources of corporate inertia. Only leadership can motivate the actions needed to alter behavior in any significant way. Only leadership can get change to stick by anchoring it in the very culture of an organization. (Kotter, 2012, p. 32)
The combination of management and leadership is also something illustrated in Beer's model (as cited in Hughes et al., 2012) where he suggests that good leaders need both, good leadership abilities but also managerial skills. Both are needed in order for the change initiative to be successful in the long run. Leadership can help leaders in different phases of the model, for instance, when it comes to propagate and generate acceptance for a new vision for the organization. Leadership is also necessary when it comes to raising dissatisfaction, to motivate employees in their journey of doing something different and it can also help when trying to overcome resistance. Management and control abilities and skills; on the other hand, can help when it comes to setting goals and when it comes to making evaluations and follow-ups on the change plan's development.

**Michael Beer’s Code for Organizational Change**

Many have written about organizational change and there is a great variety of perspectives when it comes to both leadership and change; there are, however, also many similarities between these perspectives and Beer is one author that has focused on some of the most important issues highlighted by other authors in the field (Hughes, Ginnett, & Curphy, 2012). Beer (Hughes et al., 2012). takes a very rational approach and offers a very clear model for the success of organizational change. His model for organizational change has the primary function of helping leaders and managers initiate the change process; it also has the function of acting as an assessment instrument for evaluating change initiatives and understanding where they fail (ibid).

Beer’s model for organizational change can be best illustrated in the formula shown in Figure 4:

![Figure 4. Michael Beer’s formula for organizational change where C stands for change, D for dissatisfaction, M for model, P for process and R for resistance.](image)

In this formula, the D stands for the term *dissatisfaction* and it refers to employees' dissatisfaction. The M represents the word *model* and it illustrates a model or design of the change itself, this includes a future vision as well as goals and the objectives of the change. The P in the formula stands for the word *process* and refers to a plan that will help the organization initiate the change; this plan will often include who, what, when where and how of the change process. The R in the formula signifies *resistance* and depicts how much employees resist the change. When developing a plan for change, it is important to take into account the resistance level and the expected inertia.
At last, the C in the formula represents the word change (more specifically the amount of change) and it is the result of the combination of the presented factors (Hughes et al., 2012).

It is important to highlight that the following factors (D x M x P) constitute a multiplicative equation. Change will only happen when there is enough dissatisfaction with the status quo. In addition to dissatisfaction there must a clear and congruent model and vision of the change and an organized and planned process. All three must be in line with each other and all three affect each other. If there is a great discontent with the situation in the organization but there is not a clear and organized plan, then change will not occur. Likewise, if there is a motivating and consistent vision with the change and a well-structured plan for the change process but there is not enough dissatisfaction with the situation as it is, then change will not happen. Additionally, all of these factors should be greater than the level of resistance in order for the change initiative to be successful (Hughes et al., 2012). To further specify what each factor conveys; a short and straightforward description is presented below:

**Dissatisfaction.** By increasing discontent among employees, they can be motivated to change their work situation. If employees are satisfied with their situation, they will not be inclined to change. This means that the organization’s management must raise discontent to a level that will make individuals want to take action; However, a very important factor is not to raise dissatisfaction levels so high that employees choose to leave the organization (Hughes et al., 2012).

**Model.** The organization’s management and/or its leaders must create a clear model for the implementation of the change. This model has to include a vision for the future state of the current organization and existing systems and processes. In addition to the vision, a series of goals to achieve and support this vision must also be presented here. The model also has to specify what systems need to be changed and what kind of changes need to be made.

**Process.** This factor conveys the development and execution of the change process. Here, a change plan will be designed and implemented. The change plan can vary in complexity and detail depending on the severity and size of the change but, overall, the change plan should answer the following questions: 1.) What will be done? 2.) When should it begin? 3.) Where will the development take place? And 4.) Who will be responsible? A complete change plan could also include instructions on how to minimize expected resistance as well as the steps needed to create dissatisfaction (Hughes et al., 2012).
Resistance. People might resist change for a lot of different reasons and according to Beer (2000) most change initiatives can expect a resistance that grounds itself on the fear of loss. People naturally resist change for fear of losing their identity, power, social contacts, competence and even their rewards and benefits (Hughes et al., 2012). Even when resistance is not grounded on these last factors, it could still appear as a result of failed expectations and frustration with the change process. Once a change process has started, most organizations experience a decline in both productivity and performance. This decrease is temporary and it occurs as individuals try to learn the new system and skills; if this decline and frustration is not handled properly it can lead to resistance. Because of this, it is crucial to create realistic expectations and develop strategies to manage the frustration that comes with the decline in performance as well as strategies to deal with fear (ibid).

Change. For the change to take place, leaders must increase the dissatisfaction level among employees while increasing the clarity of vision and also creating a thought-out plan for the change. All of this at the same time as they try to get the resistance level is so low that the change can take place (Hughes et al., 2012).

This model gives leaders a systematic process for managing change and at the same time increase understanding of why some change initiatives succeed or fail in both organizations and society (ibid).

Culture and Change Management

The role that culture plays in all organizational processes, including change, is immensely important. Globalization has brought about a need in organizations to learn and understand more about the cultural differences that characterize modern organizations (Porter, Bigley, & Steers, 2003). This need has started a wave of research in culture which has resulted in findings that link and attribute differences in values, behaviors, work attitudes, motivation and more to the influence of culture (ibid). According to Eroglu (2014) to achieve globalization, it is extremely important that managers possess a clear understanding of the role that cultural and national differences play in the success of the organization.

With this in mind, assuming that one model of management can be universally applied is pure naïveté (Hofstede, 2001). Hofstede (2001) highlights the problem by naming that the idea of general theories and models is widely spread not only by scholarly articles and by popular literature and culture but also by journalism and politics. It is the belief that practices, models, resolutions and theories can transfer without taking into consideration the countries in which they were created (ibid). Management
and organizational practices as well as politics are culture-based; despite this, Hofstede (2001) does not discredit the idea that countries can learn from each other and succeed in making some of these ideas applicable in different cultures. The important thing is to prove these practices and judge them carefully before transferring them out of their culture of origin (ibid).

Wursten (2008) refers to Hofstede (2001) in his article: “Culture and Change Management” where he emphasizes the impact that cultural differences have on the implementation and construction of change. According to Wursten (2008), resistance to change is extremely dependent on culture and people will have different reactions to the same motivation style. When it is time for a global company to introduce a change, it is important and necessary to use different approaches in different countries and utilize the differences in culture in a way that can benefit the change process. Understanding the effect of national culture is not only beneficial when it comes to leading change but it improves the organization’s chances of success as there is evidence that argues that adapting managerial practices (such as strategy, leadership and human resources) to national culture provide organizations with a competitive advantage (Eroglu 2014).

As a tool for identifying the different types of culture and their characteristics, Wursten (2008) introduces Hofstede’s (2001) 5-Dimensional Model for cultural differences. He explains how the model can help identify key factors that are crucial in understanding how to lower resistance in the important phases of change. Wursten (2008) finishes off his article by declaring that an understanding of the dynamics of change and resistance is therefore no longer enough, organizations must also deeply understand the cultural dynamics and differences that surround a change process.

**Hofstede’s Theory of Cultural Dimensions**

Hofstede (2001) has performed some of the largest studies in international management between 1967 and 1973. His research at the multinational corporation IBM included more than 116,000 employees from 72 countries and questionnaires in 20 different languages. Results from this research identified four dimensions of culture that explain differences in behaviors across nations. After further research, Hofstede (2001) added another dimension: Long-term/short-term orientation. The dimensions are presented below:

**Power distance.** This dimension has to do with how society handles the inequality of people across a nation. Hofstede (2001) explains that power distance is the degree to which a social environment supports and accepts that power is distributed unevenly between individuals. According to Hofstede (2001) this is determined by culture. Societies with a high degree
of power distance accept unequal distributions of power. Countries with high power distance tend to view involvement with distrust, disrespect and fear so that managers that encourage participation in these cultures are viewed as incompetent or weak (Eroglu, 2014). According to Eroglu (2014) empowerment and team building practices were ineffective in high power distance cultures. Societies with a low power distance believe that power should be dispersed and distributed equally across society members. For instance, companies in the United States (low power distance) where involvement was practiced were more efficient and faster growing than others; furthermore, involvement was found to be positively correlated to performance in American companies (Eroglu, 2014). However, the opposite was found in Mexico (high power distance) where more authoritarian managements were found to be more effective (Eroglu, 2014). Examples of countries scoring the highest power distance were Malaysia, Guatemala, Panama, Philippines and Mexico (Hofstede 2001). Countries scoring lowest on high power distance were Austria, Israel, Denmark, Ireland, Sweden, Norway and Finland (ibid).

**Uncertainty avoidance.** According to Hofstede (2001), the second dimension of culture deals with a society's tolerance for uncertainty and ambiguity. According to Hofstede (2001) humans learned to develop certain ways to cope with the uncertainty of the unknown. These ways are illustrated in elements such as technology, law, religion among others. Societies high on uncertainty avoidance do not feel comfortable with uncertain or unknown situations and try to decrease this by implementing laws, strict rules, safety, security regulations, and religion. Companies in high uncertainty avoidance cultures rely on clear procedures and rules as well as very structured organizational activities (Eroglu, 2014). Societies low in uncertainty avoidance are less concerned with ambiguity and uncertainty; they tend to accept and are comfortable with unstructured environments and are more tolerant of change and variety of opinions (ibid). Countries scoring high on uncertainty avoidance are Greece, Portugal, Guatemala and Uruguay whereas countries scoring the lowest uncertainty avoidance are Singapore, Jamaica, Denmark and Sweden (Hofstede 2001).

**Individualism and collectivism.** The third dimension examines the extent to which members of a culture prefer to act as individuals or as a group (Hofstede 2001). Individualism could be seen as a social pattern where the ties between individuals are loose; they see themselves as independent from the group and are motivated by individual choices and expected to look after their own interests and/or their immediate family's (Eroglu, 2014). Companies in countries with high individualism show greater support for individual initiatives and for promotions based on market value (ibid). Collectivism is, on the other hand, a social pattern where individuals see
themselves as part of strong cohesive in-groups that they form a part of since birth and continues throughout life (Hofstede cited in Eroglu, 2014). People in Asian countries tend to be more collectivistic and group-oriented than the United States for instance which scored the highest in individualism (Eroglu, 2014). A concrete example of countries scoring the highest in individualism are the United States, Australia, Great Britain, Canada, the Netherlands, New Zealand and Italy (Hofstede 2001). Lowest scores for individualism were Guatemala, Ecuador, Panama, Venezuela, Colombia, Indonesia, Pakistan, Costa Rica, Peru, Taiwan and South Korea (ibid).

**Masculinity and femininity.** This dimension is one of Hofstede’s (2001) most controversial ones since it examines how society distributes roles between genders. According to Hofstede (2001) societies cope with the difference between sexes in different ways and this has important implications in the social roles of the genders as well as in the values that prevail. Masculine societies value assertiveness, competitiveness, success, money, ambition and are more performance oriented. For instance, management practices such as contingent rewards are effective and produce a higher performance in countries such as the United States which is high in masculinity (Eroglu, 2014). Feminine societies place more value on the quality of life and relationships. In this type of society, gender roles overlap and both men and women are supposed to act modest, tender and caring (Eroglu, 2014). Employees in feminine cultures get motivated by and prefer fewer working hours so they can have a better work to life balance and they value a high quality working environment (ibid). According to Hofstede (2001) masculine countries include Japan at the top, Germanic countries (Austria, Switzerland, Germany), Caribbean Latin American countries (Jamaica, Venezuela, Mexico, Colombia), Italy, the Anglo countries (Ireland, Great Britain, South Africa, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, Canada) and some Asian countries (Hong Kong, India, Malaysia, Pakistan, Singapore). At the other extreme, feminine countries were mainly characterized by the Nordic countries (Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland) but also by the Netherlands, some Latin American countries (Costa Rica, Chile, Guatemala, Uruguay) and Portugal (Hofstede 2001).

**Long- versus short-term orientation.** This final dimension examines how societies manage and view time. Societies with a long-term orientation are more concerned about the future and are characterized by being more patient, perseverant, they save more and place importance on adaptation and benefiting the greater good. Short-term societies, on the other hand, value practices related to the present and the past a lot more. For instance, they place a greater importance on tradition and fulfilling social obligations. Countries high in long-term orientation are East Asian countries (Japan, China, Hong Kong, Taiwan and South Korea) whereas countries scoring low
in the long-term orientation include European and Western countries (Hofstede, 2001). According to Taylor (1991 as cited by Eroglu 2014), this can be illustrated in management in the way that a Japanese manager can exert his belief in that the role of a company is to enhance stockholder welfare as well as employee welfare, whereas an American manager can opt for believing that the goal of a company should be that of enhancing shareholder’s interest.

**The Psychology of Change**

Almost all individuals affected by change tend to experience some kind of psychological distress, even when the change seems to bring positive and rational outcomes and alterations. This can many times confuse change leaders and initiators because they normally assume that employees resist change only when the change does not match their best interests (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). Understanding the psychological processes that individuals go through when experiencing change is an important part of the process that can signify a success for the change, since knowing how to deal with these processes could define whether the change will face resistance or not. Without proper information about what factors influence employees’ reactions to change it will be difficult, if not impossible, to effectively implement change (Rafferty & Griffin, 2006).

**Coping with change**

In order to understand how to deal with resistance, it becomes important to have awareness of what affects people during a change process as well as which processes they use to cope with these emotions and factors during change. For instance: Do we know exactly which aspects of change that affect employees the most and that lead to negative outcomes?

Rafferty and Griffin (2006) are among the few researchers that have studied those organizational change factors that affect individuals and their well-being. In their article, they have identified three important characteristics of change that are likely to affect employees' responses. Responses that more specifically include uncertainty, job satisfaction and turnover intentions. These significant characteristics of change are presented below:

**The Frequency of Change**

This is one of the characteristics of change that was found to have a negative impact on individuals' responses to change. According to Rafferty and Griffin (2006) the frequency of change related to how individuals perceived how often change had occurred. The higher the frequency of change the more individuals perceived change to be unpredictable. The reactions to frequent changes most often involved high levels of anxiety (due to a high level of unpredictability) as well as tired and exhausted individuals. This
characteristic of change was known to have a positive correlation to employees’ intentions of turnover.

**The Impact of Change**

The second factor known to affect individuals the most during organizational changes was the impact or significance of the change. The study found that transformational changes (which they categorized as changes to organizational core systems such as ways of working, values, structure, strategy, etc.) obligate employees to act in new ways and adopt other values and this caused a great deal of uncertainty and vulnerability. Making individuals feel threatened and scared of the change. This characteristic of change was also found to have a positive correlation when it comes to turnover intentions (Rafferty & Griffin, 2006).

**Planning Involved in Change**

The last factor known to affect individuals’ responses was the planning in change efforts. According to empirical results, employees experienced higher levels of well-being when planned changes were present. By planned change, Rafferty and Griffin (2006) defined as the perception of serious thought, preparedness and construction of change processes before the actual implementation of the change. The explanation behind this result lies in the decrease of uncertainty by change becoming more predictable when planned in advance. The previous planning allowed for individuals to receive more information about the approach, urgency and proximity of change as well as the duration of the process. This characteristic was shown to be positively correlated to job satisfaction. (Rafferty & Griffin, 2006).

**Support**

Knowing how to moderate these three characteristics of change could prevent negative reactions to change within the organization. Another important contribution of Rafferty and Griffin’s (2006) article was the role that support played when individuals tried to cope with these salient aspects of change. In their study Rafferty and Griffy (2006) examined three coping resources namely: level of neuroticism, conscientiousness and leader social support. According to the article level of neuroticism is important since a lower level of neuroticism can help individuals cope with the stressful situation of change, likewise, the personality dimension of conscientiousness (that relates to individuals being organized, responsible and thorough) was regarded to help individuals persist and endure the change process. Similarly, higher levels of leader support were theorized to be a good coping resource because of the information, help and advice that a supportive leader could offer individuals during a change situation (Rafferty & Griffin, 2006).
Results showed that leader social support had a very strong impact on the three significant characteristics of change that affect individuals. Employees with supportive leaders communicated that they experienced less psychological uncertainty than those employees who did not report having supportive leaders. Moreover, employees that reported supportive leaders also reported that they experienced less transformational change, less frequent change and more planned change. The important thing about these results is that organizations implementing change must ensure to provide a supportive leadership and, above all, ensure that leaders understand the importance of considering employees’ needs and the need of providing support during a change process (ibid).

**Resistance to change**

In reality, there are several reasons why people might resist change and the news is that it not only involves personal interests. If an organization does not want resistance to get on the way when implementing an organizational change, it is imperative that it understands the reasons why people resist change. Besides an understanding, it is important to have a strategy of how to diagnose resistance. Assessing all the possible ways that individuals could resist change is very important because this will help management choose and plan an effective way to deal with resistance (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008).

**Reasons Behind Resistance**

People resist change because of different reasons. These reasons can be seen as belonging to three dimensions, either cognitive (thoughts about change), affective (emotions about change) or behavioral (actions and expressions towards change). These reasons tend to operate at an individual level but also at a group and organizational level (McKenna & Beech, 2014). Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) present in their article some of the most common reasons why people might resist change and they are presented here below in a summarized manner.

*Self-interest*- To summarize this reason, people resist change because they do not wish to lose that which they value. This could be in terms of influence, power, resources, expertise and even relationships (McKenna & Beech, 2014). Any change that threatens the employees’ or a group’s best interests, runs the risk of creating resistance (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008).

*Misunderstanding and lack of trust.* Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) argue that misunderstandings about the change might originate in those instances where there is a lack of trust between management and employees. Lack of trust could be present due to past experiences of changes where the guaranteed advantages and benefits had not been delivered or where the affected had not received proper information about the implications of the
change (McKenna & Beech, 2014). Often the misunderstanding lays in the perception about how the change will affect them. Misunderstandings often have its ground in beliefs that the change will have greater costs than it will have benefits (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008).

**Different Assessments.** Another reason for resistance is the difference in information and analysis of the situation when it comes to the need for change. Resistance occurs when employees assess the need for organizational change differently than from those initiating the change. For instance, management can hold optimistic views about why the change is necessary in regards to the benefits and expected results while employees see greater costs not only for themselves but also for the company (McKenna & Beech, 2014). According to Kotter and Schlesinger (2008), in these cases sometimes resistance can mean a good thing for the organization, especially when those initiating the change do not have a correct assessment of the situation:

Managers who initiate change often assume both that they have all the relevant information required to conduct an adequate organization analysis and that those who will be affected by the change have the same facts, when neither assumption is correct. (p. 4).

**Low tolerance for change.** According to Kotter and Schlesinger (2008): “All human beings are limited in their ability to change, with some people much more limited than others” (p.4). People might also resist change simply because they have a lower tolerance for uncertainty. Change makes them feel anxious, apprehensive and insecure about their own abilities, behaviors and adaptability (McKenna & Beech, 2014). This lower tolerance for change is the reason people might resist change even when they understand the need for change.

**Competing Commitments.** Organizational psychologists argue that there is more behind an individual’s resistance to change. Robert Kegan and Lisa Laskow Lahey (2001) in their article: “The Real Reason People Won’t Change” present a guide that managers can use to help their employees overcome their immunity to change. According to Kegan and Laskow (2001), an employee’s immunity to change can be fought by getting rid of something that they call for competing commitments. A competing commitment is when people unconsciously apply their energy to a previous commitment; therefore, interfering with their current attempt to change. This situation presents itself when employees support the change, are committed to the organization and own every skill and ability to make the change possible but still do not manage to change. Kegan and Laskow mean that that this type of inexplicable resistance does not mirror opposition or passivity; it rather has its ground on unconscious drives the employees themselves are not always aware of. Overcoming these competing commitments requires that people admit
painful or embarrassing emotions that are sometimes hard to admit for themselves and that they question deeply rooted beliefs (Kegan & Laskow, 2001).

**Dealing with Resistance**

There are a variety of ways to overcome resistance that have been proposed, some of which are more accepted than others by HRM (Human Resource Management) practitioners. Some of these negative-seen ways of dealing with resistance are for instance coercion and manipulation (McKenna & Beech, 2014). However, many managers are not aware of the advantages and disadvantages of every method as well as the variety of ways that they could influence groups and individuals. A common mistake is that managers use only one of approach or method instead of a combination of these without regarding the situation in a realistic way and without considering strengths and limitations (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). For this reason, a presentation of these methods as well as their advantages and disadvantages is represented below:

*Education and Communication.*

In order for people to fully comprehend and see the logic of the change it is necessary to educate them. Giving information about and explaining the change, the reasons behind it and why it is crucial will help employees see the need for the change (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008).

The way the change is communicated has also an important place when it comes to dealing with resistance. For instance, studies of companies going through strategic changes have shown that change will be more effective if the reasons for the change are communicated in a way that shows that stakeholders interests are being considered and when employees perceive that the change will be implemented in a congruent and fair manner (McKenna & Beech, 2014). Furthermore, keeping people informed about the details of the change will diminish the risk of creating rumors, speculations and assumptions (McKenna & Beech, 2014). According to Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) this method only works when there is trust towards the organization; it also requires time especially if many are involved.

*Involvement*

People are more likely to accept decisions if they have contributed to the decision-making process (McKenna & Beech, 2014). It is therefore a good idea to involve resisters in some aspect of the change (design or implementation) to overcome resistance (ibid).

Among managers, there are diverse views about participation and involvement. While there are those who completely support participation,
there are others who totally reject it (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). However, both extremes of these views are unrealistic and can create great problems for management. Involvement can be a crucial factor when there is not enough information to plan, design and implement the change. It is also key when there is a need for commitment to the change. The drawback of this method is definitely that it is time consuming to involve others as well as it can lead to a poor solution if the process is not well managed or if those who could make valid contributions are not involved (ibid).

Facilitation and Support

The importance of being supportive has already been named throughout this report when trying to minimize uncertainty. This method is therefore the most appropriate to employ when fear, uncertainty and anxiety are the main reasons behind resistance (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008).

