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Abstract

Managing Organizational Change programs is a relevant and enduring effort for managers and modern organizations. One of the main reasons why organizational change programs fail or succeed is due to the way human resources are managed. With effect, the way how people are dealt with in these programs raises several challenges due to the different roles people can play in programs designed to transform and to develop an organization. With effect, people can have a profound effect on the way how an organizational change program reaches its effectiveness, as this raises tremendous challenges for Human Resource Management professionals.

This study main aim is to clarify the predictive nature of organizational change programs orientation in workers’ commitment to the organization, and also, to examine in particular, the role of perceived support in this relation. One hundred and fifty three workers of a Hotel Business Industry constitute the participants of this correlational study, proposing that organizational change programs orientation have predictive abilities over organizational commitment, and that perceived support plays a mediator role in this relation.

Main results provided empirical basis for our proposed model of analysis, based on which we have interpreted the theoretical, empirical and practical consequences of our findings.
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Introduction:
Whenever organizational development is in discussion, its commonplace to realize that there are a wide variety of issues worthy of consideration. With effect, the theme of organizational development is probably one of the areas where it’s possible to have in simultaneous several remits of research looking forward to contribute to relevant answers over diverse management challenges. We can observe this by simply putting into perspective the amount of research avenues able to be followed if we are searching for external or internal organizational development factors. With effect, there are several areas that deal with external challenges for organizations, as the way an organization is able to develop new products (eg.: Marketing); how it manages its image and reputation (eg.: Public Relations); how it becomes more sustainable (eg.: Corporate Social Responsibility). Likewise, there are also diverse areas dealing with internal challenges influencing organizational development, as the way an organization communicates with its internal publics (eg.: Internal Communication), how it follows internal procedures in order to maximize efficiency (eg.: Quality), or the way how the workers’ skills are managed and developed (eg.: Human Resources Management).

An interesting characteristic when we observe organizational development discussions, is that, despite effective efforts of managers, the areas that provide answers for real and profound problems are rarely integrated and/or combined, and usually follow uncrossed alignments. This is a serious problem for competitive and modern organizations, and widens the interest of researching over the broad issue of organizational change (OC), as this is probably one of the most challenging ones for managers. This standpoint is based upon the notion that it is possible to develop OC processes combining diverse possibilities of intervention and using both external as well as internal development factors, and thus, to fight back the problem of lack of management areas’ integration in organizations.

OC has a very broad remit of considerations, as there are virtually no areas in an organization that are excluded from change processes and intervention. With effect, it is possible to develop change processes in the “beginning of the line”, “during the processes”, and in the “end of the line”. If we consider that organizations can foster change processes based on strategy, structure development or market adjustment, this is clearly an area able to call for the contribution of various fields to outline what the organization should be in its “beginning of the line” moments. Likewise, it is also possible to develop several kinds of profound or superficial improvements regarding what the organization actually performs in its day to day basis, that is to say, in its “during the line” moments. Following the similar reasoning, it is also possible to develop organizational change regarding the way how an organization delivers its products or services to its customers and stakeholders in its “end of the line” moments. OC is thus a relevant and critical area of organizational development that has this unique characteristic of being able to stimulate management areas’ integration.

Regardless of what the OC processes’ aims are, a key issue that naturally emerges deals with the way how the workers are involved in the change activities, as most of these changes may rely on their active contribution. Furthermore, organizations that actually seek change on a daily basis, tend to be specially guided in valuing the workers’ contributions in process developments or process improvements, and providing them a relevant voice in the way how processes are conducted. As such, it is easy to conceive that OC processes depend on the workers’ valid ideas and involvement to produce results, but can we look at OC as a way of enhancing the workers’ commitment to the organization? Is it possible to conceive OC as an organizational principle and/or value that serves as a trigger for workers’ commitment? It is due to this matter in particular that our main aim of research in this paper is on the way how OC may be used to predict workers’ commitment. It is also our aim to study this relation using an organization of the hotel
business industry as a reference, as this is a strongly competitive market that is especially open to change processes leading towards excellence in performance.