When it comes to competing commitments and unconscious immunity to change, it is necessary for managers to act as counselors and understand the complexity of employees’ behavior. They must guide people into the process of bringing to the surface that which is keeping them from making the change and help them cope with the internal conflict. According to Kegan and Laskow (2001) this might seem more like the job of a psychologist but their argument against that says: “...in a sense, managers are psychologists. After all, helping people overcome their limitations to become more successful at work is at the very heart of an effective management” (p. 78).

Besides a supportive leadership (where emotional support and coaching is included), providing people with competence development and tools to deal with the change or giving people time to recover after a hard period of changes will be extremely helpful in aiding resistance (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). Drawbacks of this method is that it can become unpractical if there are no resources in the organization in terms of time, money and competence.

Negotiation and Agreement

An easy way to deal with resistance is through a bargaining process. By offering potential and active resisters incentives or positions in exchange for compliant behavior, management could overcome resistance. This type of method is mostly recommended when it is evident that people are going to lose greatly or become very affected by the change and when their resistance is significant. However, the drawbacks are that it may be expensive as well as open the possibility for blackmail (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008).

Manipulation and co-optation.

As one of the methods viewed negatively by HRM specialists, manipulation conveys the use of deception by altering facts and figures or withholding
negative information about the change so that it can become attractive to employees (McKenna & Beech, 2014). Co-optation is a form of manipulation that suggests giving an individual or a group a desirable role in the design, planning and execution of the change only to have their support and giving them a false sense of participation (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). This method is inexpensive and can save time when trying to get the support of certain individuals. Manipulation has also been used when there are no other alternatives available (there is no time or resources to educate, involve, support and negotiate) and when there is a need to act fast; however, this method has negative drawbacks to a great degree. If people feel that they are treated unfairly, lied to and tricked; they will respond very negatively and create more resistance (ibid). Employees lose trust in management and change initiators ruin their reputation, as Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) expressed, managers who apply this method can ruin their entire careers.

Explicit and Implicit Coercion.

This last method is also one of the ones that least appeals HRM professionals since coercion conveys the use of direct threats and forces employees’ compliance (McKenna & Beech, 2014). Coercion can be either explicitly or implicitly applied and it involves threatening resistant employees with loss of jobs, transfers, dismissal, promotion among others (Kotter & Schlesinger, 2008). This method can be useful when speed is crucial; however, as with manipulation, this method signifies a great risk for the whole organization. Both, the change and management team will be disliked and people will resent and remember the process (ibid).

Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) present the above methods in a summarized way in their article. Table 1 shows a representation of these methods, the situations in which they are appropriate and the advantages as well as drawbacks.
Table 1. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Commonly used in situations</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education + Communication</td>
<td>Where there is a lack of information or inaccurate information and analysis</td>
<td>Once persuaded, people will often help with the implementation of the change</td>
<td>Can be very time consuming if lots of people are involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation + involvement</td>
<td>Where the initiators do not have all the information they need to design the change, and where others have considerable power to resist.</td>
<td>People who participate will be committed to implementing change, and any relevant information the have will be integrated into the change plan.</td>
<td>Can be very time consuming if participators design an inappropriate change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitation + support</td>
<td>Where people are resisting because of adjustment problems.</td>
<td>No other approach works as well with adjustment problems.</td>
<td>Can be time consuming, expensive, and still fail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negotiation + agreement</td>
<td>Where someone or some group will clearly lose out in change, and where that group has considerable power to resist.</td>
<td>Sometimes it is a relatively easy way to avoid major resistance.</td>
<td>Can be too expensive in many cases if it alerts others to negotiate for compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation + co-optation</td>
<td>Where other tactics will not work or are too expensive.</td>
<td>It can be relatively quick and inexpensive solution to resistance problems.</td>
<td>Can lead to future problems if people feel manipulated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explicit + implicit coercion</td>
<td>Where speed is essential, and the change initiators possess considerable power.</td>
<td>It is speedy and can overcome any kind of resistance.</td>
<td>Can be risky if it leaves people mad at the initiators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology

Research Strategy

Methodological Triangulation

Methodological triangulation was used in this study with the purpose of obtaining a multi-dimensional picture of the phenomenon. Methodological triangulation is a strategy that seeks to combine two or more data sources, investigators, methods, or theoretical perspectives with the aim of improving the research strategy and to increase the ability to analyze and interpret results (Thurmond, 2001).

This study adopted a between-or-across method triangulation approach. The purpose of using different types of data collection methods was to increase the understanding of the phenomenon of organizational change (see Figure 5). Even a within-method triangulation was used where two types of interviews were used (respondent and informant interviews).

Informant interviews were conducted in this study with the purpose of getting background information on measures of change within the organization. Holme and Solvang (1997) claim there is a difference between informant and respondent interviews. Informant interviews include individuals who are outside of the studied research area; their goal is to get additional information about the study area. Respondent interviews, on the other hand, include those individuals who are in the research area. Informant interviews were conducted in an early phase of the work in order to use the result as a basis for the creation of both the survey and the interview template for the respondent interviews.

In a similar way and with the aim of getting more information about the measures of change within the organization, web-based questionnaires were
sent to those departments have experienced recent organizational changes as well as are in the process of organizational change. The result served, partly, as a basis for the qualitative interviews.

The study's primary method was composed of 20 qualitative semi-structured interviews with individuals who have played an active role in the change process at the company Sandvik Coromant as well as individuals who have been most affected by the change measures.

Figure 6 below illustrates the idea behind the chosen research strategy. The purpose of the survey and the informant interviews was that they would act as a complement to the study's primary method, which is the qualitative-respondent interviews.

**Figure 6.** Complementing methods within methodological triangulation.

**Selection**

**Organization**

Sandvik Coromant is a global organization specializing in tools and tool solutions within the metal industry. Sandvik Coromant has 8,000 employees and operations in 130 countries, with headquarters in Sandviken, Sweden (Sandvik, 2017). Attitudes from employees located in 4 continents were examined. The reason for this selection is the number of employees affected by organizational changes within the company. For that reason, attitudes, thoughts and opinions from employees in departments such as finance and pricing, IT, marketing and communications and HR were examined. These are departments that are and have been affected by previous and current reorganizations.

**Participants**

The investigation group consisted of employees from the company Sandvik Coromant. Employees belonging to the finance and pricing, HR, information technology and marketing and communication functions acted as respondents.
in both surveys and respondent interviews. Employees belonging to the management group, global operations, production and global sales acted as informants in the informant interviews. Participants belonging to different nationalities participated. They were separated into different groups to even distribution and to facilitate statistical analysis. An illustration of how participants were grouped is shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2
Groups of participants’ nationalities representing continent areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationalities</th>
<th>Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belgium, Germany, Britain, France, Italy, Slovenia, Spain</td>
<td>Europe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark, Norway, Sweden</td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China, India, Japan, Malaysia, Thailand</td>
<td>Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA, Brazil, Canada, Mexico</td>
<td>Americas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informants

Informants were chosen on the basis of their roles and level of responsibility as well as their function (belonging to a function that is not the focus of this investigation). Informants varied in their employment history with the company from 16 years to 30 years. Because of ethical and privacy reasons, this investigation will not use the respondents’ real names. Instead, this thesis will refer to them simply as: Informant 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 respectively. In order to get a clear view of the demographics of every informant, Table 3 below shows information pertaining each individual.

Table 3
Informant demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>Management Team</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I2</td>
<td>Global Sales</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I3</td>
<td>Global Operations</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>56 +</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I4</td>
<td>Global Sales</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I5</td>
<td>Global Sales</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Brazilian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I6</td>
<td>Production</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey respondents

Surveys were sent to a total of 264 employees belonging to the marketing and communications function, the information technology, the HR function and to the finance and pricing functions. A total of 113 surveys were answered which shows a total response frequency of approximately 43%. Table 4 below shows a clear picture of the demographics surrounding returned surveys.

Table 4
Survey demographics and response rates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Marketing &amp; Comm.</th>
<th>HR</th>
<th>Finance &amp; Pricing.</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/Field</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The numbers represent respondents in individual functions as well as the positions they behold. Individual as well as a total response rate for every function are also shown here.

Respondents

The respondent interview group consisted of 20 employees belonging to the four focus groups of this investigation (marketing and communications, HR, finance and pricing and IT). The selected respondents varied in age, hierarchical position, gender, nationality and history of employment. Employment history among respondents varied from a couple of months to more than 30 years. However, the strategy behind the selection of respondents involved choosing employees based solely on their level of responsibility and geographical location. This selection was done in order to get a complete understanding of change processes on a global scale. Although it was not planned for this investigation, half of the respondents were male and female, half of the respondents were Swedish and half of the respondents had a management position.

Because of ethical and privacy reasons, this investigation will not use the respondents’ real names. Instead, this thesis will assign and refer to them with a number. A more structured picture of the demographics of every respondent, can be seen in Table 5 below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>Function &amp; Communication</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Pricing</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>German</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Indian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11</td>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Support</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13</td>
<td>Finance &amp; Pricing</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R15</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Mexican</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R16</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R17</td>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R18</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>56+</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20</td>
<td>Marketing &amp; Communication</td>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Materials

1. An interview template designed for interviews with informants. Kotter (2012) and Beer (2000) and their theories were used as a basis for the informant-interview-template. The interview template also addressed questions involving quantitative and background information as well as explorative questions about current and past changes within the company. Three versions of this interview template were created, one in Swedish, one in Portuguese and one in English (see appendices A, B and C).

2. Three different questionnaires in English designed to measure experiences and opinions of change of employees belonging to the marketing and communications function (Appendix D), the HR function (Appendix E) and the IT and finance and pricing functions respectively (Appendix F). The different questionnaires based themselves on the theories and work of Kotter (2012), Beer (2000), Hofstede (2001), Rafferty and Griffin (2006) and also on key results from the informant interviews. The questionnaires also addressed quantitative and background questions as well as based themselves on the individual organizational change situation of each independent function.

3. Three different interview templates designed for interviews with respondents. As with the survey, these interview templates were created to fit the organizational situation of each individual function. These templates were based on theories by Kotter (2012), Beer (2000), Hofstede (2001), Rafferty and Griffin (2006) as well as on key results from the survey. Three versions were created for the template designed for the marketing and communication function, one in Swedish, one in English and one in Spanish (see appendices G, H and I). Two versions of the template for the HR function were created, one in English and one in Swedish (see appendices J and K). The template for the IT and finance and pricing functions was created in Swedish and English (see appendices L and M).

4. Two different sound recording apps (automatic call recorder and röstinspelare) which are part of a series of tools provided by the Android and Google-apps systems were used to record informant and respondent interviews.

5. Evasys is a survey software program that is used to develop questionnaires, send them out electronically and print them. This program was used in the design and distribution of surveys (http://www.alcom.se/evasys/).
6. *GotoMeeting* is a software used for meetings and conferences and offers audio, video, recording, screen sharing among other tools. This program was used for interviewing respondents stationed outside of Sandviken, Sweden as well as for recording the audio for those interviews (https://www.gotomeeting.com/sv-se).

7. *Otranscribe* is an app available on http://otranscribe.com/. This tool facilitated the transcription process of interviews by assisting the treatment and usage of audio files.

8. *SPSS* (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) is a statistical software program used to perform different analyses and procedures on statistical data (Bryman & Cramer, 2005). This program was used to analyze survey results and acquire descriptive statistics of data, as well as to make graphs, figures and diagrams.

**Procedure**

**Interviews**

Interviews with informants from the global sales function and production were conducted via mobile phone. Interviews with informants belonging to the management group and global operations function took place at the company’s headquarters in Sweden. Informant interviews were conducted in an earlier phase of the investigation (February 22\textsuperscript{nd} to March 8\textsuperscript{th}), these interviews lasted between 25 to 35 minutes. Two different templates (Appendix A and Appendix B) were used to interview informants in Swedish and Portuguese.

Interviews with respondents located outside of Sandviken, Sweden were conducted through the video-conference program *GotoMeeting*. Interviews with respondents visiting and working in Sandviken happened on place. All of the 20 respondent interviews were conducted after the survey was sent out, between April 4\textsuperscript{th} and April 25\textsuperscript{th}, these interviews lasted on average between 40 and 45 minutes. These interviews were conducted in Swedish, English and Spanish.

All interviews began with a presentation of the study as well as an explanation of the purpose of the interview. Participants also received information about the ethics involving the study. This type of information included issues of confidentiality and management of the interview material. At last permission to record the interview was asked, here participants also had the opportunity to ask questions. The interviews started with some background questions that developed into general questions about the research area. These general questions developed into specific questions as the interview advanced. Participants were given time to answer freely after every question and supplementary questions were asked after some
responses. When a question was hard to understand, the interviewer presented the question with a different choice of words, often with an example of the issue in question.

Towards the end of the respondent interviews, they were asked to complete a task. The task involved ranking a set of factors (based on Hofstede’s [2001] cultural dimensions theory) based on what would motivate them the most during an organizational change process. As for interviews with respondents outside of Sandviken, Sweden, this task was completed by sharing computer screens on the program GoToMeeting.

In some instances, interviews with respondents ended before accorded time due to unexpected meetings and urgent time constraints. In this case, and after permission was granted, the researcher sent respondents remaining key questions and task by e-mail. Interviews ended always by the researcher thanking respondents and informants.

**Surveys**

Three different surveys were sent, one to the marketing and communications function, one to the HR function and one to both, the IT and the finance and pricing function. The reason behind the creation of these slightly different surveys was that questions regarding organizational change processes were customized to fit the change situation of each individual function. Surveys were sent in an e-mail to all 264 Sandvik Coromant employees on March 16th after informant interviews were completed. An explanation of the study as well as the contact information of researcher and supervisors were included in this e-mail. The e-mail also explained confidential and anonymity factors involving survey answers. A reminder e-mail with the link to the survey was sent one week later to those employees who, at the time, had not completed the survey.

As a strategy for increasing response rate, a post was written and posted on a blog available for employees in the marketing and communications function. The post was written by the HR Business Partner working within the function and included information about the study as well as a presentation and picture of the researcher in question. In order to increase response rate within the HR function, the researcher was invited to participate in a global meeting involving all HR professionals. During this meeting, HR professionals were informed about the study and the researcher was introduced to the group. With the same purpose, a company e-mail account was created for the researcher.

The survey began with some background questions aimed at measuring demographic factors such as: age, nature of position, nationality and function affiliation. It then proceeded to present questions aimed at measuring
experiences and opinions about organizational change processes. Throughout these questions, participants were asked to choose between 6 alternatives, where the right extreme represented an absolute positive answer and the left extreme represented the most negative answer. Following this section, a series of questions aimed at finding experiences and opinions in general about change within the organization were presented. In order to answer these questions, respondents were asked to choose again between these 6 alternatives. The same procedure followed the section regarding questions aimed at measuring general perspectives of change.

Data Analysis

Orthographic Transcription

After the interviews, the recorded material was transcribed to an entire text using orthographic transcription. This method focuses on writing into text words that are spoken while employing the spelling system of the spoken language (Howitt, 2013).

Thematic Analysis

Thematic analysis is a form of qualitative analysis chosen in this investigation with the purpose to analyze the interviews’ information. Thematic analysis is a method where data is coded and divided into different themes with the purpose of understanding interview information. It identifies the common themes in the interviews and compile them as a result. These themes are then given a name and description. The aim is to come up with a detailed description and summary of the interview data (Howitt, 2013). There is both a deductive and an inductive approach in thematic analysis. The deductive approach is based on theory and it decides the themes that will represent results while an inductive approach bases itself only in those themes that come out of the data collection (Hayes, 2000). An inductive approach was chosen for this study, the reason being more clarity in the key attitudes and experiences of change that have been experienced. Thematic analysis was chosen because of the method's flexibility and descriptive characteristics.

Statistical Analysis

Survey results were analyzed by SPSS. Differences and factors affecting data were analyzed by using the following methods:

1. Coefficient alpha. Known as Cronbach's Alpha is a psychometric statistic method that measures the internal consistency in a set of items. It is used to test reliability. It has a coefficient that can range from .00 to 1.0, with .00 meaning that there is no consistency and 1.0 meaning that there is absolute consistency in a measurement. Acceptable levels, according to most social
sciences research, involve a Cronbach's alpha of .70 and higher, this is because then 70% of the variance in the scores would be reliable (Bryman & Cramer, 2005)

2. One-way analysis of variance. One Way ANOVA is a parametric test used to compare three or more unrelated means by estimating the variance between groups and comparing that to an estimate of the variance within groups. This test could be used to test whether there are any significant differences between three or more independent groups on a specific factor (Bryman & Cramer, 2005).

3. Analysis of variance, two-way ANOVA. Also known as factorial or multi-factor ANOVA, is a parametric test in which two or more factors who are suspected of having an effect on one variable are compared on that dependent measure (Bryman & Cramer, 2005). This method is used when more than one independent variable has or may have an effect on the results of one specific measure or dependent variable.

4. Independent -samples t-test. Known as between-groups t-test, is a test that compares means from two different groups on one specific variable (Bryman & Cramer, 2005). This test is used when trying to see if results from two different groups are statistically and significantly different from each other.

5. Sheffe test. Is a type of post hoc test, also referred as posteriori tests. The Sheffe test is a test that is carried out after data had been analyzed in an analysis of variance. This test is used when significant results have been identified in order to discover which pairs of means that are significant within the groups (Bryman & Cramer, 2005).

Validity and Reliability

In order to reach reliability in interviews, two pilot interviews were performed. This was done with the purpose of identifying unclear questions, test the type of answers and performance and total time. In order to reach validity in interviews, questions were asked after pilot interviews with the aim of finding out whether volunteers understood the aim of every question and theme. Interviews were realized in four different languages (Swedish, English, Portuguese and Spanish) with the purpose of interviewing respondents in their mother tongue. This was done in order to avoid language barriers and misinterpretations when talking about a complicated subject in a second language.

Six pilot questionnaires were sent in order to test consistency and to identify deviated and/or incomprehensible questions. In order to test reliability in
survey questions measuring perspectives of change, a Cronbach’s alpha was performed on every theme of questions after survey answers were completed (See Appendix S). This was done in order to test the consistency in questions within a theme and to test correlation between them. When it comes to analysis, reliability was attempted by using the same transcription method in the same way for all interviews.

**Ethical Considerations**

The American Psychological Association has developed a set of ethical principles than can be applied to both qualitative as well as quantitative research. Among these principles is for example the act of avoiding harm of any kind to participants or patients (Howitt, 2013).

The principle for fidelity and responsibility states that researchers and psychologists should take responsibility and behave themselves professionally. The principle for integrity relates to being honest, even in those cases when deception is needed for the purpose of the investigation. Dishonesty should always be rectified afterwards especially if there was harm involved. Finally, the principle for respect for people’s right and dignity dictates that researchers should respect all individuals’ right to privacy, confidentiality and self-determination. (Howitt, 2013)

This investigation has attempted to follow each of the presented principles above. Before any interviews and surveys could take place, consent as well as information of the study and about the company were discussed in different meetings with the HR Business Partner for the marketing and communications function (who also acted as the study’s supervisor at the company) and with the Head of the HR function. Interview templates as well as the questionnaires were revised and approved by both supervisors (university and company) before any interviews could take place. Participants’ identities were not revealed for supervisors nor the members of the management team nor for the interview respondents themselves. For further information about how these principles were applied in the methods of this study and with participants, please see the section *procedure* presented earlier.
Results and Data Analysis

Informant Interviews

After a careful codification and analysis through thematic analysis, results showed three main themes among informants’ opinions, experiences and attitudes of change within the company.

Deficiency of Change Competencies

The first theme relates to a lack of change competencies in the organization such as leading and/or managing change. This theme was expressed by the majority of the informants when they talked about past and current organizational changes and the lack of a change management team and project that is responsible for leading change as well as a lack of experiences of bigger organizational changes within the company.

According to informants, leading and motivating change across most levels within the organization was a task primarily implemented by line managers and not by specialists in change. Included in this type of answers were comments about the role of the HR function and their absence of a central and leading role in the change perspective. As one informant illustrated: “...HR is not on the map, they don’t have the resources. They exist on a micro-level but not at all as a leading role when it comes to change...” (Informant 3). The same informant declared that normally they have project management processes but when it comes to past reorganizations, there had been none: “We don’t have any specific change leaders or a team and it seems like we don’t have any ‘decentralization leaders’ either, it is up to the involved managers to lead and deal with this issue” (Informant 3).

According to informants, these managers, apart from having to multitask, have not had previous experience of big organizational changes. When asked whether he thought managers had the competencies needed to lead and manage change, another informant answered: “No, this type of big reorganization has not happened before and that is the reason. Competency builds on experience and we don’t have that” (Informant 2). Yet another respondent illustrated the necessity for employees on a higher hierarchical level to develop their evaluation and sensitivity skills when it comes to handling bigger organizational changes. He expressed: “Some changes must be very carefully evaluated. I don’t think that people on a strategic level think in those kinds of deeper details and it is then that the change affects the lives of many individuals...” (Informant 5).

Finally, one informant belonging to the global sales function expressed this theme further when he explained the justification for the most recent reorganization within the function. According to the informant, the functions management team did not correctly justify and motivated the last
organizational change. Rather he saw the justification of the change as a failed attempt of manipulation:

I believe that the management team in certain situations underestimated our intelligence when they said that this was for the better but that is not how we experience it right? As I said, people are not stupid and if you want to get everyone to push in the same direction, you cannot fool them to think that it is one way when they clearly see it is on another. I mean with the motivation behind why we did this, so no there I think there is more to wish for. I understand that sometimes you cannot say everything, I have a complete understanding of that but I believe that you should never try to fool people, I mean in this case they said that it would be better for our clients when everyone has seen that it has been much worse (Informant 2).

**Time Constraints**

This theme refers to the shortage of time across the organization. Informants believed that this was a problem that often prevented the organization from leading and managing change in the best way possible. Time constraints were known to affect line managers, HR professionals and management teams when making decisions associated to change management. One informant made a reference to this theme when he explained that a big company that is part of a bigger group of companies has: “...no time for democracy...” (Informant 1) when it comes to implementing changes. According to him, there is no time for involving employees in a change process and the company cannot afford to spend time in arguments and discussions about change. He described the following when referring to the current organizational change process of decentralization and how the decision to do it had come from a group level:

We go back to what I was saying, there’s no point in discussing a decision that has already been taken because it is not going to change either way. So, we could either spend energy on that or we could spend energy in ‘ok how do we do the best of this situation?’, given the conditions and framework that we have. (Informant 1)

Yet another informant expressed that when it comes to both, HR professionals and line managers, time was an issue that prevented them from dealing with change processes:

This type of bigger organizational changes it would feel good to have someone that is a change leader because all the managers involved, they have also a change role and it is difficult to maybe then act as both, change leader and be a manager in the new structure at the same time. (Informant 3)

This theme also showed itself when informants named the speed of the change. According to some informants, organizational changes (especially those of a greater magnitude) require a longer time to complete. Something that the organization cannot always afford as one informant attributed this to external and client demands:
Everything must go faster and faster and faster all the time and with more flexibility and such and it is a big and slow organization, that is the way it is... demands increase all the time and in my experience, it's a way too big organization so it's not easy. (Informant 4).

Another informant that shared a similar view on the speed of change attributed the long and timely processes to creating uncertainty:

Sandvik, Coromant, it is such a big organization that when they need to make interviews of 10 or 20 candidates it takes a long time and I believe that those changes should be done in a grouped manner like by departments, by areas not changing a whole structure all at once because I don’t think that it was done in a quick manner in order for people to have less uncertainty. (Informant 5)

**Big, Constant, Incongruent Changes**

The following theme relates to the magnitude and frequency of changes. Most informants named these factors as an impediment for the organization when it comes to effectively leading change and are the reason for creating uncertainty and low productivity within the organization. One informant expressed that too much change (specially in important functions) was not a positive thing: “...I like change, I see change as positive, as an opportunity but too much change creates insecurity...” (Informant 5). He continued explaining that even though he experienced a good communication during change processes, the frequency of change was a problem:

Changes are good but I believe they should occur, I don’t have a formula, but they are occurring very fast in Sandvik and they are very big structural changes that end up affecting employee productivity, regardless of if there is communication or not. (Informant 5)

This theme also signified an incongruence of change that created not only unproductivity but also a mistrust against the management team. This theme showed itself when informants from the global sales function named the lack of relevance of past reorganizational changes to the organization’s best interests. According to informants, the last reorganization within sales had only brought a decrease in service quality. Informants felt, among other things, like the management team had not taken into consideration cultural differences in clients and did not have insights into local operations; for this reason, they did not fully understand the strategy behind that specific organizational change:

It feels sometimes like there is a big gap between how the management team sees the client and the client's needs and how we who meet the client everyday experience it, sometimes it does not seem like we have been to the same planet. (Informant 2)

Another informant expressed: “Sometimes I get the feeling that the ones making the decisions lie too far away from the client and do not understand how it affects in the end...” (Informant 4).
Survey results

After results were analyzed using a combination of statistical analysis some significant results were discovered. Interesting distributions of ratings among answers were also detected. A summary of these results will be presented below divided by function.

Marketing and Communications

The survey sent to the marketing and communications function focused on investigating the organizational process of a recent reorganization (spring 2016) that included the transformation into one global marketing function. Experiences and opinions about how the company dealt with this reorganization as well as how the company deals with organizational change in general were also investigated in this survey.

Questions investigating individual perspectives of change in general were presented. These questions were based on Hofstede's (2001) theory of cultural dimensions. The purpose of these questions was to test respondents in 5 factors or categories, namely: 1.) power distance, 2.) uncertainty avoidance, 3.) individualism and collectivism, 4.) long-term orientation and 5.) masculinity and femininity. The aim of these questions was to find out which factors are viewed as most important during an organizational change and see whether these perspectives differ depending on nationality factors. Questions within every dimension had the intention of measuring two different extremes/sides of this dimension.

Answer options to all questions and statements included a scale of 1 to 6 where 1 represented the option of extremely unimportant or extremely negative and 6 represented the answer option extremely important or extremely positive.

Positive results

Positive answers of a value of 3.5 and higher were shown in most respondents regarding the communication during the reorganization where 62% of respondents gave positive answers. Positive ratings were also found for the clarity of vision with the reorganization where 56% of respondents gave a positive answer. Positive answers were also shown in the question: How well did the change fit in with the needs of the organization where 64% of respondents though the change matched the needs of the organization. Most respondents also gave positive answers when it comes to the need and urgency of that reorganization within the function where 64% of respondents thought the change was urgent and needed.
Positive answers were also shown by a majority of respondents regarding improvement within the organization as a result of the reorganization where 64% gave a positive answer.

Positive answers of 3.5 and higher were also shown by a majority of respondents regarding the question: *How successful was the reorganization? (transformation within one global marketing function)*. About 70% of respondents gave answers that included successful to extremely successful.

Although a great distribution was shown, a slightly bigger portion of respondents (54%) gave positive answers regarding how well the organization had dealt with resistance during the reorganization as well as how well the organization dealt with uncertainty during the last changes (52%).

**Negative results**

Negative answers of a value of 3.5 and under were observed in most respondents regarding two factors. These factors included the comprehension of information during the reorganization process where 60% of respondents gave a negative answer as well as received support during the process were 61% of respondents declared they had received little to no support during the process.

Regarding the kind of support received during the reorganization process the majority described it was a practical support such as help with administrative, financial and work related questions (47% of answers) while the least type of support received was in the form of competence development such as training and coaching where only 13% of respondents described that they received. Respondents that had not received support at all were 35 % of all respondents answering the survey (see Figure 7).
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**Figure 7.** Type of support received during reorganization process within marketing and communications.

Although not showing negative results a great distribution of answers regarding the structure and plan for the reorganization process was shown where half of respondents 50% rated the structure as positive and 50% gave negative answers.
A slightly bigger portion of respondents (52%) reported feeling more anxiety, worry and uncertainty during the reorganization. Divided answers regarding opinions about how the company leads organizational change were shown were 50% of respondents gave both positive as well as negative responses.

**Significant results**

After an analysis with a one-way ANOVA, statistically significant differences (F (4,70) = 2.90, p=0.028) were shown for the question: *How well did the change fit in with the needs of the organization*. According to the analysis, this difference was due to position. A post hoc analysis using the Sheffe post hoc criterion for significance revealed no significant differences between any of the groups. However, it was observed that management, supervisory and support had a more positive average mean score (M=5 to M=4.3) than those possessing a position as a specialist or field operational with an average mean score of M=3.5.

Statistically significant differences were also found for the factor of structured planning during the reorganization process. According to the one-way ANOVA analysis (F (3,67) = 3.66, p=0.017), this difference in scores was due to nationality. A Sheffe post hoc test showed that ratings from respondents belonging to the Americas (including respondents from the United States, Mexico, Canada and Brazil) was statistically significantly higher (M=4.2, p=0.043) than Scandinavia (M=3.1, p=0.043) including respondents belonging to Sweden, Norway and Denmark. No significant differences were found among the other groups (Asia and Europe). This result suggests that respondents belonging to the Americas had a view of a more well-structured plan for the reorganization than respondents from Scandinavia. Figure 8 below shows a graphic illustration of these significant differences.
Figure 8. Question 3.6. Means and standard deviations for nationality groups regarding structure during the reorganization process in marketing and communications.

Significant differences were also shown for the question: *How much support did you receive during that change process.* According to the one-way ANOVA analysis this statistically significant difference was due to both position ($F(4,69) = 3.50, p=0.012$) and nationality factors ($F(3,68) = 3.13, p=0.031$). Post hoc comparisons using the Sheffe test revealed that a statistically significant difference when it comes to received support during the change process was present between the positions of management ($M=3.9, p=0.030$) and specialist/field operational ($M=2.7, p=0.030$). As seen in Figure 9 below, management had a more positive mean score, meaning they described more received support than respondents with a specialist/field operational role that, on average, described they received little to no support at all.
When it comes to nationality, the Sheffe post hoc criterion for significance revealed no significant differences between any of the nationality groups. However, it was observed that differences in means regarding received support during the process were greater between Asia and Scandinavia where Asia score a more positive mean of $M=4.2$, meaning they rated more received support than Scandinavia with an average more negative mean of $M=2.8$.

At last, a statistically significant difference using one-way ANOVA was found regarding position and answers about improvement within the organization after organizational change ($F(3,70) = 4.00, p=0.006$). The Sheffe post hoc criterion for significance revealed no statistically significant differences between any of the positions. However, mean scores for supervisory ($M=5$), support ($M=4.4$), and management ($M=4.3$) were higher than for position type specialist/field operational ($M=3.3$) suggesting than managerial
positions had seen more improvements as a result of the reorganization than respondents with more operational roles.

Statistically significant differences were shown after a one-way ANOVA \( (F(4,69) = 2.70, p=0.038) \) between the amount of anxiety, worry and uncertainty experienced during the reorganization and the type position. However, the Sheffe post hoc criterion for significance did not find any statistically significant differences between positions. It was observed that the group feeling the least amount of anxiety, worry and uncertainty was the one with supervisory positions showing an average score of \( M=2 \) (meaning little to none). The groups showing most anxiety, worry and uncertainty were support positions (\( M=3.8 \)) and specialist/field operational positions (\( M= 3.6 \)).

Statistically significant differences with the one-way ANOVA \( (F(3,67) = 3.96, p=0.012) \) analysis were also found between the question: \textit{How well does Sandvik Coromant lead organizational change?} and the factor of nationality. The Sheffe post hoc test revealed that ratings from Europe (including respondents belonging to Belgium, Austria, Britain, France, Italy, Germany, Slovenia and Spain) were statistically and significantly higher (\( M=4.1, p=0.030 \)) than ratings from Scandinavia (including respondents from Sweden, Norway and Denmark) (\( M=3.1, p=0.030 \)). This result suggests that European respondents had a more positive view about how the company leads organizational change than their Scandinavian counterparts. An illustration of this difference is shown in Figure 10 below.
Question 4.5. Means and standard deviations for nationality groups regarding leadership and organizational change at Sandvik Coromant within marketing and communications.

Change values

Most of the questions measuring factors that could be relevant during organizational change received positive scores of 3.5 and higher by most respondents; however, some statistically significant differences were shown in some dimensions.

Power Distance. One-way ANOVA analysis showed statistically significant differences within questions measuring the power distance dimension. Answers regarding the importance of transparency \( F(3,68) = 5.72, p=0.001 \) and democracy \( F(3,67) = 2.75, p=0.049 \) during organizational changes differed significantly on the factor of nationality. A Sheffe post hoc test revealed that ratings from Europe \( M=5.7, p=0.006 \) regarding the importance of transparency during organizational changes were statistically and significantly higher than ratings from Scandinavia \( M=4.7, p=0.006 \).
The Sheffe post hoc test did not find significant differences between nationality groups regarding the importance of democracy; however, Europe showed the highest mean score \( M=5.2 \) in comparison to Scandinavia \( M=4.3 \) with the lowest mean score. These results suggest that democracy and transparency appears to be more important to European respondents than to their Scandinavian counterparts. Figure 11 below shows a clear illustration of the significant differences between nationality groups after the Sheffe test.

\[ \text{Figure 11. Question5.1. Means and standard deviations for nationality groups regarding low power distance.} \]
**Individualism and Collectivism.** One-way ANOVA analysis showed statistically significant differences in questions measuring the individualism dimension. A significant difference \( (F(3,68) = 3.86, p=0.013) \) was shown between the question measuring the importance of developing team competencies during an organizational change (low level of individualism or collectivism) and the factor of nationality. The Sheffe post hoc test revealed that ratings from the Scandinavian group (\( M=4.9, p=0.042 \)) were statistically and significantly lower than ratings from the European group (\( M=5.5, p=0.042 \)). What this means is that Scandinavian respondents appear to be less collectivistic than European respondents. This difference between means is illustrated in Figure 12 below.

![Figure 12](image)

**Figure 12.** Question 5.11. Means and standard deviations for nationality groups regarding collectivism.
One-way ANOVA demonstrated a statistic significance ($F (3,68) = 5.37$, $p=0.002$) between the question: *How important is it that the change process benefits my work and career* and the factor of nationality. The Sheffe post hoc test showed that ratings from Scandinavia ($M=4.2$, $p=0.035$) were statistically and significantly lower than rates from Europe ($M=5.1$, $p=0.035$) meaning that European respondents show a higher individualistic tendency than Scandinavian respondents. This difference is illustrated in Figure 13 below.
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Figure 13. Means and standard deviation for nationality groups regarding individualism.
Statistically significant differences \((F (3,68) = 3.53, p=0.019)\) were also shown between the question: *How important is it to offer individual career and development opportunities during an organizational change?* And the factor of Nationality. The Sheffe post hoc test did not show any significant differences between nationality groups; however, it was observed that the Americas (\(M=5.3\)) and Europe (\(M=5.2\)) groups showed higher average mean scores than Asia (\(M=4.8\)) and Scandinavia (\(M=4.5\)) suggesting than European and American respondents show more individualistic tendencies than Asian and Scandinavian respondents.

**Masculinity and femininity.** Statistic and significant differences using a one-way ANOVA analysis \((F (3,67) = 3.29, p=0.007)\) were also found in one question measuring the dimension of masculinity: *How important is it that the organizational change maximizes economic value* and the factor of nationality. The Sheffe post hoc test did not find statistically significant differences between the nationality groups; however, mean ratings from Asia (\(M=5.6\)) and the Americas (\(M=5.1\)) were higher than ratings from Scandinavia (\(M=4.4\)) and Europe (\(4.5\)) suggesting that Asian and American respondents score higher in masculinity than Scandinavian and European respondents.

**Uncertainty Avoidance.** At last, a statistic significant difference using one-way ANOVA \((F (4,71) = 1.88, p=0.030)\) was found between the question: *How important is it that the approach to organizational change is based on what works best in practice?* Measuring the dimension of uncertainty avoidance and the factor of age. The Sheffe post hoc test revealed that ratings belonging to the age group 46-55 years old (\(M=5.1, p=0.047\)) were statistically significantly higher than ratings from the age group 56 years or older (\(M=4.1, p=0.047\)). This result suggests that older respondents could be less tolerant for uncertainty. Figure 14 below shows a graphic illustration of these differences between age groups.
For a more detailed statistical description of significant results for marketing including one way ANOVAs and Sheffe post hoc tests, see Appendices N and O.

**Human Resources**

The survey sent to the HR function focused its first part on asking questions about the organizational change process of a current decentralization happening within the function. Experiences and opinions about how the company has dealt with this decentralization as well as how the company currently deals with organizational change in general were also investigated in this survey. At last questions investigating individual perspectives of change in general were presented.
Positive results

All answers to questions evaluating the current organizational change process of decentralization were for the most part positive (meaning a score of 3.5 and higher). About 94% of all respondents who answered the survey within HR believed that the current decentralization within the organization was needed and 82% believed it was urgent. More than 70% of respondents reported a clear vision with decentralization as well as a good communication during the process. Approximately 77% of respondents also reported the information during the decentralization process to be comprehensible, 59% of respondents reported positive answers regarding the structure of the change plan for decentralization. At last 59% of respondents reported little to no uncertainty. Although a slight majority of the respondents reported positive answers in this question, the distribution among the ratings was greater making it seem almost even. Approximately 53% of respondents reported that the information available was complete.

A majority of respondents reported positive answers regarding the effectivity of the decentralization process where 82% of respondents reported that it would be successful. About 83% of respondents also reported that the impact the organization as a whole would have as a result of a decentralization process happening at individual functions would be of a great dimension. At last about 59% of respondents gave positive answers when it comes to evaluating how the organization has dealt with uncertainty during the last organizational changes.

Negative results

When it comes to the support they thought they would receive during the current decentralization process, most respondents (65%) reported that they believed they would receive little to no support at all. When it comes to the question: In your opinion, how well is Sandvik Coromant dealing with the current decentralization process? A slightly majority of 53% of respondents reported negative answers. Approximately 53% of respondents also reported negative answers when evaluating how the organization generally leads organizational change.
**Significant results**

A one-way ANOVA analysis found statistically significant differences between the question: *How structured is the plan for decentralization?* And the factor of age (F (3,13) = 3.63, p=0.042). Since some of the age groups had fewer than 2 cases, a post hoc analysis using the Sheffe criterion was not possible. However it was observed that the age group 46-55 years old had a lower average mean score (M=3.7) than the 36-45 years old group ( M= 4) meaning that the older group reported less structure in the change process of decentralization.

**Change values**

*Uncertainty Avoidance.* No statistically significant differences were found among these questions in relation to nationality or position. However, an independent samples t-test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the scores for a question measuring the factor uncertainty avoidance between the age groups 36-45 years old and 46 to 55 years old (t (13) =8.55, p= 0.012). The older group of 46 to 55 years of age had an average mean score of M=5.8 on the question: *How important is it that the change process is well structured and planned?* Measuring a high level of uncertainty avoidance while the younger group including ages 36 to 45 had a lower average mean score of M=5.3. These results suggest that the older age group has a lower tolerance for uncertainty. A two-way factorial ANOVA was not performed for this result. Figure 15 below shows a graphic illustration of the significant differences between age groups on uncertainty avoidance.
Figure 15. Means and standard deviation for age groups regarding uncertainty avoidance in the HR function.

See Appendix P for a more detailed statistical illustration of significant results for the surveys sent to the HR function.

**IT**

The survey sent to the IT and finance & pricing functions was the same and it focused its first part on asking general questions about the organizational change process of a possible decentralization happening at the organization and at a group level. Experiences and opinions about how the company will be able to deal with this change as well as how the company currently deals with organizational change in general were also investigated in this survey. At last questions investigating individual perspectives of change in general were presented just like in the previous surveys. Results for the finance & pricing function will be presented separately.
**Positive results**

Positive answers of a value of 3.5 and above were shown by a majority of respondents when it comes to the need of a decentralization process at the organization (73% of respondents). Most respondents (64%) also believed the decentralization was urgent and about 55% reported a clear vision with that particular change.

Positive answers were shown by a slight majority of respondents (55%) regarding the question: *In your opinion, how well would Sandvik Coromant deal with a decentralization process?* About 55% of respondents also gave positive ratings when it comes to the question about how much impact the organization would have as a whole from decentralization processes happening at individual functions. At last, positive answers were also reported when it comes to the effectivity of an organizational process (such as decentralization) where 73% of respondents believed it would be effective. Only 30% of respondents reported anxiety, worry and uncertainty when it comes to a possible decentralization process.

**Negative results**

Negative answers of a value of 3.5 and below were shown by a majority of respondents when it comes to the comprehension of available information about the change (73%) as well as the quality of that communication (73%). When it comes to how complete available information about decentralization had been, 73% of respondents reported an unstructured plan or no plan for the organizational change.

Negative answers were shown by most respondents (73%) regarding the question of how much support they thought they would receive during an organizational change. A slight majority of 55% reported negative answers when it comes to how well the organization had managed uncertainty during the last organizational changes. At last, 64% of respondents answering this survey reported negative answers when it comes to the question: How well does Sandvik Coromant lead organizational change?

**Significant results**

No statistically significant results were found throughout this section when it comes to type of position and nationality. However, an independent samples t-test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the scores for a question measuring the need for a decentralization process within the organization between the age groups 36-45 years old (M=4.7, SD=1.5) and 46 to 55 years old (M=3.8, SD=0.75) (t (8) =4.02, p= 0.037). The younger group of 36-45 years had a higher mean score than the older group. This suggest that the younger group saw a greater need with decentralization
than the older group. Figure 16 below illustrates the significant difference in opinions between the age groups.

In order to test whether this significant difference was due to the factor of age, a two-way factorial ANOVA was computed. This was done in order to see which of the independent factors (age, position, nationality) had the most effect on the dependent variable (scores). There were however no significant results in any of the factors here.

Statistically significant differences were found using one-way ANOVA between the question measuring expectations of the possible effectivity of a decentralization process at the organization and the factor of position ($F(2,6) = 9.25$, $p=0.015$). A Sheffe post hoc test revealed that ratings belonging to the position group management ($M=5.0$, $p=0.015$) were statistically significantly higher than ratings from the position group specialist/field operational...
This result suggests that respondents with a management position have a much greater confidence in the effectivity of decentralization at the organization than respondents having a specialist or field operational role. Figure 17 below shows an illustration of this confidence shown in the difference of means between type of positions.
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Figure 17. Means and standard deviations for type of position regarding perceived effectiveness of decentralization.

**Change values**

No statistically significant differences were found among these answers when it comes to the factor of nationality (which can be due to the fact that only 2 respondents were non-Swedish). However, an independent samples t-test showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the scores measuring the power distance dimension between the age groups 36-45 years (M=5.0, SD=.00) and 46 to 55 years (M=4.3, SD=1.21) (t (8) =5.00, p= 0.005).
**Power Distance.** In order to test whether this significant difference was in fact due to the factor of age, a two-way factorial ANOVA was computed. This was done in order to see which of the independent factors (age, position) had the most effect on the dependent variable (power distance). Results showed that there was a statistically significant difference in the factor of position $F(3, 3) = 1.878$, $p = .039$. The same was not true for the factor of age nor for the interaction between the two. What these results suggest is that differences in power distance had a stronger influence of position rather than age. Figure 18 below shows an illustration of the significant differences found between groups when it comes to the dimension of power distance.
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*Figure 18.* Means and standard deviations for type of position regarding power distance.

See Appendix Q for a detailed statistical description of significant results for the IT function.
Finance & Pricing

Positive results

Positive answers were shown by a majority of respondents when it comes to the need for decentralization within the organization (63%) as well as for the urgency of this decentralization (63%). Most respondents (75%) also believed the vision for the decentralization from a group level perspective had been very clear.

Positive answers were shown by most respondents regarding the impact that the organization will have as a result of decentralization processes happening at individual functions where 75% gave answers of a value of 4 and higher. In regards to the future effectivity of a decentralization process within the organization 63% of respondents believed that it would be successful. Most respondents (63%) reported little to some anxiety, worry and uncertainty when it comes to a group level decentralization process.

Negative results

Negative ratings or answers were given by most respondents in regards to the communication and available information about decentralization where 63% believed the change had been badly communicated, 88% believed the information was not complete and 63% believed the change process around decentralization was unstructured and unplanned.

A great distribution of answers was also shown when it comes to the question about the comprehension of available information about decentralization where 50% believed it was comprehensible and the other 50% believed it was not.

Negative answers were shown by most respondents (75%) when answering the question: How much support (psychological, practical, competence development) do you think that you will be receiving if a decentralization change process occurs at Sandvik Coromant? Most respondents (57%) also believed that the organization did not lead organizational change very well.

Distributed results were shown for two questions. When it comes to how the organization would deal with a decentralization process 50% of both, negative and positive answers were reported. In regards to how well the organization had dealt with uncertainty throughout the latest organizational changes a distribution of 50/50 was also observed.

Change values

Respondents from the finance and pricing function were all Swedish respondents. Because of this, analysis to find national differences in change
values and perspectives was not possible. However, a one-way ANOVA analysis was possible to realize on factors such as age and position.

**Power Distance.** A statistically significant difference was found with the one-way ANOVA on the question measuring power distance (*How important is it that there is a hierarchy system at your workplace?*) and the factor of age (*F*(2,4) = 21.51, *p*=0.007). A post hoc analysis using the Sheffe post hoc criterion for significance revealed that the age group of 36 to 45 years (*M*=2.3, *p*=0.008) had statistically significantly lower ratings than the age group 46 to 55 years (*M*=5.5, *p*=0.008), suggesting that the younger group had a lower acceptance for unequal levels of power than the older group.

The Sheffe post hoc also found that the age group 46 to 55 years (*M*=5.5, *p*=0.025) had statistically and significantly higher ratings than the age group of 56 years or older (*M*=3.00, *p*=0.025). What these results suggest is that the younger group (36-45) has a lower acceptance of unequal distribution of power while the oldest group (56 years or older) has a higher acceptance; however, both of these groups have a lower acceptance of unequal distribution of power than the age group of 46 to 55 years. Figure 19 below shows the significant differences between these groups.
Figure 19. Means and standard deviation for age groups regarding the dimension of power distance.

See Appendix R for a detailed statistical description of significant results for the finance & pricing function.

Open Questions

Two open questions were presented in the survey. Answers to these open questions were analyzed and divided into different themes using thematic analysis. When it comes to the first question: *What do you need to feel better (mentally and psychologically) about current and future organizational changes?* Common answers included a wish for more stability and congruency in both communication and change processes. However, the most common theme identified among answers was the following:
Clarity. The majority of respondents who answered this question mentioned the importance of clarity to mental and psychological well-being during organizational changes. Clarity in the vision and goals of the change as well as in the information and communication. Answers included comments regarding a clear connection to the strategy and clearer explanations of why the organizational changes are being made. Finally, clarity in roles, instructions, guidelines and responsibilities was also mentioned as a way to minimize mental and psychological distress during changes: “...but doing the change, it’s important we have a clear and transparent communication, on a regular basis. It’s usually when time passes and there is no update on the situation that anxiety and rumors grow...” (unknown survey respondent).

Regarding the second question: *What does Sandvik Coromant need to improve when leading organizational change* Among factors to improve were common answers that included support (dialogues and competence development) as well as more sensitivity. Answers regarding sensitivity included having direct and open discussions with affected employees in an early phase of the change process (when decisions are made). Common answers regarding an improved cultural awareness were also shown. Besides these answers, three main themes were detected among all answers and they are presented below:

**Justification.** Most respondents wanted more information about the justification for the change but also wanted better rationales and motivations for the change. These included logical explanations about how the change will improve processes or the company as a whole as well explanations of the processes taken to determine the need of the change. Comments such as “...more communication in advance about the why/how and when...”(unknown survey respondent), as well as “...clear communication of WHY we do this Change...”(unknown survey respondent). In order to feel good about the change a respondent wrote that he/she needed the following: “...better reasons and arguments as to why the change is done. It would also be good if the organizational changes were done to improve our processes, which I don’t think was the case last time...”.

**Communication.** A majority of respondents answering this question mentioned communication as something the organization needs to improve when it comes to leading change. Answers highlighted a more complete communication that included the most important aspects of the change (what, why, who, how). More clarity in communication as a way to ensure that information is well understood at lower levels. Better communication processes in the form of delivering relevant information, as one respondent wrote “...communication does not mean webinar after webinar. Although webinars are nice, if there is nothing to communicate, then people feel let
down” (unknown survey respondent). Suggestions for communicating at the right time as well as for choosing different ways of communication were also written. A more coordinated communication between the functions dealing with similar organizational changes was also suggested. Finally, a more personalized and deeper communication in form of dialogues about how the change would affect the individual was suggested.

**Structure.** Respondents believed that more structure in the planning, strategy and execution of the change was needed. Comments such as the need for change leaders for working and communicating the change were presented and they proposed managerial processes at all levels when executing the change.
Respondent Interviews

All twenty interviews from respondents belonging to the focus functions (marketing and communications, HR, IT, finance and pricing) were transcribed with orthographic transcription and analyzed through thematic analysis. Results from the analysis show eight common themes among respondents' answers. These prevalent themes illustrate mutual experiences, opinions and insights among respondents. The themes were given a definition and are presented and described below along with some examples illustrating each theme.

**Multiple, Frequent and Colossal Changes (Influential dimensions of change)**

The following theme refers to the amount of change, the frequency of change and the magnitude of organizational changes within the organization as well as the combination of some of them. These three dimensions of change were among the most prevalent themes across all answers. This theme was, for the most part, revealed when speaking about challenges and obstacles during the implementation of change processes.

When referring to the amount of change, respondents expressed that having parallel changes within their own function was a source of stress and also an obstacle that kept them from correctly implementing the organizational change in question. As a respondent with a high management position expressed, one of the challenges during the last reorganization was having many changes at the same time where one was organizational and the rest being changes in the way of working.

References to the amount of change were also present when respondents mentioned parallel and big changes in other important functions within the organization. According to respondents, these changes created confusion when implementing their own organizational change and created uncertainty. One respondent with a management position from the marketing function expressed the impact that change within sales, engineering and other functions had on their reorganization:

> Some of the obstacles were that there were multiple things going on at the same time, it was complex enough if it was just marketing that was going through the change but there was a whole new organization, sales organization, a lot of building parts and the change, the pace on where you were and...so I think just a challenge was a lot of moving pieces and a lot of leadership changes. (Respondent 1).

Respondents belonging to the marketing function expressed that a downsizing process happening within the organization at the same time as they performed a reorganization created uncertainty and confusion as to
whether the downsizing process was part of the reorganization. When referring to the downsizing process, a respondent expressed:

We tried as best as possible to explain the difference between these but since everything happened at the same time, it was that fall, everything happened, the layoffs in Sandviken, we reduced people out there and at the same time we reorganized the organization so for a lot of people it was the exact same thing. (Respondent 4)

This theme was also shown when respondents referred to the magnitude of change within the organization. According to respondents, big structural organizational changes but also transformational changes (such as changes in the way of working) along with other organizational changes and the frequency of them created weariness and exhaustion towards change. Answering a question about possible obstacles within a decentralization process, one respondent from the HR function described: “As I see it, it is the fact that we have done so many changes in recent years and they have been so big so people are starting to get tired of change...” (Respondent 2). Respondents meant that great changes and more specifically the frequency of these colossal changes brought about a skepticism towards change and towards the organization. Another respondent expressed: “I think that after two big reorganizations in three years there is some skepticism in the HR community and people feel a bit alone...” (Respondent 7). Respondents meant that a break from these big changes would bring about stability which they perceived was so needed in the organization.

At last, this theme revealed itself when respondents spoke about the frequency of all organizational changes. According to respondents, the frequency of changes within the organization is high and this brings exhaustion towards change, lowers motivation but also brings uncertainty. A respondent explained that this tiredness lowers motivation and belief in the company. He expressed:

We change always, always, always it is too much change and I believe that people get tired of it regardless of how good it is, like ok in a certain frequency but not too often. I notice that now when I talk to people, you can speak to whoever and they will say the same thing ‘I don’t have energy for a new change again’. (Respondent 6)

Respondents referred to this frequency when talking about uncertainty as one respondent expressed about employees in the organization: “...they also feel uncertainty, I think because the organization is always changing so everyone fears.” (Respondent 20). At last, one respondent illustrated the combination of magnitude and the frequency of change as a source of uncertainty when he replied:

In the last three years, I’ve seen at least two to three major organizational changes and you know...those changes and the frequency of that I think that even an experienced person would be really scared to join an organization which is
undergoing such frequent changes in all structural functions so that was also kind of scary. (Respondent 10).

**Global and Local Awareness**

The presented theme represents an understanding of the balance between local and global processes as well as consciousness about national cultures and differences within the organization. This theme also represents actions the organization takes when it comes to its role in leading change as a global organization. This theme was shown by all respondents in responses to both, the perceived challenges and the success factors that the company has when it comes to leading change.

This theme arose when respondents with a management position spoke about their own experiences when leading and managing change in a global context. According to respondents, managers leading global teams face difficulties and challenges when it comes to performing changes that benefit the local markets while keeping an alignment to global templates and ways of working. One respondent expressed his concern for emerging markets in Asia and the importance of cultural and local awareness:

> As a manager, we are part of the change and we need to pay more attention to the difference, the cultural differences between the different markets, especially when you are a manager from a very big market you need to understand even better the needs and the situation... this is important for the change. You should never take anything for granted... you need to respect the communication needs for the small market. (Respondent 16)

This theme was also present when respondents spoke about the difficulties of adapting an approach to change that would work in the different national cultures. A manager spoke about the challenges of choosing the correct cultural approach when lacking experiences within that specific culture:

> It’s very difficult to have a global organizational change with many different cultures and I think that the way some cultures are more direct than others and some are more consensus-based so it was, for me I guess, my personal challenges were about feeling with the people and change within a different cultural framework, some of which I hadn’t work with that deeply... the Japanese is a unique culture and how to manage change within that organization is still probably the biggest challenges we have, I have. (Respondent 1)

Another manager illustrated this theme when he spoke about the challenges that his own personality and national culture imposed when communicating in a global context:

> My personality and the Swedish culture, I am very used to communicating things that do not need to be one hundred percent done, like ‘this is what we are thinking about, this is what we are wondering about, this is what a scenario can look like’. When I communicate in a global context, I get questioned a lot and I realized that this creates a lot of uncertainty. What people often want in other cultures is for me to say ‘this is what it will look like’, that I am that determined. (Respondent 12)
This theme was also illustrated when respondents spoke about the tendency for the organization to lead and manage global changes with a Swedish approach as opposed to doing it from a more balanced and global approach. One respondent described a disconnection between Sweden and the current change and market situation in the individual countries as an obstacle to the organization by explaining a crash between the organizations marketing strategy and the American culture, she expressed:

From a market standpoint, we need to get a better handle for being local... local vs global approach so it's balancing that, there are things, that I'm not sure that Coromant or Sandvik in general from a global perspective, I think they still manage, they still market from a very Swedish mindset and there are some things that have been done in the past that as far as US culture, don't make sense. (Respondent 11)

Another respondent that shared this perspective named that one of the company's challenges was having a complete Swedish team when it comes to global and leading positions. She expressed:

We are still very Sweden-focused, I believe that is the biggest challenge, to dare to be global for real. Many of those that work with HR in global roles are stationed in Sweden together which causes us to have a great amount of people in the outside. This makes it easier to have a lot of focus on Sweden questions about what is important for Sweden and then we remember 'oh yeah! We got to think about the global perspective' and then we take the Swedish model and try to adapt it globally and that is not the best approach. (Respondent 8)

One respondent who illustrated this theme described the struggle of feeling accepted in the organization as a non-Swede in his global role. Although he recognized that the Swedish model has contributed to the success of the company in the past, he referred to it as a current obstacle for the organization and something that kept it from being fully agile. He described it as a Swedish resistance as he expressed the following:

Let's say 99% of people belonging to the global teams were Swedes, born in Sandviken, raised in Sandviken, started in Sandviken, family in Sandviken, perhaps with colleagues or fathers or whatever that had been working for Sandvik in Sandviken before so they had strong bonds together and changing this or giving it a different dimension was naturally difficult and they, most of them three or four years ago had a way of working which was more suitable to a medium privately held company rather than a big international group, so they were working very much with the Swedish mentality , the Swedish mentality of people in a relatively small city in the countryside of Sweden and sometimes they fail to consider that there could have been good contributions also from other sides of the world.(Respondent 9)

He continued by explaining that the company tries to solve Swedish dominance in global teams through reorganizations; however, there is still an obstacle to overcome which for him was the Swedish managing style, as he expressed:

You can feel that the company has managed with the Swedish style, the meeting culture, the consensus culture all these things are applied all over the world and
sometimes perhaps this approach doesn't fit very well with some of the national cultures for example the consensus culture, the consensus approach strikes really... with the Latin culture, we like to fight we don't like to agree on things so even if outside we agree inside there is war because we are not grown up this way, to us is really something alien. (Respondent 9)

At last, this theme was illustrated when respondents spoke about the success factors for leading change as a global organization. The success factors consisted in having a heterogenic group with a diverse base ground and the input of different perspectives. Some respondents proposed the use of this diverse ground by involving more people from different cultures, backgrounds and countries in the planning and implementation of organizational changes. One respondent expressed the involvement of more locals in change processes in order to find a right structure and plan:

We need to have a local responsible person that leads the change process in the local markets or the local country, if we are coming from here and think that we will do it with our approach then it will not work. (Respondent 6).

Another respondent proposed competence development in culture and above all, in change communication within the different cultures as she realized this was needed when managing global teams. One respondent who labeled the globalization of the company as a success factor believed that the company could use this globalization to motivate and justify certain changes. She expressed:

That it has presence is so many countries I think that helps it back up the changes that are deemed necessary... the fact that they explain you the reason of the change, for some cultures it might be a shock, but in reality, if the change has a foundation based on that globalization then that becomes the most important factor. (Respondent 15)

**Unpredictable Structure**

The following theme refers to the lack of a consistent structure across all stages of change processes within the organization. While some respondents described certain structured processes in change as something that facilitated implementation, others referred to the lack of structure in current and past change processes as something that obstructed change. A majority of respondents expressed this theme when answering questions and describing change processes.

This theme arose when respondents at all levels and positions described a lack of a plan to counteract resistance, a lack of plan for motivation during change as well as a lack of a plan to consolidate changes. This theme was also shown when respondents expressed a lack of clarity during change processes as well as a lack of follow ups after implementation. One respondent expressed that a lack of change evaluations can lower employees trust in management as he declared that an analysis of the change, a communication of the reasons for the change and a follow up of the change were essential for
the organization to succeed in change: “We must follow up change and that we are not doing in a good way...do the analysis first, communicate why for the organization and follow up afterwards with a communication if it was as expected.” (Respondent 2). Another respondent expressed the importance of follow ups and change management for the success of change processes:

As you do now. When we do change look at what was good? What was bad? What could we have done, what will we do better next time? Or what did we do good that we could re-use? I think that we sometimes we underestimate the weight of change management. Active change management, it’s not good that change just happens like uncontrolled. (Respondent 19)

One respondent that expressed the lack of a realistic plan and goals for the change explained that the current change process was implemented in a rush as a result of lack of planning. She expressed:

We should have started a lot earlier because then it would have been more realistic and we could have done this even better. It is like everything in the last minute and I believe it’s kind of unprofessional but we have succeeded. The result was either way good but I think that the journey there we could have, we could have done it so much better, that has been a big part of the frustration. (Respondent 8)

One respondent illustrated the lack of structure and clarity in the process when it comes to communication as he expressed:

I think we should have a very clear picture of what we want to achieve and how we do it before we communicate something, I think that within Coromant, within Sandvik we are used to, we sometimes communicate something ‘now we will do this’ but then we have no plan how and when we do it so we create news, we create a consciousness in the organization, ‘now something will happen’ and then nothing happens in several months so people don’t know where they stand. (Respondent 6)

Another respondent that illustrated the lack of structure expressed that incomplete changes, lack of clear change leaders and a general lack of plans in the process were obstacles when leading change

There was no one that really drove it, there was no one clearly appointed...it was not so clear who it was that like, who is the project leader or who is the responsible so it was more like ‘ok what’s the status now?’ ‘We should probably communicate something now’ and so I think it became a little more ad hoc I think we could have done it more structured, more planned and with a real project group. (Respondent 5)

This theme was shown when many of respondents mentioned a lack of clear appointed change leaders as a lack of leadership and structure during organizational change processes. Another respondent that saw the lack of clear change leaders as an obstacle expressed:

It’s a lot of system solutions and it is a very complicated work and I am a bit worried that there is no one that takes the flag and clearly leads the work I think, so that is a challenge. (Respondent 12)
When asked, the same respondent replied that the obstacles in the current change process was the lack of that leadership: “...the biggest obstacle now is that no one takes the lead, there is no one that owns the change, so that I see as the biggest problem right now”. Finally, one respondent that recognized the need for a special appointed change leader explained that he was in the way of hiring a person with a specific role as change leader when he explained his change strategy. He expressed that this was a result of learning by the experience of past changes: “Maybe part of what one has seen and learned about past change projects is that... that it is important to have one person full time that can help me in my role to drive change...” (Respondent 13).

At last one respondent with a very long work trajectory in the organization expressed that the best change processes she had seen in her history with the company had been those changes that were:

Where they have had a strategy, when they knew where they wanted to go and why they wanted to get there, they could communicate, they could build and combine a strategy with the goals of individuals, they could spread it, construct it and keep it together, communicate and keep the contact so people were motivated. (Respondent 17).

Rapid changes

The following theme refers to the speed of change and the impact it has on individuals. One of the most common themes among respondents were references to the speed of change, particularly the desire for faster and more agile change processes. Many respondents believed that slow change processes cause a great amount of uncertainty and, as an effect of that uncertainty, also a great decrease in productivity. One respondent that mentioned the speed of change as something to improve for future change processes expressed:

Some people within my team, that thought that things moved super fast but for me, they made a big announcement in the early part of July and a lot of people went on vacation for a month and then this went over everyone’s head and created a lot of internal anxiety and you know people questioning their organizational belonging and questioned what the company was doing and why and we had some people during that process that took the opportunity to explore jobs outside of Sandvik. (Respondent 1)

According to respondent 1, the delay in the change process not only caused uncertainty but also caused employees to lose faith in the organization and turnover. Another respondent who shared her view about slow change processes and employee turnover described that waiting on decisions obligated people to look for other options and question the organization. She expressed the importance of moving fast with the change by saying:

Once you get your plan laid out or your restructuring plan laid out then you need to move quickly you can't move slow you got to be quick you got to give people the
information quickly you got to let them know where they stand through the reorganization and what their options are, you can’t drag it out you can’t continue you know , showing timelines and time plans that have no substance to them that doesn’t tell them exactly where they stand, how they are going to be affected. (Respondent 11).

Another respondent that mentioned the influence that time takes on uncertainty described that waiting too long for decisions and information slowed down the organization. He mentioned that it is better to wait until there is more information than go out with information of change in an earlier process:

The whole organization becomes very nervous like ‘ok maybe I will lose my job’ and then nothing happens for six months and then after six months ‘yeah well now we know how many we will be and who it will be’ but in the whole six months the whole organization is nervous and waiting. (Respondent 6)

At last some respondents mentioned a fast change process was something that they considered was good during the last change process, as one respondent replied: “It is good that it went really fast and that is good, you should not drag this out for unnecessary long periods of time...it went fast and that is good otherwise it would have been painful...” (Respondent 19).

**Eagerness of change**

The following theme refers to a tendency and eagerness of the organization to start change processes. According to employees this was a success factor for the organization but mostly an obstacle since this eagerness to start changes often resulted in unorganized, unstructured and incomplete changes that lowered employees trust in management. The tendency to start change processes was also seen as the inability of the organization to correctly analyze the current situation and assess the need for change. One respondent that explained the paradox of the positive and negative aspects of the eagerness to change expressed the following:

I think there is an ability to see the need for change because I believe that the organization purely and generally is very eager to start up like ‘this is what we will implement' which is good but there is also a tendency not to complete the goals with the changes, so it becomes rather a problem than something positive. (Respondent 5)

She explained that this could be seen as an obstacle by affirming: “...there is a tendency to start up new changes, new change, new initiatives instead of driving the change from start to finish and really implement what has changed in the organization...”. Another respondent described this tendency as erroneous behavior within the organization to fix effectivity issues:

We get suck in these continuous organizational changes. You change report lines and then nothing happens in six months, twelve months and then you get impatient and then you think ‘now we must change something’ and then you change the organization again and get new managers and try to find new ways instead of saying ‘to hell with
The same respondent continued to explain lean processes and the lack of these within the organization: “...if we look at Sandvik, we have not succeeded in fully implementing agile ways of working so that is also a sign that we have focused way too much on reorganizations and way too little in output and effectivity.”

Yet another respondent highlighted the need for the organization to look further and really analyze and understand the situation before deciding to do an organizational change:

I’ve been in the company for more than 20 years and I’ve seen a lot of reorganizations in this company and I think, the thing that I see we might do wrong in some cases is that we create boxes in the organization charts and we put you know, this makes sense but we don’t explain how we are going to work because if you really understand the task and the purpose of the function and the way you work, then the roles will come automatically but I feel often we do in the wrong order, we put roles in there and then we figure out how we should work. (Respondent 14)

At last one respondent with more than 26 years in the company illustrated this reliance to organizational change as the universal solution within the company, she said:

Sometimes we try to solve problems with organizational changes but in reality, is not the organization that is the problem. Maybe it is a process problem or a competence problem but we try to solve it anyways, very often, with an organizational solution but you might not solve the problem. If the problem is that we don’t have competencies, it doesn’t matter that we move boxes around.... I believe we have a reliance to change boxes around in the organizational schedule when in reality, the problem might be the process, do we have the right process? Do we have the right competencies? Do we have people that are motivated? Do we have managers that dedicate themselves to leadership and motivating people? We should maybe ask ourselves those questions. (Respondent 17)

**Intangible Aspects**

The following theme relates to factors of change regarding individuals. These intangible aspects include the psychology of change such as mindset and feelings of validation/appreciation as well as factors such as trust and respect.

Respondents showed this theme when answering questions about the biggest challenges when leading organizational change. According to respondents, one of the biggest challenges that the organization faces in change is changing people’s mindset. As one respondent expressed:

For most people, the biggest challenge is to change their mindset to accept the new situation, you talk to them, you explain, is not hard to get them to understand it but to really get them to accept it from their heart and also to buy in our new changes, our new approach and way of working, so this is the biggest challenge I think. (Respondent 3)
Another respondent described that the real change is to psychologically prepare individuals for the new change; she expressed:

Most important is the resistance that people that were habituated might have or that have been in the company for a long time functioning in some way and then suddenly a change comes and that change and those people I think could be one of the biggest challenges for the company because it’s a psychological change, not so much of activities because at the end, one can learn to perform some activity in another way but the psychological change that they face is where the most effort and most work will go. (Respondent 15)

Comments about mindset were also mentioned when speaking about the success factors for leading organizational change. Accepting that change is the new norm was mentioned by a variety of respondents as something that would benefit the organization.

This theme also arose when respondents spoke about transparency as a success factor for leading change in a global organization. According to respondents, transparency was key when leading organizational change because it showed respondents that the organization trusted its employees. For one respondent, this made a great difference to his trust in the organization:

The virtual trust and the other the transparency of the information because I feel we are much more transparent than before in Sandvik Coromant some information we could never get before but now we have almost all the informations that we need so this is a big difference compared to before. (Respondent 16)

Transparency was also named by some respondents as something that existed in the culture of the organization. Referring to the company culture as a success factor, a manager mentioned the following:

Fair play, openness, transparency and so on, my team they know I always tell them all that I can. They also know that there are things that I cannot tell but they know that I always tell them what I can and that creates credibility, they know that I am trustworthy, ‘if she says so, then it is so’. (Respondent 19)

Another manager mentioned that being transparent was something that helped them during the implementation of the last reorganization. According to him, trust, transparency and collaboration helped them reduce resistance and improve the work situation of many employees:

Transparency, I believe, we have tried as much as possible. All of a sudden, people that have worked in Japan have seen the market plan directly from us, not through their manager's manager's manager that might even have decided to keep some information from them. (Respondent 4)

At last, this theme emerged when talking about the need for showing respect and sensibility towards individuals during organizational changes. According to most respondents, having the ability to show concern about its people will always be a success factor for the company. As one respondent expressed,
giving support, showing respect and concern will always be an important factor during organizational changes:

In an organization and in changes and whatever in all countries in all times in all companies and no matter whether the change is good or bad, I think that the people who are responsible for it should always try to handle it with the most absolute respect for the people who they talk to because before employees, we are individuals and as you know even without arriving to reorganization people lose their jobs even just changing jobs or in some cases trying to relocate has an effect on people and it brings positive and negative and the people in charge of the change should respect this and be considerate on that and so try to help the ones who are suffering from the negative consequences and support the ones that are having positive changes (Respondent 9)

One respondent admitted that sometimes, people leading the change can have a tendency to focus on project management rather than on individuals. She explained that one of the success factors will be to move the focus back on the intangible elements of the change:

When we do these change processes you know the human factor must be, you know, the one who we need to put more focus on and the risk is to be you know more focus on the processes rather than on the human being. (Respondent 7)

According to some respondents, this also conveyed appreciating and valuing employees. As most believed that making people apply or reapply for new positions at the company during reorganizations was a sign of unappreciation and something that lowered the moral across the organization, as well as increased turnover. As one respondent expressed:

In the US to have people that currently have jobs or that have jobs that are going to be eliminated or maybe their function stays somewhat the same but changes some and to have them actually have to apply for a position is a very degrading, demeaning thing to do to an individual. (Respondent 11)

**Insufficient Communication**

This theme refers to the lack of consistency as well as a desire for more relevant communication during organizational changes. This theme also represented opinions regarding improvements in the ways of communicating. A great deal of respondents was satisfied with the frequency of information about current organizational changes; they were, however, unsatisfied with the content of this communication. Most respondents desired more information about how the change in question would personally affect them. One respondent that described the lack of specification in the communication expressed:

There’s been a lot of communication, but no answers so we communicated, yes this is going to happen, yes this is going to happen, we’re changing, we’re changing but we haven’t given the specifics of what the new organization looks like and what, how were going to actually transition into the new organization... they have communicated a lot but said very little if that makes sense, so there’s still a large part of the
organization that are still sitting out there waiting for 'ok so what does this mean to me?' and we haven't gotten to that point where we can tell people 'this is what this means to you'. (Respondent 11)

Another respondent described the uncertainty felt when the change was announced and not knowing how it would affect his economic situation:

At times even I could feel that the information that was shared was not really sufficient and it was shared on a need to know basis ... so when was the next round up communication that will come to you at that particular time it was not clear whether, in the beginning it was not really clear whether or how I would be affected with this change, will I be affected in a positive or negative way? and where the immediate manager that I was reporting to in India, he had the same information that I had so it was not really helping me to you know be comfortable in my own role... the information was not really sufficient and it was not really clear how the things will really go and so there was no particular communication saying that 'you don't have to worry' or something like that it just said that the change will happen and 'let's be ready for that!' (Respondent 10)

This theme was also shown when respondents spoke about the obstacles throughout the change process as they believed an inconsistency of communication was a cause. According to respondents, communication about the change was not consistent across the world with some countries getting more information than others. This was also a pattern seen in answers as employees with an operational role located in the Americas and Asia had trouble answering questions about change processes. Referring to this issue, Respondent 1 declared:

I thought we did a relatively good job in Europe despite all the challenges to sit and talk to employees and listen and handle it in a good way but in Asia they didn't really communicate much of everything. It was a bit... yeah, I don't know if it was communicated to be honest. (Respondent 1)

At last, respondents showed this theme when talking about the challenges of communicating. As some respondents expressed, communicating across the globe and with different cultures was a challenge that could be solved by using different ways and channels of communication. According to one respondent:

I would think the challenges would be to communicate and activate the organization I mean first of all to communicate in different ways. I don't think that just putting on the intranet maybe is the right solution, I think we have a lack of competence how we actually communicate to different stakeholders, I think you know being on top of you know, making a stakeholder analysis and communicate to the people through different channels, I think that is key but I don't think that we are always that successful. (Respondent 14)
**Motivational Change: Is it worth it?**

The following theme refers to opinions and experiences of factors that create motivation towards change. According to respondents, leading and implementing organizational change was something that took a great amount of time and energy since most respondents had to multitask and perform the task of change in addition to their original work duties. Furthermore, and because the consequences of the change many times conveyed hard times, motivating the change was considered necessary in order to facilitate the process.

Factors such as support, competence development, involvement, resources and a congruent justification of the change were named. This in addition to a relevant connection to the business were some of the factors that respondents believed would help the organization succeed in organizational change as well as create motivation. One respondent that illustrated the importance of explaining why the change would be worth it declared:

> Change takes time and the individual has to understand that it is worth it to spend this time on this. Everyone has it completely full with something else, one works, and works and works overtime and, it takes so much energy so why should we spend time on things that will take even more energy? Yes, because it is worth doing it, because it will be, the sun shines brighter over there. (Respondent 19)

This theme was also present when respondents spoke about resources and competence development and how these two would represent tools that could be used to lead and drive change in the best way possible. One respondent described the lack of change competencies in the organization and how competence development in change communication and leadership could help:

> We have the lack of competence in the organization about, you know change communication. I think more leaders should be trained in change communication. Just because we have an internal communication department doesn't mean that you know, they are the only ones writing the communication. (Respondent 14)

Some respondents illustrated this theme when they talked about support and understanding from the organization when performing organizational change. According to respondents, appreciation, feedback, social support and above all, understanding from managers was essential during organizational changes and more motivational than competence development. According to her: “... it’s always been that way that when HR changes there is no support because we are the support...” (Respondent 8). Respondent 8 continued by explaining that an understanding of not being able to provide the same kind of service when undergoing organizational change would be of great help for HR professionals:
That they can feel like they actually can prioritize certain things and that it is ok that I feel worried and that it is ok that I might not perform to one hundred percent and that I really have someone to have a dialogue with, that I think more that competence development. I believe it is more that they can feel like ‘I get as much support from the managers in this as I support them when they change’. (Respondent 8)

This theme was also present when speaking about career opportunities as one respondent spoke about the need to activate, re-energize and appreciate employees during organizational changes. When talking about factors that will help the implementation of the change, she expressed:

This is something that in my opinion Sandvik is not being so good at because when we went through changes, most of the time we created you know more fears rather than you know helping people to look at the future like you know a new opportunity or a new possibility to expand yourself or to expand your own abilities and your own area to act and this for me is the major risk when you do this kind of processes because if you don’t have with you the motivation the drive and the energy of the people, I mean you can do whatever change but it will never be you know really effective. (Respondent 7)

Finally, many respondents mentioned the importance of involvement as motivation during organizational changes. Respondents with a managerial as well as a more specialist and operational positions recognized that involvement in some part of the change process would increase engagement and by consequence also motivation for the change in question. One respondent that mentioned this declared:

I think this kind of exercise is really reassuring for me as an Indian participating in this kind of surveys considering that you know this initiative is being...taken by the organization I am working with to understand how the change went through because maybe this dialogue or feedback process was not there originally in the organization but when you are now working on this so we get to share our views and what we felt and what happened so I think that this is really good a possibility for us to interact and maybe understand what’s happening and at least share our concerns if not everything gets answered in this process like 'ok but at least we are able to express ourselves’. (Respondent 10)
**Motivation during change**

During the respondent interviews a section showing a list of five different factors based on Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) and McKenna and Beech (2014) was shown. Respondents were presented with instructions. They were asked to order the factors according to the degree of importance for their own motivation during change. They were asked to write a number on a scale of 1-5, where 5 represented most important and 1 represented least important. Figure 20 below shows the results of the mean responses from every group.
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*Figure 20.* Mean scores in the ranking of factors for motivation during change.
Statistically significant differences were found for the factor of participation/involvement in decision-making. According to a one-way ANOVA analysis ($F (3, 16) = 7.75, p=0.002$) this difference in scores was due to nationality. A Sheffe post hoc test showed that ratings from respondents belonging to Asia was statistically significantly lower ($M=1.7, p=0.004$) than Scandinavia ($M=4.4, p=0.004$) suggesting that for Scandinavian respondents, involvement was very important motivator during change while for Asian respondents it was the least important. Figure 21 below illustrates this difference.

*Figure 21.* Means for nationalities regarding involvement as motivator during change.
Significant differences between nationality groups were also found for the factor of strong leadership and competent leaders who lead the process (F(3, 16) = 5.61, p=0.008). A Sheffe post hoc test showed that ratings from respondents belonging to Asia was statistically significantly higher (M=4.7, p=0.032) than Scandinavia (M= 3.1, p=0.032), even though both seemed high. This result suggests that Asian respondents are more motivated by a strong leadership during change than Scandinavian respondents. Figure 22 below illustrates the difference in means between nations.

Figure 22. Means for nationalities regarding Leadership as motivator during change.
Finally, significant differences for motivators were also found among work positions on the factor opportunities for professional development and financial/material rewards \((F(2, 17) = 11.00, p=0.001)\). The Sheffe test showed that ratings given by management positions \((M=1.1, p=0.001)\) were statistically significantly lower than the position of specialist \((M=3.6, p=0.001)\) meaning that self-interests and rewards during change are more motivating to specialists than managers. Figure 23 below shows an illustration of these differences between positions.

![Figure 23. Means for type of position regarding self-interest factors as motivation during change.](image-url)
Discussion

A deeper discussion of the study’s results with a start point in the research questions is presented below. This is followed by a summary of the study’s final conclusions. Further, a discussion of the study’s methods will be presented along with recommendations for future research.

Discussion of Results

The purpose of this thesis was to investigate organizational change to find out how to successfully and effectively lead change in global organizations. This thesis shows that to achieve that, it is necessary to address and have strategies to fulfill the initially presented research questions. The research questions will be answered throughout this section along with a discussion of how these results compare to existing theories.

What factors enable and/or prevent the implementation of organizational changes?

Answers to this question will be divided into enablers and obstacles. Enablers signify factors known to facilitate and enable the implementation of organizational changes and obstacles meaning factors known to prevent the implementation of changes in the organization.

Obstacles

Results from both, interviews and surveys, show that a lack of a consistent structure in changes was an obstacle when undergoing organizational change at the presented organization. This is consistent with Beer’s (as cited in Hughes et al., 2012) code for organizational change where one of variables for success is P (process) and conveys having a well-structured plan for the change. According to the model, the plan for the change process should include the who, what, when, where and how of the process as well as a plan for minimizing expected resistance as well as the steps needed to create dissatisfaction. While some parts of the studied changes were present (such as the what, where, when), other parts were missing which could explain the varied results in experienced structure. No strategy plans for diagnosing and managing resistance for the investigated changes were present, which according to Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) is something that should also be part of a structured strategy for change. The lack of a general strategy to counteract resistance is also consistent with Beer’s (as cited in Hughes et al., 2012) code for organizational change where he clearly highlights the importance of including a resistance plan in the complete strategy for the change.
This perceived obstacle of a lack of consistent structure is also consistent to Kotter’s (2012) leading change model. According to Kotter (2012), performing the 8 stages in their chronological order was a success factor for leading change, not performing these factors was among the fundamental errors that most organizations commit. The investigation showed that only about 4 of these stages where performed to some extent of what Kotter described in his model. For instance, step 1: Establishing a sense of urgency. Here, a great majority of respondents believed that the organizational changes in question were necessary and urgent (although only one function reported more than a 75% urgency level). A great majority of answers in the survey (56 to 75%) also reported, a clear vision with the organizational changes in question which relates to step 3 (developing a vision and strategy); however, a clear strategy of how to achieve that vision did not appear in the results.

Results from the surveys also confirmed that the organization attempted to fulfill step 4 of Kotter’s (2007) 8 step model (communicating the vision); however, respondent interviews and surveys showed that this communication was not consistent all over the world and among positions which suggests that the organization has not used all existing possible channels and ways of communicating the vision. The lack of a consistent structure was also apparent in the chronological order that some of the studied functions chose when driving organizational changes; for instance, some performed step 4 (communicating the vision and change) before steps 2 (building a change coalition) and 3 (creating a strategy for the change). The need for more structure that participants showed could also be explained by what Rafferty and Griffin (2006) found in their study, which is that planned change decreases uncertainty in individuals.

Analysis from the interviews showed that another factor that prevented the implementation of changes were time constraints and a lack of specifically appointed change leaders. This suggests a lack of complete fulfillment of Kotter’s (2008) step 2 (forming a powerful guiding coalition) where he explains that having a team of appointed change leaders (20-50 in big organizations) would help transformation.

Results from both, surveys and interviews, showed that another obstacle preventing the implementation of changes was the lack of support in form of competence development and resources as well as lack of change competencies within the organization. This is consistent with Kotter's (2007) fundamental error that companies commit and the reason for creating success factor and step 5 in his model: Empowering and removing obstacles. This step says that failure to remove obstacles, which includes providing skills and tools to lead change, will not create the atmosphere needed for employees to have the power to act during a change process.
Besides the lack of consistent structure, competencies and support, another factor that prevented the implementation of organizational changes were: 1.) the amount of changes, 2.) the high frequency of these changes in the organization and 3.) changes of great magnitude. These results can be explained by what Rafferty and Griffin (2006) found in their study, that the frequency of changes has a negative influence on individuals’ reactions to change; more specifically, provoking anxiety, tiredness and exhaustion and leading to employee turnover. This could be a reason why respondents reported the frequency of change as an obstacle and something negative. This result is also very much consistent with the other aspect of change that Rafferty and Griffin (2006) found affected employees the most; namely, the impact. Transformational change such as change in ways of working, values, structure or strategy were found to induce uncertainty and vulnerability in employees leading them to turnover. These issues could be solved by performing more planned change, regulating those dimensions as well as developing strategies to deal with transformational change. Rafferty and Griffin’s (2006) findings showed that supportive leadership played a crucial role in all the salient aspects of change affecting individuals. Employees that reported more supportive leaders communicated that they experienced less psychological uncertainty, more planned change, less frequent change and less transformational change. Helping managers offer a more supportive leadership during changes would therefore help the implementation of future organizational changes by reducing uncertainty and negative reactions to change.

Kotter’s and Beer’s model for driving change is presented in this thesis and could be used as a guide for performing more structured changes. The perceived lack of change competencies and time were also obstacles in change processes that demotivated respondents when performing the change. Kotter (2007) proposes in his model the creation of a team of change leaders that can have the specific focus and energy to dealing with the change.

**Enablers**

It was observed that factors in communication such as clarity and clear and congruent justifications for the change were known for facilitating the implementation of change processes. The clarity in communication is something that McKenna and Beech (2014) as well as Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) argue can help employees see the need of the change as well as help minimize resistance. Results show that congruent and clear justifications of the change, besides being facilitators, were also seen as motivation during organizational changes. This can, in a way, be linked to Kotter’s (2007) step 4 when he argues that a congruent and credible communication was essential for motivating employees to change. Another factor facilitating the
implementation of changes was delivering a good justification for the change which according to McKenna and Beech (2014) could be done by communicating change in a way that shows stakeholders interests.

Interview results demonstrated that the speed of change (particularly fast change) was viewed as something that could be used to minimize uncertainty; therefore, facilitating change. No theories regarding the speed of the change were presented during this study. However, this factor could be more related to the speed of decisions during change rather than the change process itself. This since uncertainty in respondents as well as turnover grew as respondents waited for answers regarding their future at the company.

**Which are the success factors for leading change in a global organization?**

Both, analysis from surveys and interviews, show that concern for the intangible aspects of change, including human factors and transparency, played a crucial role in the success of the organization when leading change. Included in these human factors was the ability to show respect, sensibility and appreciation for individuals affected by the change. Interview results demonstrated that individuals’ mindset towards change was also considered a success factor for leading change. No theories regarding the importance of these human factors were presented in this investigation; however, according to Kotter’s (2012) management versus leadership model, satisfying basic human needs is something included in the task that leadership has when driving change. Based on that, this thesis affirms what Kotter (1995) suggested was one of the biggest barriers to change: that change conveys more than an organizational challenge, a challenge involving the psychology of change and the human factor.

Results from the interviews also showed that a global awareness, understanding differences in nations, values and perspectives and having diversity within the organization were success factors when leading change in global organizations. The understanding and awareness of different national cultures and individuals is something that matches Hofstede’s (2001) theory of cultural dimensions. According to Hofstede (2001) being aware that management and organizational practices differ depending on national culture is the first step for succeeding in motivating, managing and leading individuals in global organizations.

Interview results also showed that local awareness, understanding the local markets situation and being able to adapt to all local environments was a success factor in leading change within the organization. This can be consistent with Wursten’s (2008) theories of culture and change management, where he argues for the need to take different approaches to change depending on the local or national culture.
Finally, results show that having diversity, especially in perspectives, is a success factor. Involving people from different background and cultures when planning change could make the organization succeed in its quest of leading change. Although no theories handling the importance of different perspectives during change were presented, the involvement of people (for example: from the local markets) that can make valid contributions to the change was consistent with Kotter and Schlesinger (2008) arguments that different perspectives and contributions could help when those leading the change miss information about the change.

**What are the challenges when it comes to leading change in a global organization?**

Results show that one of the perceived challenges when leading change was an insufficient communication. Not being able to deliver a consistent communication across the whole organization, including all countries and levels, and using all possible ways of communication was something named by several respondents in interviews and surveys. This matches Kotter’s (2007) arguments in being the reason he created the fourth step: Communicating the change vision. According to Kotter in his article “Leading Change: Why Transformation Efforts Fail” one of the biggest mistakes that companies do is failing to use all the communication channels, thereby, missing to successfully communicate the vision with the change. Interview results revealed that being able to adapt this communication to the different cultures was a challenge possibly due to the lack of change communication and culture competencies in the organization. This is consistent with Rao’s (2014) arguments presented earlier, in that it is, in fact, a difficult task to lead change in an environment characterized by differences in national culture. In his model, Kotter (2007) suggests investing in competence development. Competence development in change management, leadership, and communication would aid in the effectivity of organizational changes. As was suggested by respondents, competence development in change communication could help in deliver a clearer, wider and more adaptable communication.

Results from respondent interviews show that another challenge when leading organizational change was a tendency in the organization to do organizational changes and an eagerness to start new changes. According to respondents this eagerness to produce new change caused the organization to start unstructured sometimes incongruent changes, often not completing the changes in their totality. This represented a challenge when it comes to dealing, driving, and believing in the change in question. This result could be, again, consistent with Kotter’s (2007) arguments of the fundamental errors that most companies commit when leading change and the reason he created
steps 7 and 8. Being mistakes that most companies commit suggests these can be important challenges for many organizations. According to Kotter’s (2007) step 7 (consolidating improvements and producing still more change), one mistake that companies make is to declare victories too soon leading employees to abandon the process of change and causing the organization to lose momentum. In the case of the investigated organization, it is suggested that moving on to new changes could be a way of declaring victory against current changes thereby causing the organization to lose energy, surrender and go back to traditional ways. An eagerness to change could have caused the organization to miss Kotter’s (2007) step 8: Institutionalizing new approaches. According to Kotter (2007), after a change is completed, it is important to have strategies for consolidating and adhering the new changes into the organization, otherwise the organization runs the risk of going back to old ways once the pressure to continue the change disappears. By starting new changes and abandoning old ones, the organization missed this step. Not completing or going through with changes could have been the reason that respondents perceived this eagerness as lack of structure. This, again, is consistent with Rafferty and Griffin (2006) which argue that the absence of plan and structure produces uncertainty in individuals.

Finally, interview results show that one of the challenges for the organization when leading change was a tendency to lead from a Swedish approach. According to respondents, having Swedish personnel in most global roles in the organization caused leading teams to focus more on issues concerning Sweden. Taking a Swedish approach in other cultures was perceived as a challenge and something that kept the organization from successfully leading change across all national borders. This is because, according to most respondents, the Swedish approach to change management did not work well in all countries. McKenna and Beech (2014) suggest the involvement of different perspectives and participants in the planning of change, this could also help bring insights in the values, situation and concerns of local markets and national cultures, enhancing in this way factors such as: transparency, appreciation, and global and local awareness. The involvement of different perspectives could also be a solution to one of the presented challenges to change found in this study. The tendency to take a Swedish approach to change could, indeed, be solved by involving different national cultures and perspectives in the planning and implementation of changes. Cultural competence development for managers could also aid in this question using Hofstede’s (2001) cultural dimensions theory presented here as a guide to understanding the behavior of different national cultures.
**Is there a difference in perspectives, attitudes, motivation and values towards change?**

Survey results show that there is indeed a difference in perspectives, opinions, values and attitudes towards change in a global organization. Statistical tests proved that this difference is attributed to nationality, age and position. The fact that significant differences in values, experiences and attitudes between nationalities were observed is something that according to Hofstede (2001) is expected in an international environment; however, differences in these factors between positions and age groups was unexpected.

**Nationality**

When it comes to perceived structure, a one-way ANOVA and a Sheffe post hoc test revealed that respondents belonging to the Americas region reported more structure than the Scandinavia region when rating the most recent organizational change. However, this difference in perceived structure between countries could be attributed to a downsizing process taking place in the Sweden-region at the same time as the reorganization in question took place. This could explain the perceived lack of structure among Scandinavian respondents. This could also explain significant differences between Europe and Scandinavia in ratings regarding the organization's abilities to lead change where Europe reported higher ratings than Scandinavia.

Survey results and analysis showed a difference in national cultures when it comes to Hofstede’s (2001) power distance dimension. European respondents appeared to have a higher desire for more equal distributions of power during change (more democracy and transparency) than Scandinavian respondents. This result can be considered as being inconsistent with Hofstede’s (2001) cultural dimensions theory since according to his findings, European countries tend to have a higher tolerance for unequal distributions of power than Scandinavian countries.

Survey results also found differences between nationalities when it comes to the dimension of individualism where American and European countries appeared to be more individualistic than Scandinavian and Asian respondents by, for instance, expressing a stronger desire for the change to provide individual benefits. Although not showing great differences in the individualism dimension between Scandinavian and European countries in Hofstede’s (2001) work, it is highlighted in his work that the United States, Canada and Great Britain (belonging to the Americas and European region) showed the highest level of individualism. This could suggest that the result could be consistent with Hofstede’s work; however, significant results also showed that in the collectivism dimension (which is low individualism) Europe and Asia scored higher, showing a stronger desire for collective
benefits during change than Scandinavia and the Americas. This is in part consistent with Hofstede’s (2001) work, since most Asian countries appear to score low on individualism; it is, however, not consistent with the fact that Europeans also scored low individualism on this question. This contradicts previous results. A reason for this could be due to the fact that nationalities were grouped into bigger areas (Europe, Americas, Asia, Scandinavia) instead of being analyzed individually.

Survey results demonstrated a difference in the dimension of masculinity and femininity where Asian and American countries scored higher on the masculinity dimension than European and Scandinavian countries. This is consistent with Hofstede’s (2001) work where Japan, Latin American and Asian countries and the United states all scored high on masculinity while the Nordic countries scored the opposite of that dimension (low masculinity, high femininity).

Interview results also showed significant differences when it comes to what motivates respondents the most during organizational changes. Although a strong leadership was a factor motivating most respondents, differences were shown between nationalities when it comes to both leadership and involvement. While for Scandinavians involvement was the most motivating factor towards change, for Asian respondents it was the least. Likewise, leadership was the factor motivating Asia the most during change while for Scandinavians it was lower (after team and involvement). This is also very much consistent with what Eroglu (2014) and Hofstede (2001) presented earlier that cultures scoring high in power distance do not appreciate involvement and have a higher preference for authority. According to Hofstede (2001) Asian countries are known to score high on power distance; the opposite applies to Scandinavian countries scoring the lowest. These results are therefore consistent with his theory.

Age

Surprisingly and although it was not the purpose of this investigation, differences in perspectives, attitudes and experiences of change were found among respondents between age groups and positions. Survey results showed statistical significant differences in experienced structure between age groups where the age group 46-55 years old reported less perceived structure than other age groups. Results also showed differences between age groups when it comes to questions measuring the uncertainty avoidance dimension. Some age groups demonstrated, a higher level of uncertainty avoidance by wanting more structure in change (46-55 years) as well as a lower preference for less secure/proven approaches and methods in change (56 + years). When it comes to perceived necessity for the change in question, survey respondents differed in age with the age group, 36-45-years, feeling a greater
need for the current change than the age group 46-55 years old. The fact that older age groups seem to be more critical/skeptical towards change could rely in the fact to them having had longer experiences of change within the organization; however, the history of employment with the company was not something that was analyzed/investigated. Finally, survey results also found a difference between age regarding the dimension of power distance where the age group 46-55 years had a significantly higher acceptance of hierarchy than age groups 36-45 and 56 years and older. No theories regarding the effect of age on perspectives were explored during this study. The fact that a certain group of respondents seemed more critical towards change and less tolerant of uncertainty suggests the need for a more sensitive approach to change regarding these groups.

**Position**

Results showed a difference in perspectives and experiences between types of work position. Regarding questions about change processes, management positions gave significantly more positive ratings than specialist and operational positions. Management positions were; for instance, more positive towards improvements after change processes, the ability of the organization to deal with change as well as received support during processes. When it comes to the estimated effectivity of a decentralization process, management positions were also statistically and significantly more confident in the change process of decentralization than specialist or operational roles.

Respondent interviews also demonstrated a difference between positions when it comes to motivation during change. While respondents in specialist and operational roles rated opportunities and rewards as providing some motivation during change for management positions this factor was the least motivating. The fact that management positions had a more positive view of the organization’s process during changes could be due to the fact of them having more information about the purpose, strategies and effects of the change. What these results suggest is that the more information respondents have, the more satisfied they could become with the change. However, differences in motivation during change between management and specialist/operational positions is unknown and would require more investigation. Whether the type of position could affect views about change and motivation was not something that was explored during this study.

This interesting finding is essential for organizations when it comes to motivating change but also for motivation purposes in general. Being aware of these differences and investigating them further could therefore bring further insights and good consequences for the organization. The unequal experiences of change and information between positions is something that
should be further analyzed. Could unequal distribution of information lead to dissatisfaction and confusion during organizational changes?

These findings also call for a deeper survey study focusing solely on motivation factors. Is the organization aware of the differences in motivation between national cultures and types of work positions? This could be useful not only for motivating employees in its future change efforts but also for different organizational purposes

Conclusions

The overall conclusions of this thesis are that to lead change, global organizations must consider and have strategies to address factors related to the change process, the intangible human aspects of the change, the challenges of leading change globally and finally strategies to deal with differences in motivation, attitudes and perspectives of the change among employees. These factors are represented into the earlier presented research questions and are described below.

**Change Processes.** This investigation has succeeded in showing those aspects of organizational changes that obstructed the implementation process and caused the most uncertainty and dissatisfaction. The lack of structure, lack of support, the combination of frequent changes with the magnitude of these and the amount of change in the organization were impediments during change processes. Further obstacles included the lack of clarity in justifications for the change as well as the lack of clarity in information. To facilitate the implementation of the change process, it was therefore crucial to improve these aspects as well as have a congruency in the reasons for the change and speed up change processes and decisions to minimize uncertainty.

**Intangible Aspects.** Results demonstrated that to effectively lead change, global organizations must focus on enhancing factors that relate to individuals and their motivation. Factors such as mindset and transparency during change were seen as success factors. Furthermore, showing appreciation, respect, trust, sensibility, and social support were also identified as success factors for leading change in a global organization. This study found that besides a concern for tangible aspects, factors aiding the success of the change were also a global and local awareness and diversity.

**Challenges.** It was observed that the ability to adapt locally to different cultures and maintain a global way of working was a challenge when leading change. A related challenge lied in the organization’s tendency to lead change from a Swedish approach and perspective. Further challenges were identified when it comes to delivering a widespread, adaptable, complete and consistent communication as well as management’s attitude of eagerness towards starting change.
**Differences.** Finally, results demonstrated differences in attitudes, perspectives and values towards change between age groups, work positions and nationalities. Results from respondent interviews also showed a difference in motivation factors during change between nationality and position.

The most important insights that this investigation has brought is the awareness that in order to successfully lead change, organizations must go beyond improving and developing change processes. Besides providing structure, stability, congruency, proper communication and tools; the challenges for global organizations when leading change lie in enhancing the intangible aspects of the organization. Cultural understanding and awareness, satisfying human needs by showing appreciation, transparency and respect in times of organizational uncertainty are some of the identified intangible aspects. These in combination to motivating, generating trust, urgency and acceptance for the change and organization as well as developing mindsets compatible with change are crucial for its success. It is therefore suggested that what Kotter (2012) argued happens in many organizations can also be true for the investigated organization. The fact that the issue with change is not only one of a change management nature but one of leadership.
Method Discussion

Methodological triangulation was used throughout this study with the purpose of acquiring a deeper and wider picture of attitudes, experiences and perspectives of change in a big and complex organization. This research strategy allowed the investigation to obtain different types of information (qualitative and quantitative) which served the function of providing a richer and more valid result. The use of surveys provided a representative result while qualitative semi-structured interviews provided the study with a deeper understanding of the change phenomenon.

Factors affecting the validity of surveys was the approximate total response rate of 43% which, depending on the source, could be considered between acceptable and low (Wiseman & Billington, 1984). Another factor was the omission of certain answers during statistical analysis due to the fact that some respondents did not manage to answer certain questions. Another drawback throughout this method was failure to get answers from respondents belonging to the finance and pricing function that are stationed outside of Sweden. This was due to the researcher’s unawareness of a global organization within the finance and pricing function. A majority of survey respondents were Swedish which could have affected results in a number of ways. The representation of different countries was too small for them to be correctly analyzed as one country, because of this, countries were grouped into continents. This could explain the incongruences of certain results (For example contradictions in individualism scores) since countries within the same group could have shown potential differences in national values between them. Finally results from the reliability analysis showed a low Cronbach’s Alpha score for those questions measuring the dimension of uncertainty avoidance, power distance and collectivism. This indicates a low reliability on those dimensions which could signify that those questions have measured other ideas than what they intended to.

More than half of all interviews were performed virtually through a video-conference program or by telephone; however, some connection problems were experienced during some of these interviews. The connection problems caused disruptions in the voice and, as a result, words and pieces of information were missed. Time constraints were present, due to some respondents taking longer time than others to respond interview questions or due to technology problems. As a consequence, the researcher was restricted in asking follow-up questions or in some cases not being able to ask all important questions in the interview template. This could have resulted in the investigation missing important parts of information.

Finally, and as it is the nature of all qualitative interviewing, the face to face presence of the researcher as well as lack of anonymity during the interview
could have caused respondents to unconsciously make attempts to satisfy that which they believed the researcher wanted to hear. Consequently, their answers could have turn out to be dishonest in some cases. To increase objectivity, avoidance of showing personal opinions and views during interviews and analysis was attempted.

Besides these drawbacks, I hope this thesis has managed to present a view of the challenges, obstacles, success factors, and differences of change values and perspectives in a global organization.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

This thesis succeeded in finding differences in values, perspectives and motivation of change among different national cultures. A greater, more thorough investigation that studies the difference among cultures when it comes to motivational factors during change would bring more understanding to the subject of leading change across countries and national cultures.

Since some aspects that could be related to organizational culture (values, mindset and eagerness to change) were found to be both success factors and challenges to driving change in a global organization, a further investigation of the role that organizational culture plays when leading change across nations could help bring insights on how organizational culture can help or obstruct change in an international environment.

Finally, and because statistically significant differences were found among age groups and positions, it would be interesting to investigate differences of change values and perspectives between age groups and see the role that generation plays when it comes to change. At last, a further investigation on the role that type of work position has when it comes to change would also shed light and further insights on how to lead change in organizations.
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Appendix A
Intervjumall- Informant (Svenska)

Bakgrundsinformation
- Befattning/tid på företaget
- Ålder
- Nationalitet/arbetsplobtsområde
- Kort beskrivning av arbetsuppgifter

Förändringsprocesser
1. Hur mycket information finns det tillgänglig om den aktuella decentraliseringen inom organisationen?
   - Hur mycket information har du fått?
   - Hur mycket information har du om tidigare omorganisationer (till exempel: de senaste inom sälj och marketing funktioner)?
2. Hur har de senaste stora förändringarna (mer specifikt decentraliseringen) kommunicerats?
   - Vad ingick i den kommunikationen? (Ex: vilka som berördes, vem skulle driva den, förändringens rättsfärdigandet, företagets vision, etc.)
3. Hur har detta skilt sig från hur tidigare omorganisationer/förändringar kommunicerades?
4. Finns det en strategi för hur man ska bemöta decentraliseringen?
   - Vad innebär strategin?
   - Har de funnits strategier vid tidigare förändringar?
5. Har de som berörts fått stöd?
6. De ansvariga för att leda den här processen (förändringsagenterna), har de den kompetens som behövs för att leda förändringen?
7. Har Top Management/HR den kompetens som behövs för att leda förändringen?
   - Stötta personal?
8. Har man under dessa förändringar (tidigare som aktuella) jobbat med företagets kultur?
   - I så fall, på vilket sätt?

Upplevelser av förändring
9. Hur påverkas du nu av den decentraliseringen som pågår?
10. Vilken är din upplevelse av den förändringen?
   - Vad är bra med den?
   - Vad kan utvecklas?
11. Känns det som att den förändringen behövs?
   - Har det känts så vid tidigare förändringar?
12. Från dina erfarenheter, har tidigare omorganisationer fungerat bra?
   - I så fall på vilket sätt?
   - Om inte, varför?
13. Känns beslut om förändring rättvist?
14. Hur upplever du att högsta ledning motiverar personalen när det kommer till förändring?
15. Finns det motstånd från personalen mot den aktuella förändringen?
   - Har det funnits mot tidigare?
16. Vad behöver organisationen göra nu för att den aktuella förändringen ska bli så framgångsrik som möjligt?
   - Vad behövs det inom organisationen för att framtida förändringar ska bli så framgångsrika som möjligt?
Appendix B

Modelo de entrevista – Informante (Português)

Informação
• Posição / tempo na empresa
• Era
• Nacionalidade / área de trabalho
• Breve descrição dos deveres de trabalho

Processos de mudança
1. Quanta informação existe sobre a descentralização atual dentro da organização?
   - Quantas informações você recebeu?
   - Quantas informações você tem sobre reorganizações anteriores (por exemplo, o mais recente nas funções de vendas e marketing)?
2. Como as recentes mudanças organizacionais recentes (mais especificamente a descentralização) foram comunicadas?
   - O que foi incluído nessa comunicação? (Ex: quem seria afetado, quem o operaria / lideraria a mudança, mudaria a justificativa, visão, etc.)
3. Como isso é diferente de como as reorganizações e mudanças anteriores foram comunicadas?
4. Você sabe se existe uma estratégia para responder a descentralização atual?
   - Se então; O que essa estratégia implica?
   - Havia estratégias no passado para mudanças anteriores?
5. Os participantes afetados por esta descentralização receberam suporte?
6. As pessoas responsáveis por liderar esse processo (agentes de mudança); Eles têm as habilidades necessárias para liderar a mudança?
7. O Top Management e o RH possuem as habilidades necessárias para liderar a mudança?
   - Suporte funcionários?
8. Durante essas mudanças (passado e presente); A organização trabalhou com a cultura da empresa?
   - Nesse caso, de que maneira?

Experiências de mudança
9. Como você está afetado pela descentralização que está acontecendo?
10. Qual é a sua experiência com esta mudança organizacional?
    - O que é bom nisso?
    - O que poderia ser desenvolvido?
11. Você sente que a mudança é necessária?
    - Há sido esse o caso durante as mudanças anteriores?
12. De sua experiência, as reorganizações anteriores e / ou as mudanças organizacionais funcionaram bem?
    - Nesse caso, de que maneira?
    - Se não, por quê?
13. Sente que a tomada de decisões sobre as mudanças organizacionais é justa?
14. Como a alta gerência motiva a equipe quando se trata de mudanças?
15. Existe resistência da equipe para a mudança atual?
    - Houve resistência às mudanças organizacionais anteriores?
16. O que a organização precisa fazer ou tem agora para que a mudança atual seja tão bem-sucedida quanto possível?
    - O que a organização precisa fazer ou tem para que futuras mudanças sejam tão bem-sucedidas quanto possível?
Appendix C
Interview template- Informant (English)

Background information
• Position / time at the company
• Age
• Nationality / work area
• Brief description of work duties

Change processes
1. How much information there is available about the current decentralization within the organization?
   -How much information have you received?
   -How much information do you have about previous reorganizations (for example; the latest in the sales and marketing functions)?
2. How have recent major organizational changes (more specifically decentralization) been communicated?
   -What was included in that communication? (Ex: who would be affected, who would operate it/lead the change, change justification, vision, etc.)
3. How is this different from how previous reorganizations and changes were communicated?
4. Do you know if there is a strategy for how to respond to the current decentralization?
   - If so; what does that strategy imply?
   -Were there strategies in the past for previous changes?
5. Have the affected employees by this decentralization received support?
6. The persons responsible for leading this process (change agents); do they have the skills needed to lead change?
7. Has Top Management and HR the necessary skills to lead change?
   -Support employees?
8. During these changes (past and present); has the organization worked with the company's culture?
   -In that case, in which way?

Experiences of change
9. How are you affected by the decentralization that is going on?
10. What is your experience of this organizational change?
    -What is good about it?
    -What could be developed?
11. Do you feel that the change is needed?
    -Has that been the case during previous changes?
12. From your experience, have previous reorganizations and/or organizational changes worked well?
    -In That case, in what way?
    -If Not, why?
13. Does it feel like the decision-making on organizational changes is fair?
14. How does top management motivate the staff when it comes to change?
15. Is there resistance from staff to the current change?
    - Have there been resistance to previous organizational changes?
16. What does the organization need to do or have now in order for the current change to be as successful as possible?
    -What does the organization need to do or have in order so that future changes will be as successful as possible?
Appendix D
Survey-Marketing & Communications

### Information
Welcome! The purpose of this survey is to investigate organizational change at Sandvik Coromant. This survey will take around 5-7 minutes to complete. Your responses will be completely confidential and private. Thank you so much for your participation.

### Background

#### 2.1 Under which of these functions do you work?
- Marketing and Communication
- IT
- Finance and Pricing
- HR

#### 2.2 Demographics of work position:
- Management
- Specialist/Field operational
- Other
- Supervisory
- Support

#### 2.3 What is your nationality?

#### 2.4 What is your age?
- 25 or younger
- 26-35
- 36-45
- 46-55
- 65 years or older

### The Organizational Change Process of Reorganization
Choose the answer that best describes the process of the latest reorganization (within the marketing and communications function, the transformation into one global marketing that started in the spring of 2018).

#### 3.1 How urgent and necessary was the reorganization?
- Extremely urgent
- Extremely important
- Extremely necessary
- Extremely unimportant

#### 3.2 How clear was the vision with the reorganization?
- Extremely clear
- Clear
- Unclear
- Extremely unclear

#### 3.3 How communicated was the reorganization? (Ex. communication channels, congruent behaviors/deeds, relevance of information, information frequency, etc.)
- Extremely well
- Well
- Not well
- Extremely poorly

#### 3.4 How comprehensive was the information about the reorganization process?
- Extremely important
- Important
- Not important
- Extremely unimportant

#### 3.5 How well did the change fit in with the needs of the organization?
- Extremely well
- Well
- Not well
- Extremely poorly

#### 3.6 How structured was the plan for the process? (Ex. Change plan that included a vision, goals, milestones, what, when, who, etc.)
- Extremely structured
- Structured
- Not well structured
- Extremely unstructured

#### 3.7 How much support did you receive during that change process?
- None at all
- Little
- Moderate
- Extensively

#### 3.8 What kind of support did you receive during that change process?
- Psychological (personal dialogues, emotional support, therapy)
- Practical (administration, financial, work-related questions)
- Competence development (training, coaching)
- Did not receive support

#### 3.9 Who were the main sources of that support?
- Manager
- Coworkers
- Family and friends
- HR
- Other

#### 3.10 How much improvement in general, within the organization, have you seen after the transformation into one global marketing function?
- Huge deterioration
- Little deterioration
- Little improvement
- Huge improvement
4 Experiences and opinions about change

Choose the answer that best describes your opinion or experience about the question.

4.1 In your opinion, how well did Sandvik Coromant deal with the resistance during the organizational change? (transformation into one global marketing function)  
- Extremely bad  
- Not much trouble  
- None at all  
- Extremely successful

4.2 How successful was the reorganization? (transformation into one global marketing function)  
- Extremely bad  
- None at all  
- Extremely successful

4.3 How much anxiety, worry, and uncertainty did you experience during the last organizational change? (transformation into one global marketing function)  
- None at all  
- Extremely much

4.4 In your opinion, how well has the organization managed the uncertainty that has come with the latest organizational changes?  
- Extremely bad  
- None at all  
- Extremely well

4.5 How well does Sandvik Coromant lead organizational change?  
- Extremely bad  
- None at all  
- Extremely well

4.6 What do you need to feel better (mentally and psychologically) about current and future organizational changes?

4.7 What does Sandvik Coromant need to improve when leading organizational change?

5 General Perspectives of Change

Choose the degree of importance that every statement has for you.

5.1 How important is it to have absolute transparency about organizational changes within the company?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.2 How important is it to be consulted by higher levels in the organization about decisions regarding organizational changes in your area of work?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.3 How important is it to have a democracy at your workplace?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.4 How important is it to have good competent leaders that you can follow during organizational changes?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.5 How important is it to have a hierarchy system at your workplace?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.6 How important is it that the change process is well structured and planned?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.7 How important is it that the approach to organizational change is based on a ground of proven principles?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.8 How important is it that the approach to organizational change is based on what works best in practice?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.9 How important is it that the change process be flexible and changeable?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.10 How important is it that the organizational change benefits the organization as a whole?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.11 How important is it to develop team competencies during an organizational change?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.12 How important is it that it benefits my work and career?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.13 How important is it to offer individual career and development opportunities during an organizational change?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.14 How important is it that the organizational change maximizes economic value?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.15 How important is it that the organizational change develops organizational capability?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.16 How important is it for the change strategy to be implemented fast and with a clear plan of action?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

5.17 How important is it to have a slower but more thorough process and change strategy?  
- Extremely important  
- Not much important  
- None at all  
- Extremely unimportant

6 Thank you so much for your time. Have a great day!
# Appendix E

## Survey-HR

### 1 Information

Welcome! The purpose of this survey is to investigate organizational change at Sandvik Cominco. This survey will take around 5-7 minutes to complete. Your responses will be completely confidential and private. Thank you so much for your participation.

### 2 Background

2.1 Under which of these functions do you work?  
- [ ] HR  
- [ ] IT  
- [ ] Finance and Pricing  
- [ ] Marketing and Communications  
- [ ] Management  
- [ ] Supervisor  
- [ ] Support  
- [ ] Specialist/Field operational  
- [ ] Other

2.2 Demographics of work position:  
- [ ] 25 years or younger  
- [ ] 26-35  
- [ ] 36-45  
- [ ] 46-55  
- [ ] 56 years or older

2.3 What is your nationality?

2.4 What is your age?

### 3 The Organizational Change Process of Decentralization

Choose the answer that best describes the process of the current organizational changes (within the IT, HR, and finance and pricing functions, the decentralization that is planned to happen during 2017).

**3.1 How necessary is decentralization for Sandvik Cominco?**
- [ ] Extremely unnecessary
- [ ] Very unnecessary
- [ ] Somewhat unnecessary
- [ ] Rather necessary
- [ ] Extremely necessary

**3.2 How urgent is decentralization for Sandvik Cominco?**
- [ ] Extremely urgent
- [ ] Very urgent
- [ ] Somewhat urgent
- [ ] Rather urgent
- [ ] Very unnecessary

**3.3 How clear is the vision with decentralization?**
- [ ] Extremely clear
- [ ] Very clear
- [ ] Somewhat clear
- [ ] Rather clear
- [ ] Very unclear

**3.4 How communicated has the current organizational change with decentralization been?**
- [ ] Extremely well
- [ ] Very well
- [ ] Somewhat well
- [ ] Rather well
- [ ] Very poorly

**3.5 How comprehensible is the current information about decentralization?**
- [ ] Extremely comprehensible
- [ ] Very comprehensible
- [ ] Somewhat comprehensible
- [ ] Rather comprehensible
- [ ] Very incomprehensible

**3.6 How complete is the current information available about the decentralization?**
- [ ] Extremely complete
- [ ] Very complete
- [ ] Somewhat complete
- [ ] Rather complete
- [ ] Very incomplete

**3.7 How structured is the plan for decentralization?**
- [ ] Extremely structured
- [ ] Very structured
- [ ] Somewhat structured
- [ ] Rather structured
- [ ] Very unstructured
- [ ] Extremely unstructured
### 4 Experiences and opinions about change

Choose the answer that best describes your opinion or experience about the statement.

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>How much support (psychological, practical, competence development) do you think that you will be receiving during the decentralization change process?</td>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>In your opinion, how well is Sandvik Coromant dealing with the current decentralization process?</td>
<td>Extremely bad</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>How much impact do you think that Sandvik Coromant will have as a whole from the decentralization process happening at the IT, HR and finance functions?</td>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>How much anxiety, worry and uncertainty does this organizational change with decentralization make you feel?</td>
<td>None at all</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>In your opinion and expectations, how effective will the decentralization process be?</td>
<td>Extremely unsuccessful</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>In your opinion, how well has the organization managed the uncertainty that has come with the latest organizational changes?</td>
<td>Extremely bad</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>How well does Sandvik Coromant lead organizational change?</td>
<td>Extremely bad</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>What do you need to feel better (mentally and psychologically) about current and future organizational changes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>What does Sandvik Coromant need to improve when leading organizational change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5 General Perspectives of Change

Choose the degree of importance that every statement has for you.

<p>| | | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>How important is it to have absolute transparency about organizational changes within the company?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>How important is it to be consulted by higher levels in the organization about decisions regarding organizational changes in your area of work?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>How important is it to have a democracy at your workplace?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>How important is it to have good competent leaders that you can follow during organizational changes?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>How important is it that there is a hierarchy system at your workplace?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>How important is it that the change process is well structured and planned?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>How important is it that the approach to organizational change is based on a ground of proven principles?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>How important is it that the approach to organizational change is based on what works best in practice?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>How important is it that the change process be flexible and changeable?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>How important is it that the organizational change benefits the organization as a whole?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>How important is it to develop team competencies during an organizational change?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>How important is it that it benefits my work and career?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>How important is it to offer individual career and development opportunities during an organizational change?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>How important is it that the organizational change maximizes economic value?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>How important is it that the organizational change develops organizational capability?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>How important is it for the change strategy to be implemented fast and with a clear plan of action?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>How important is it to have a slower but more thorough process and change strategy?</td>
<td>Extremely unimportant</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Extremely important</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6 Thank you so much for your time. Have a great day!
Appendix F
Survey-IT; Finance & Pricing

1 Information
Welcome! The purpose of this survey is to investigate organizational change at Sandvik Coromant. This survey will take around 5-7 minutes to complete. Your responses will be completely confidential and private. Thank you so much for your participation.

2 Background
2.1 Under which of these functions do you work?
- HR
- IT
- Finance and Pricing
- Marketing and Communications

2.2 Demographics of work position:
- Management
- Specialist/field operational
- Other
- Supervisory
- Support

2.3 What is your nationality?

2.4 What is your age?
- 25 years or younger
- 25-35
- 35-45
- 45-55
- 55 years or older

3 The Organizational Change Process of Decentralization
Choose the answer that best describes the process of current organizational changes (the decentralization that was announced and planned to happen during 2017 from Sandvik Group level).

3.1 How necessary would decentralization be for Sandvik Coromant?
- Extremely unnecessary
- Very unnecessary
- Somewhat unnecessary
- Neutral
- Somewhat useful
- Very useful
- Extremely useful

3.2 How urgent is decentralization for Sandvik Coromant?
- Extremely unclear
- Somewhat unclear
- Neutral
- Somewhat clear
- Very clear
- Extremely clear

3.3 How clear is the vision with decentralization from the Sandvik group level?
- Extremely critical
- Somewhat critical
- Neutral
- Somewhat positive
- Very positive
- Extreme positive

3.4 How communicated has the current organizational change with decentralization been? (Ex: communication channels, congruent behaviors/results, relevance of information, information frequency)
- Extremely bad
- Somewhat bad
- Neutral
- Somewhat good
- Very good
- Extremely good

3.5 How comprehendible is the current information about decentralization?
- Extremely incomprehensible
- Somewhat incomprehensible
- Neutral
- Somewhat comprehensible
- Very comprehensible
- Extremely comprehensible

3.6 How complete is the current information available about the decentralization?
- Extremely incomplete
- Somewhat incomplete
- Neutral
- Somewhat complete
- Very complete
- Extremely complete

3.7 How structured is the plan for decentralization? (Ex: change plan that includes a vision, goals, milestones, responsibilities, what, when, etc.)
- Extremely unstructured plan
- Somewhat unstructured plan
- Neutral
- Somewhat structured plan
- Very structured plan
- Extremely structured plan
4 Experiences and opinions about change

Choose the answer that best describes your opinion or experience about the statement.

4.1 How much support (psychological, practical, competence development) do you think that you will be receiving if a decentralization change process occurs at Sandvik Conax?
- None at all
- Slightly
- Quite
- Very
- Extremely much

4.2 In your opinion, how would Sandvik Conax deal with a decentralization process?
- Extremely bad
- Bad
- OK
- Good
- Extremely well

4.3 How much impact do you think that Sandvik Conax will have as a whole from the decentralization process happening at individual functions within the organization?
- None at all
- Slightly
- Quite
- Very
- Extremely much

4.4 How much anxiety, worry and uncertainty does this organizational change with decentralization (at Sandvik group level) make you feel?
- None at all
- Slightly
- Quite
- Very
- Extremely much

4.5 In your opinion and expectations, how effective would a decentralization process at Sandvik Conax be?
- Extremely bad
- Bad
- OK
- Good
- Extremely well

4.6 In your opinion, how well has the organization managed the uncertainty that has come with the latest organizational changes?
- Extremely bad
- Bad
- OK
- Good
- Extremely well

4.7 How well does Sandvik Conax lead organizational change?
- Extremely bad
- Bad
- OK
- Good
- Extremely well

4.8 What do you need to feel better (mentally and psychologically) about current and future organizational changes?

4.9 What does Sandvik Conax need to improve when leading organizational change?

6 General Perspectives of Change

Choose the degree of importance that every statement has for you.

5.1 How important is it to have absolute transparency about organizational changes within the company?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.2 How important is it to be consulted by higher levels in the organization about decisions regarding organizational changes in your area of work?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.3 How important is it to have a democracy at your workplace?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.4 How important is it to have good competent leaders that you can follow during organizational changes?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.5 How important is it if there is a hierarchy system at your workplace?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.6 How important is it that the change process is well structured and planned?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.7 How important is it that the approach to organizational change is based on a ground of proven principles?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.8 How important is it that the approach to organizational change is based on what works best in practice?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.9 How important is it that the change process be flexible and changeable?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.10 How important is it that the organizational change benefits the organization as a whole?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.11 How important is it to develop team competencies during an organizational change?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.12 How important is it that it benefits my work and career?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.13 How important is it to offer individual career and development opportunities during an organizational change?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.14 How important is it that the organizational change maximizes economic value?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.15 How important is it that the organizational change develops organizational capability?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.16 How important is it for the change strategy to be implemented fast and with a clear plan of action?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important

5.17 How important is it to have a slower but more thorough process and change strategy?
- Extremely unimportant
- Slightly unimportant
- Quite important
- Very important
- Extremely important
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Appendix G
Respondent Intervjumall-Marketing (Svenska)

Bakgrundsinformation
- Befattning/tid på företaget
- Utbildning
- Ålder
- Nationalitet/arbetsplatsområde
- Kort beskrivning av arbetsuppgifter

Förändringsprocesser
1. Kan du beskriva (från början till slut) sista förändringsprocessen inom funktionen (transformationen i ”one global marketing” VT 2016)?
   - Vilka steg togs det? (Ex: Information, kommunikation, ansvariga, mål, åtgärder, m.m.).
2. Vad var anledningen till omorganisationen?
3. Har det funnits en genomtänkt förändringsplan som dikterade vem, vad, när, hur?
4. Har målen med förändringen varit realistiska?
   - Har det funnits delmål?
5. Hur mycket tydlighet fanns det i informationen under processen?
   - Fanns det en tydlig vision med förändringen?
   - Anledning till förändring?
   - Ansvarsområden?
   - Var informationen förståeligt?
6. Hur var kommunikationen under processen?
   - Hur kommunicerades förändringen för första gången? (När, var, hur)
   - Vilka medier användes?
   - Uppdateringar?
7. Vilka var de ansvariga för att leda den förändringen?
8. Hade de ansvariga de kompetenserna som behövdes för att leda förändring?
9. Har de berörda fått stöd under förändringen?
   - (Ex: Verktyg, kompetens, socialt stöd, m.m)
10. Hur behöll ni motivationen under förändringen och efter att det genomfördes?
    - Belönades ni?
    - Celebrerade ni?
    - Positiv feedback?
11. Fanns det motstånd?
    - I så fall hur hanterades det?
12. Hur har ledningen/organisationen konsoliderat de nya förändringarna?
    - Har de kopplat positiva resultat till relevanta förändringsåtgärder?
    - Hur gör de för att de nya förändringarna stannar inom organisationen?
13. Vilka har varit de största hinder i förändringsprocessen?
14. Vilka faktorer har hjälpt under förändringsprocessen?

Upplevelser av förändring
15. Hur påverkades du själv av den förändringen?
    - Vad stressade dig mest under förändringen?
16. Kändes det som att förändringen behövdes?
17. Hur skulle du utvärdera den förändringsprocessen som skedde?
    - Vad var bra?
    - Vad kunde utvecklas?
18. Vad krävs det av organisationen för att kunna ha mer tydlighet? En bättre kommunikation vid förändringar?
19. Från dina erfarenheter, har tidigare omorganisationer inom Sandvik Coromant fungerat bra?
20. Hur mycket osäkerhet kände du vid den förändringen?
   - Vad gjorde du och dina chefer för att hantera den osäkerheten?
   - Vilken del av förändringen gjorde dig mer stressad?
21. Hur var stödet du fick under förändringsprocessen?
   - Vad var bra med den?
   - Vad skulle du ha behövt?
22. Om du skulle kunna rangordna följande faktorer där 1 betyder minst viktigt och 5 mest viktigt. Vilken skulle motivera dig bäst under en förändringsprocess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faktor</th>
<th>Rangordning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medverkan/inblandning i beslutsfattandet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tydlighet och ordning i förändringsprocessen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Möjligheter till professionell utveckling och finansiella/materiella belöningar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark ledarskap och kompetenta ledare som leder processen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samhörighet, jobba som ett team där man stödjer varandra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Vilken/Vilka är de största utmaningarna med att leda förändring inom Sandvik Coromant?
24. Vilka anser du är framgångsfaktorerna för att leda förändring i Sandvik Coromant?
Appendix H

Respondent Interview Template-Marketing (English)

Background Information
• Position / time at the company
• Education
• Age
• Nationality / work area
• Brief description of duties

Change processes

1. Can you describe (from start to finish) the last change process within your function (transformation into "one global marketing" Spring 2016)?
   - What steps were taken there? (Ex: information, communication, responsibilities, objectives, actions, etc.).
2. What was the reason for the reorganization?
3. Was there a well thought-out change plan that dictated who, what, when, and how of the change process?
4. Were the goals for the change realistic?
   - Were these goals broken into milestones?
5. How clear was the information during the process?
   - Was there a clear vision of the change?
   - Justification for the change?
   - Was the information understandable?
6. How was the communication during the change process?
   - How was the change announced for the first time? (When, where, how)
   - Which media channels were used?
   - Updates?
7. Who was responsible for leading the change?
8. Did the managers have the skills needed to lead change?
9. The people affected by the change, did they receive support during the process?
   - (Ex: tools, skills, social support, M. M)
10. How did they manage to keep motivation up during the change process and after it was completed?
    - Did you receive awards/compensation?
    - Did you celebrate?
    - Did you receive positive feedback?
11. Was there any resistance for the change?
    - If so, how it was it handled?
12. How has the management / organization consolidated the new changes?
    - Have they linked positive results to the relevant change measures?
    - What did they do/are doing to get the new changes to remain within the organization?
13. What has been the biggest obstacle in the change process?
14. Which factors have helped the change process?

Experiences of change

15. How were you affected by this particular change?
16. Did you feel like the change was necessary?
17. How would you evaluate the change that took place?
   - What was good with it?
   - What could be better?
18. What is required of the organization to be able to have more clarity and a better communication during organizational changes?
19. From your experience, have previous reorganizations within Sandvik Coromant worked well?
20. How much uncertainty did this particular change make you feel?
   - What did you and your managers do to deal with the uncertainty?
   - Which part of the change made you feel most uncertain?
21. How was the support that you received during the change process?
   - What was good about it?
   - What did you need?
22. If you could rank the following factors, with 1 being the least important and 5 being the most important. What would motivate you the most during an organizational change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation/involvement in decision-making</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearness and order in the change process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for professional development and financial/material rewards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong leadership and competent leaders who lead the process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship and togetherness, working as a team that supports each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

23. Which are the biggest challenges when leading change at Sandvik Coromant?
24. Which are the success factors for leading change at Sandvik Coromant?
Appendix I

Modelo de entrevista-Marketing (Español)

Información general
- Posición / tiempo en la empresa
- Educación
- Edad
- Nacionalidad / área de trabajo
- Breve descripción de tareas laborales

Procesos de cambio
1. ¿Puede describir (desde el principio hasta el final) el último proceso de cambio dentro de su función (la transformación en "un marketing global" en la primavera de 2016)?
   - ¿Qué pasos se tomaron allí? (Ej: información, comunicación, responsabilidades, objetivos, acciones, etc.).
2. ¿Cuál fue la razón de la reorganización?
3. ¿Hubo algún plan de cambio que dictaba quién, qué, cuándo y el cómo del proceso de cambio?
4. ¿Fueron realistas las metas del cambio?
   - ¿Estos objetivos fueron divididos?
5. ¿Qué tan clara fue la información durante el proceso?
   - ¿Había una visión clara del cambio?
   - Justificación del cambio?
   - ¿Fue comprensible la información?
6. ¿Cómo fue la comunicación durante el proceso de cambio?
   - ¿Cómo se anunció el cambio por primera vez? (¿Cuándo, dónde, cómo?)
   - ¿Qué canales de medios se utilizaron?
   - ¿Actualizaciones?
7. ¿Quién fue el responsable/los responsables por liderar el cambio?
8. ¿Tenían las habilidades necesarias para liderar el cambio?
9. Las personas afectadas por el cambio, ¿recibieron apoyo durante el proceso?
10. ¿Cómo lograron mantener la motivación durante el proceso de cambio y después de que se completó?
    - ¿Recibieron premios / compensaciones?
    - ¿Celebraron?
    - ¿Recibieron comentarios positivos?
11. ¿Hubo alguna resistencia hacia el cambio?
    - Si es así, ¿cómo se manejó?
12. ¿Cómo han consolidado los nuevos cambios?
    - ¿Han vinculado los resultados positivos con las medidas de cambio pertinentes?
    - ¿Qué hicieron / están haciendo para que los nuevos cambios permanezcan dentro de la organización?
13. ¿Cuál ha sido el mayor obstáculo durante el proceso de cambio?
14. ¿Qué factores han ayudado al proceso de cambio?

Experiencias de cambio
15. ¿Cómo se vio afectado por este cambio en particular?
16. ¿Sintió que el cambio era necesario?
17. ¿Cómo evaluaría el cambio que ocurrió?
    - ¿Qué fue lo más positivo del proceso?
    - ¿Qué podría ser mejor?
18. ¿Qué se requiere de la organización para poder tener más claridad y una mejor comunicación durante los cambios organizacionales?
19. ¿De acuerdo con su experiencia, las reorganizaciones anteriores dentro de Sandvik Coromant han funcionado bien?
20. ¿Cuánta inseguridad le hizo sentir este cambio en particular?
    - ¿Qué hizo usted y sus gerentes para hacer frente a esa inseguridad?
    - ¿Qué parte del cambio le hizo sentir más inseguridad?
21. ¿Cómo fue el apoyo que recibió durante el proceso de cambio?
    - ¿Qué fue bueno?
    - ¿Qué necesitaba?
22. Si pudiera clasificar los siguientes factores, siendo 1 el menos importante y 5 el más importante, ¿qué te motivaría más durante un cambio organizacional?

| Participación en la toma de decisiones |
| Claro y orden en el proceso de cambio. |
| Oportunidades de desarrollo profesional y recompensas financieras / materiales. |
| Liderazgo fuerte y líderes competentes que lideran el proceso. |
| Compromiso y unión, trabajando como un equipo que se apoya mutuamente. |

23. ¿Cuáles son los mayores retos cuando lideramos el cambio en Sandvik Coromant?
24. ¿Cuáles son los factores de éxito para liderar el cambio en Sandvik Coromant?
Appendix J
Respondent Interview template-HR (English)

Background Information

- Position / time at the company
- Education
- Age
- Nationality / work area
- Brief description of duties

Change Processes

1. Can you describe the change process within your function that is scheduled to take place this year (decentralization of the HR function)?
   - Which steps are planned? (Information, communication, responsible, goals, targets, actions, etc.).
2. Is there a well thought-out change plan? *Both in your country and within the function as a whole.
   - Is it clear?
   - Does it dictate the how, when, where and who is responsible?
3. Are the goals with this change realistic?
   - Are the main goals broken into milestones?
4. How clear is the information about the change?
   - Is there a clear vision of the change?
   - Justifications?
   - Is the information understandable?
5. How would you describe the communication?
   - How did they announced the change for the first time? (Who, when, how)
   - Which media channels were used?
   - Updates? How often?
6. Who is responsible for leading this change?
   - Do they have the necessary skills to lead change?
7. Those affected by this change, will they be getting support?
   - If that is the case, what kind of support? (Ex: tools, skills, social support, etc.)
8. How will leaders keep motivation up during the change process and after it is completed?
   - Will there be rewards for the employees for reaching the goal?
   - Are you going to celebrate in some way?
9. Is there a plan to counter/handle resistance?
   - Has there been resistance during previous organizational changes?
   - If so, how did the organization handle it?
10. How should management consolidate the new changes in the organization?
   - How do you get the new systems, attitudes, behavior, and processes to remain in the organization?
11. What is and/or will be the biggest obstacle in the change process?
12. What factors have helped and will help in the change process?

Experiences of change

13. How are you affected by this decentralization process?
14. Is this change necessary?
15. How would you evaluate the current change strategy and process?
   - What's good about it?
   - What could be better?
16. From your experience, have previous reorganizations within Sandvik Coromant worked well?
   - If so, how?
   - If not, why?
17. How much uncertainty do you feel about this decentralization?
   - What do you and your managers do to help you cope with that uncertainty?
   - What part of the change makes you feel most insecure?
18. Have you received any support during this change?
   - If not, do you think you will be receiving support during the process?
   - What kind of support would you need?
19. If you could rank the following factors, with 1 being the least important and 5 being the most important.
   What would motivate you the most during an organizational change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation/involvement in decision-making</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearness and order in the change process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for professional development and financial/material rewards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong leadership and competent leaders who lead the process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship and togetherness, working as a team that supports each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Which are the biggest challenges when leading change at Sandvik Coromant?
21. Which are the success factors for leading change at Sandvik Coromant?
Appendix K

Respondent Intervjumall-HR (Svenska)

Bakgrundsinformation

- Befattning/tid på företaget
- Utbildning
- Ålder
- Nationalitet/arbetsplatsområde
- Kort beskrivning av arbetsuppgifter

Förändringsprocesser

20. Kan du beskriva den förändringsprocessen inom funktionen som är planerad att ske under året (decentralisering av HR funktionen)?
   - Vilka steg planeras? (ansvariga, mål, delmål, åtgärder, m.m.).
21. Vad är anledningen till omorganisationen?
22. Hur genomtänkt är förändringsplanen som finns nu?
   - Är det tydligt vad som ska ske, hur, när och vilka som är ansvariga?
23. Är målet/målen med den här förändringen realistiska?
   - Finns det delmål?
24. Hur tydlig är informationen?
   - Finns det en tydlig vision med förändringen?
   - Anledningar?
   - Är informationen förståelig?
25. Hur skulle du beskriva kommunikationen?
   - Hur kommunicerades förändringen för första gången? (Vem, när, hur)
   - Vilka medier användes/används för att kommunicera om förändringen?
   - Uppdaterar man? Hur ofta?
26. Vilka är ansvariga för att leda den här förändringen?
27. Har de ansvariga kompetenserna som behövs för att leda förändring?
28. Kommer de berörda att få stöd under processen?
   - Hur i så fall? (Ex: Verktyg, kompetens, socialt stöd, m.m.)
29. Hur ska man behålla motivationen under förändringsprocessen tror du?
   - Ska de berörda belönas för att ha nått målen?
   - Ska ni celebrera på något sätt?
30. Finns det en plan för att bemöta motstånd?
   - Har det funnits motstånd vid tidigare förändringar?
   - Hur har organisationen hanterat det?
31. Hur ska man konsolidera de nya förändringarna inom organisationen?
   - Hur ska man på bästa sätt behålla de nya system, attityder, beteende, processer inom organisationen?
32. Vilka har varit och kommer att vara de största hinder i förändringsprocessen?
33. Vilka faktorer har hjälpit och kommer att hjälpa under förändringsprocessen?

Upplevelser av förändring

34. Hur påverkas du själv av decentraliseringen inom funktionen?
   - Vad gör dig stressad?
35. Är den här förändringen nödvändig?
36. Hur skulle du utvärdera nuvarande förändringsstrategin och process?
   - Vad är bra med den?
   - Vad kan utvecklas?
37. Från dina erfarenheter har tidigare omorganisationer på Sandvik Coromant fungerat bra?
   - I så fall, på vilket sätt?
   - Om inte, varför?
38. Hur mycket osäkerhet känner du inför decentraliseringen?
   - Vad har du gjort för att hantera den?
   - Vad har dina chefer gjort för att minska den?
   - Vilken del av förändringen gör dig mer stressad?
39. Har du fått något stöd under den här förändringsprocessen?
   - Om inte än, tror du att du kommer stödjas under processen?
   - Vilken typ av stöd behöver du eller skulle du behöva då?
40. Om du skulle kunna rangordna följande faktorer där 1 betyder minst viktigt och 5 mest viktigt. Vilken skulle motivera dig bäst under en förändringsprocess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medverkan/inblandning i beslutsfattandet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tydlighet och ordning i förändringsprocessen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Möjligheter till professionell utveckling och finansiella/materiella belöningar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark ledarskap och kompetenta ledare som leder processen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samhörighet, jobba som ett team där man stödjer varandra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. Vilka är de största utmaningarna med att leda förändringen på Sandvik Coromant?
42. Vilka anser du är framgångsfaktorerna för att leda förändring inom Sandvik Coromant?
Appendix L
Respondent Intervjumall- IT/Finans (Svenska)

Bakgrundsinformation
- Befattning/tid på företaget
- Utbildning
- Ålder
- Nationalitet/arbetsplatsområde
- Kort beskrivning av arbetsuppgifter

Förändringsprocess
17. Hur mycket information finns det tillgänglig om den aktuella decentraliseringen som skall pågå inom organisationen?
   - Hur mycket information har du fått?
   - Hur mycket information har det funnits tillgänglig vid tidigare omorganisationer?
18. Hur har de senaste stora förändringarna (mer specifikt decentraliseringen) kommunicerats?
   - Vad ingick i den kommunikationen? (Ex: vilka som berördes, vem skulle driva den, förändringens rättfärdigande, företagets vision, etc.)
   - Vilka medier/kommunikationskanaler användes?
19. Hur har detta skilt sig från hur tidigare omorganisationer/förändringar kommunicerades?
20. Finns det en strategi för hur man ska bemöta decentraliseringen i individuella funktioner?
   - Vad innebär strategin inom din funktion?
   - Har de funnits strategier vid tidigare förändringar?
21. Kommer de som berörs att få stöd?
   - Har det funnits stöd vid tidigare omorganisationer?
   - I så fall, vilken typ av stöd? (Ex: Verktyg, kompetens, socialt stöd, m.m.).
22. Vilka är eller kommer att vara ansvariga för att leda den här processen (förändringsagenter)?
   - Har de den kompetens som behövs för att leda förändring?
   - Kommer de att få kompetensutveckling?
23. Enligt dig, hur ska förändringsprocesser vara utformade?
24. Hur kan man förbättra kommunikationen om förändringar inom Sandvik Coromant?
25. Hur ska man behålla motivationen under förändringsprocesser?
   - Ska de berörda belönas för att ha nått målen?
   - Ska ni celebrera på något sätt?
26. Finns det en plan för att bemöta motstånd?
   - Har det funnits motstånd vid tidigare förändringar?
   - Hur har organisationen hanterat det?
27. Hur ska man konsolidera nya förändringar inom organisationen?
   - Hur ska man på bästa sätt behålla de nya system, attityder, beteende, processer inom organisationen?
28. Vilka har varit och kommer att vara de största hinder i förändringsprocesser?
29. Vilka faktorer har hjälpt och kommer att hjälpa under förändringsprocesser?

Upplevelser av förändring
30. Hur kommer du påverkas av decentraliseringen?
31. Vilken är din upplevelse av den förändringen?
   - Vad är bra med den?
   - Vad kan utvecklas?
32. Känner du att den förändringen är nödvändig?
33. Från dina erfarenheter, har tidigare omorganisationer (både inom din funktion och inom Sandvik Coromant) fungerat bra?
   - I så fall på vilket sätt?
   - Om inte, varför?
17 Hur mycket osäkerhet känner du inför decentraliseringen?
   - Vad har du och dina chefer gjort för att hantera den?
   - Vilken del av förändringen gör dig mer stressad?
18 Har du fått något stöd under den här förändringsprocessen?
   - Om inte än, tror du att du kommer stödjas under processen?
   - Vilken typ av stöd behöver du eller skulle du behöva då?
19 Om du skulle kunna rangordna följande faktorer där 1 betyder minst viktigt och 5 mest viktigt. Vilken skulle motivera dig bäst under en förändringsprocess?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medverkan/inblandning i beslutsfattandet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tydlighet och ordning i förändringsprocessen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Möjligheter till professionell utveckling och finansiella/materiella belöningar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark ledarskap och kompetenta ledare som leder processen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samhörighet, jobba som ett team där man stödjer varandra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 Vilka är de största utmaningar med att leda förändringen på Sandvik Coromant?
21 Vilka anser du är framgångsfaktorerna för att leda förändring inom Sandvik Coromant?
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Respondent Interview Template- IT / Finance & Pricing (English)

Background Information
• Position / time at the company
• Education
• Age
• Nationality / work area
• Brief description of tasks

Change Processes
1. How much information is available about the current decentralization going on within the organization?
   -How much information have you received?
   -How much information has it been available in previous reorganizations?
2. How have the recent major changes (more specifically decentralization) been communicated?
   -What was that communication? (Ex: those concerned, who would drive it, the justification of change, the company’s vision, etc.)
     - Which media / communication channels were used?
3. How has this been different from how previous reorganizations / changes were communicated?
4. Is there a strategy for addressing decentralization in individual functions?
   -What does the strategy in your function mean?
   - Have there been strategies in previous changes?
5. Will those affected be supported?
   - Has there been support in previous reorganizations?
   - If so, what kind of support? (Ex: Tools, skills, social support, etc.).
6. Who is or will be responsible for leading this process (change agents)?
   - Do they have the skills needed to lead change?
   - Will they develop skills development?
7. According to you, how should change processes be designed?
8. How to improve communication about changes within Sandvik Coromant?
9. How to keep motivation during change processes?
   - Will the persons concerned be rewarded for having achieved the goals?
   - Do you celebrate in any way?
10. Is there a plan to respond to resistance?
    - Has there been resistance to previous changes?
    - How has the organization handled it?
11. How to consolidate new changes within the organization?
    - How to best maintain the new systems, attitudes, behavior, processes within the organization?
12. Who has been and will be the biggest obstacles in change processes?
13. What factors have helped and will assist during change processes?

Experience of change
14. How will you be affected by the decentralization?
15. What is your experience of that change?
   -What is good with that?
   -What can be developed?
16. Does it feel like that change is necessary?
17. From your experience, have previous reorganizations (both within your function and within Sandvik Coromant) worked well?
   -If so, in what way?
   -If not, why?
18. How much uncertainty do you feel about decentralization?
   - What have you and your bosses done to handle it?
   - What part of the change makes you more stressed?
19. Have you received any support during this change process?
- If not, do you think you will be supported during the process?
- What kind of support do you need or would you need?

20. If you could rank the following factors where 1 means least important and 5 most important. Which would motivate you best during a change process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation/involvement in decision-making</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearness and order in the change process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities for professional development and financial/material rewards.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong leadership and competent leaders who lead the process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship and togetherness, working as a team that supports each other.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. What are the biggest challenges to lead the change on Sandvik Coromant?
22. What do you think are the success factors for leading change within Sandvik Coromant?
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SPSS Significant Results for Marketing- One Way ANOVA

ANOVA (POSITION)
How well did the change fit in with the needs of the organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>15.598</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.899</td>
<td>2.906</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>93.922</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>109.520</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA (NATIONALITY)
How structured was the plan for the process? (Ex: Change plan that included a vision, goals, milestones, what, when, who, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>14.866</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.955</td>
<td>3.657</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>90.796</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.355</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105.662</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA (NATIONALITY)
How much support did you receive during that change process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>15.003</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.001</td>
<td>3.134</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>108.497</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>123.500</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA (POSITION)
How much support did you receive during that change process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>21.685</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.421</td>
<td>3.499</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>106.909</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>128.595</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA (POSITION)
How much improvement in general, within the organization, have you seen after the transformation into one global marketing function?
### ANOVA (POSITION)

How much anxiety, worry and uncertainty did you experience during the last organizational change? (transformation into one global marketing function)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>20.972</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.243</td>
<td>3.999</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>91.775</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.311</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>112.747</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA (NATIONALITY)

How well does Sandvik Coromant lead organizational change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>18.002</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>2.697</td>
<td>.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>115.147</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>133.149</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA (NATIONALITY)

How important is it to have absolute transparency about organizational changes within the company?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>14.110</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.703</td>
<td>3.957</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>79.636</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.189</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>93.746</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANOVA (NATIONALITY)

How important is it to have a democracy at your workplace?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>13.131</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.377</td>
<td>5.726</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>51.980</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.111</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Square</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Groups</strong></td>
<td>89.733</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>100.789</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA (NATIONALITY)**

How important is it to develop team competencies during an organizational change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Groups</strong></td>
<td>5.967</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.989</td>
<td>3.862</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Groups</strong></td>
<td>35.019</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>40.986</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA (NATIONALITY)**

How important is it that it benefits my work and career?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Groups</strong></td>
<td>16.476</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.492</td>
<td>5.372</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Groups</strong></td>
<td>69.524</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>86.000</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA (NATIONALITY)**

How important is it to offer individual career and development opportunities during an organizational change?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Groups</strong></td>
<td>10.701</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.567</td>
<td>3.535</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Groups</strong></td>
<td>68.618</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1.009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>79.319</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ANOVA (NATIONALITY)**

How important is it that the organizational change maximizes economic value?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Between Groups</strong></td>
<td>9.862</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.287</td>
<td>4.376</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within Groups</strong></td>
<td>50.335</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>.751</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>60.197</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How important is it that the approach to organizational change is based on what works best in practice?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>7.540</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.885</td>
<td>2.859</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>46.815</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54.355</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix O

**SPSS Significant Results for Marketing- Sheffe**

**Post Hoc Tests**

**Multiple Comparisons (NATIONALITY)**

Dependent Variable: How structured was the plan for the process? (Ex: Change plan that included a vision, goals, milestones, what, when, who, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) What is your nationality?</th>
<th>(J) What is your nationality?</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>1.16746</td>
<td>.39857</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>.74332</td>
<td>.45046</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>.07273</td>
<td>.62788</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>-1.16746</td>
<td>.39857</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>-.42415</td>
<td>.33967</td>
<td>.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>-1.09474</td>
<td>.55380</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>-.74332</td>
<td>.45046</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>.42415</td>
<td>.33967</td>
<td>.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>-.67059</td>
<td>.59224</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>-.07273</td>
<td>.62788</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>1.09474</td>
<td>.55380</td>
<td>.281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>.67059</td>
<td>.59224</td>
<td>.734</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple Comparisons (POSITION)**

Dependent Variable: How much support did you receive during that change process?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Demographics of work position:</th>
<th>(J) Demographics of work position:</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>.95000</td>
<td>.77067</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/Field operational</td>
<td>1.16622’</td>
<td>.34547</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>.06111</td>
<td>.49963</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.75000</td>
<td>.62238</td>
<td>.834</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>-.95000</td>
<td>.77067</td>
<td>.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/Field operational</td>
<td>.21622</td>
<td>.74723</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>-.88889</td>
<td>.82983</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-.20000</td>
<td>.90904</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/Field operational</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>-1.16622’</td>
<td>.34547</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>-.21622</td>
<td>.74723</td>
<td>.999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>-1.10511</td>
<td>.46264</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-.41622</td>
<td>.59309</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>-.06111</td>
<td>.49963</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>.88889</td>
<td>.82983</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/Field operational</td>
<td>1.10511</td>
<td>.46264</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.68889</td>
<td>.69429</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>-.75000</td>
<td>.62238</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory</td>
<td>.20000</td>
<td>.90904</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/Field operational</td>
<td>.41622</td>
<td>.59309</td>
<td>.974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>-.68889</td>
<td>.69429</td>
<td>.911</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple Comparisons (NATIONALITY)**

Dependent Variable: How well does Sandvik Coromant lead organizational change?

Schefte

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) What is your nationality?</th>
<th>(J) What is your nationality?</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>.41725</td>
<td>.37220</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.57955</td>
<td>.42702</td>
<td>.608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Multiple Comparisons (NATIONALITY)

**Dependent Variable:** How important is it to have absolute transparency about organizational changes within the company?

**Scheffe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) What is your nationality?</th>
<th>(J) What is your nationality?</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.77622</td>
<td>.29848</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>.33831</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td>.47156</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.77622</td>
<td>.29848</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25410</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41531</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.16043</td>
<td>.33831</td>
<td>.973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td></td>
<td>.25410</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td>.44480</td>
<td>.256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.74545</td>
<td>.47156</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td></td>
<td>.41531</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Multiple Comparisons (NATIONALITY)

**Dependent Variable:** How important is it to develop team competencies during an organizational change?

**Scheffe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) What is your nationality?</th>
<th>(J) What is your nationality?</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>.48019</td>
<td>.24499</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>-.13369</td>
<td>.27769</td>
<td>.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>-.14545</td>
<td>.38706</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>-.48019</td>
<td>.24499</td>
<td>.288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>-.61388</td>
<td>.20856</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>-.62564</td>
<td>.34089</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>.13369</td>
<td>.27769</td>
<td>.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>.61388</td>
<td>.20856</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>-.01176</td>
<td>.36509</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>.14545</td>
<td>.38706</td>
<td>.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>.62564</td>
<td>.34089</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>.01176</td>
<td>.36509</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multiple Comparisons (NATIONALITY)

**Dependent Variable:** How important is it that it benefits my work and career?

**Scheffe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) What is your nationality?</th>
<th>(J) What is your nationality?</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>.95105</td>
<td>.34520</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>.06417</td>
<td>.39127</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>-.21818</td>
<td>.54537</td>
<td>.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>Americas</td>
<td>-.95105</td>
<td>.34520</td>
<td>.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>-0.88688</td>
<td>0.29387</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>-1.16923</td>
<td>0.48031</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>-0.06417</td>
<td>0.39127</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>0.88688*</td>
<td>0.29387</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>-0.28235</td>
<td>0.51442</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>0.21818</td>
<td>0.54537</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td>1.16923</td>
<td>0.48031</td>
<td>0.126</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0.28235</td>
<td>0.51442</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple Comparisons (AGE)**

**Dependent Variable:** How important is it that the approach to organizational change is based on what works best in practice?

**Scheffe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) What is your age?</th>
<th>(J) What is your age?</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25 or younger</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>0.40476</td>
<td>0.51661</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>-1.2292</td>
<td>-2.0387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.37500</td>
<td>0.49725</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>-1.1977</td>
<td>-1.9477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.20833</td>
<td>0.49725</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>-1.3644</td>
<td>-1.0601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 years or older</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.15152</td>
<td>0.52890</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>-0.5213</td>
<td>-0.2880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>25 or younger</td>
<td>-0.40476</td>
<td>0.51661</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>-2.0387</td>
<td>-1.9477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02976</td>
<td>0.27308</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.8339</td>
<td>-0.9080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.19643</td>
<td>0.27308</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>-1.0601</td>
<td>-0.8339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 years or older</td>
<td></td>
<td>.74675</td>
<td>0.32717</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>-.2880</td>
<td>-.1586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>25 or younger</td>
<td>-0.37500</td>
<td>0.49725</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>-1.9477</td>
<td>-1.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02976</td>
<td>0.27308</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-.8339</td>
<td>-0.9080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.16667</td>
<td>0.23441</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>-.9080</td>
<td>-1.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 years or older</td>
<td></td>
<td>.77652</td>
<td>.29566</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>-.1586</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>25 or younger</td>
<td>-.20833</td>
<td>.49725</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>-1.7810</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>25 or younger</td>
<td>.19643</td>
<td>.27308</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>-.6672</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>25 or younger</td>
<td>.16667</td>
<td>.23441</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>-.5747</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 years or older</td>
<td>25 or younger</td>
<td>.94318*</td>
<td>.29566</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.0081</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 years or older</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>-1.15152</td>
<td>.52890</td>
<td>.325</td>
<td>-2.8243</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>26-35</td>
<td>-.74675</td>
<td>.32717</td>
<td>.277</td>
<td>-1.7815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td>-.77652</td>
<td>.29566</td>
<td>.154</td>
<td>-1.7116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 years or older</td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>-.94318*</td>
<td>.29566</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-1.8783</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix P
SPSS Significant Results for HR

One Way ANOVA

ANOVA (AGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>6.327</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.109</td>
<td>3.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>7.556</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.882</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Samples T-Test-Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How important is it that the change process is well structured and planned?</th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>F: 8.552, Sig.: .012</td>
<td>t: 1.850, df: 13, Sig. (2-tailed): .087</td>
<td>Mean Difference: -.55556, Std. Error: .30036, Lower: -1.20445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix Q

### SPSS Significant Results for IT

**Independent Samples T-test- Process**

**Independent Samples Test (AGE)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How necessary would decentralization be for Sandvik Coromant?</th>
<th>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td>6.250</td>
<td>1.297</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| How necessary would decentralization be for Sandvik Coromant? | Equal variances assumed | 1.131 | 4.024 | .321 | .91667 | .81052 | -1.32844 |

### One-Way ANOVA

**ANOVA (POSITION)**

In your opinion and expectations, how effective would a decentralization process at Sandvik Coromant be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>8.933</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.978</td>
<td>6.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11.600</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Sheffe Test

**Multiple Comparisons (POSITION)**

Dependent Variable: In your opinion and expectations, how effective would a decentralization process at Sandvik Coromant be?
Scheffe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I) Demographics of work position:</th>
<th>(J) Demographics of work position:</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Specialist/field operational</td>
<td>2.33333*</td>
<td>.54433</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>.54433</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist/field operational</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>-2.33333*</td>
<td>.54433</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>-1.33333</td>
<td>.54433</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Management</td>
<td>-1.00000</td>
<td>.54433</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Specialist/field operational</td>
<td>1.33333</td>
<td>.54433</td>
<td>.125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Independent Samples T-test- Perspectives

Independent Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.400</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two-Way Factorial ANOVA

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (AGE & POSITION)
Dependent Variable: How important is it to have absolute transparency about organizational changes within the company?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>7.722a</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.544</td>
<td>9.267</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>186.612</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>186.612</td>
<td>1119.675</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td>5.633</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.878</td>
<td>11.267</td>
<td>.039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age * Position</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>195.000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>8.222</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix R
SPSS Significant Results for Finance & Pricing

One-Way ANOVA

ANOVA

How important is it that there is a hierarchy system at your workplace?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>12.548</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.274</td>
<td>21.510</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.714</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sheffe Test

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: How important is it that there is a hierarchy system at your workplace?

Schefee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(I) What is your age?</th>
<th>(J) What is your age?</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>-3.16667</td>
<td>.49301</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-5.0040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>56 years or older</td>
<td>-.66667</td>
<td>.49301</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>-2.5040</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.16667</td>
<td>.49301</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1.3294</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56 years or older</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.50000</td>
<td>.54006</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.4873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 years or older</td>
<td>36-45</td>
<td></td>
<td>.66667</td>
<td>.49301</td>
<td>.471</td>
<td>-1.1706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46-55</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.50000</td>
<td>.54006</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-4.5127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix S
Cronbach’s Alpha - Perspectives of Change

Reliability

Scale: Low Power Distance

Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excluded(^a)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.667</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: Low Power Distance

Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excluded(^a)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.291</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scale: Low Uncertainty Avoidance

Case Processing Summary
### Scale: High Uncertainty Avoidance

#### Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases Valid</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excludeda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

#### Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.455</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Scale: High Collectivism

#### Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases Valid</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>98.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excludeda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.
### Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.594</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scale: High Individualism**

### Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excludeda</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.*

### Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.713</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>