**Theoretical basis of research:**

*People and organizational change*

OC is a strategic area that holds hands with profound organizational strategy and development intentions. Managing OC processes represents a strong and enduring path to build up structured courses of action and to make a firm more effective and efficient (Robbins, 1999). In fact, it is an area that allows organizations to adapt and to evolve in their contexts, especially in nowadays’ competitive markets, in which organizations struggle to find added-value to the way it performs and differentiates from competitors. This differentiation issue is clearly a relevant problem for modern organizations, as successful firms nowadays need to be ambidextrous (Raish, Birkinshaw, Probst & Tushman, 2009). This ambidexterity notion adapted to organizational management implies, simultaneously, an adaptive behaviour to new market demands and institutional field, while being efficient regarding current businesses demands (Gibson & Birkinshaw, 2004; Raish, Birkinshaw, Probst & Tushman, 2009). This also implies that relevant issues of organizational development and change, such as innovation, organizational learning or strategic management to have the implicit idea of exploration (the ability that an organization has to use its competences and to be effective in its market) and exploitation (the ability that an organization has to explore new competences and new market opportunities) as a requisite for organizational development and change.

For OC purposes, the tension between exploration and exploitation’s pressures does not imply one to replace the other, by the contrary, they are not independent and they imply management processes able to integrate both tensions (Lavie, Stettner & Tushman, 2010). Each tension demands for specific management processes, which can be enabled by OC programs, but both tensions call for integration abilities, as they are part of the same organization, identity and culture. As such, OC should be seen as much more than a way for organizations to react when facing difficulties, it should be seen as a way of life of modern competitive organizations, and as a way of minimizing the emergence of severe or superficial problems.

It is surely due to the diverse nature of OC and its ability to work as an area that makes use of wide competences of any organization, that defining it is a challenge. With effect, literature delivers a wide plethora of meanings associated with OC, in which is possible to outline that it relates to any structural, strategic and human transformation that produces impact in an organization (Wood, 2000). It can also be defined as the process of continually renewing an organization’s course of direction and structure in order to serve and to anticipate internal and external demands surrounding the organization (Moran & Brightman, 2001). We can also look to OC as having a strong processual approach, seeking to actively improve diverse needs of strategic and incremental development (Gayef, 2014).

The diverse possibilities of consideration surrounding OC are surely a reflex of the also diverse management areas seeking to deliver value for the purpose of organizational development. As such, the possibilities of practical approaches to change management are quite a few, most of them having its own requisites and sets of advisable actions in a step by step design. One of the most influential models in OC is Kurt Lewin’s three step model (1958), presenting an approach of action based on three main steps that underlie any OC process: (1) the “unfreezing step” of current status quo in organizations, workers’ behavior and habits; (2) the “change step” where new ideas, ways of performance and new references of
workers’ behavior are implemented; (3) the “refreezing step” where the new references introduced in the previous stages, namely in the social system are made secure and stable. Some years later, Schein (1987) has introduced some small clarifications in the model, explaining the existence of processes and mechanisms that allow for the three stages to succeed. Another example of these step by step models is Beer, Eisenstat and Spector’s Change Model (1990), proposing four stages of development, in which a strong emphasis is placed on an earlier “Diagnostic Stage”. In this stage, an organization should be able to apply a series of techniques, in order to identify with maximum reliability the nature and the diversity of problems occurring in the organization. As such, the following stages are a consequence of investment in diagnostics. The “Preparatory Actions Stage” is the following one, where the organization has the concern of dealing with the relevant problem of resistance to change, as well as to develop preparatory actions allowing for the acceptance of the changes itself in the organization. The third stage is the “Implementation Strategy Stage” in which the foreseen changes that will potentially solve the problems previously identified should start. Lastly, a fourth “Results Stage” deals with the evaluation of the progresses made by the changes, and can also have the characteristic of working as a new “Diagnostic Stage”, forming a loop of action enabling the organization to be especially open to OC processes and programs.

There are several possibilities of approaching the subject of OC in organizations when it comes to managers’ concerns of action. Porras and Robertson (1992) offer an insightful perspective of how can we understand the diversity of change processes considering the type of demands and of directions possible to follow. With respect to this, the authors propose that it’s possible to develop OC processes based on the depth of the demands (1st and 2nd order changes) and also considering if the OC is suggested by internal factors or imposed by external ones (planned and unplanned change). Having this framework in perspective, we can have a planned and 1st order Incremental OC (small changes that are inherent to the daily dynamic of the organization, which is characterized by small improvements made on diverse work procedures); we can have a planned and 2nd order Transformational OC (profound changes required by internal factors of the organization that will produce severe impact on what is the organization should be); we can also have an unplanned and 1st order Evolutionary OC (small changes inherent to the organizations’ way of proceeding which are required by external factors); and lastly, we can have a unplanned and 2nd order Revolutionary OC (severe organizational demands for change, which are imposed by external factors, and call for severe shifts). Having this framework of approach to OC, managers can start change processes using step by step models of action, such as Beer et al. (1990), in which it’s possible to outline a proper course of action in regard to a strong investment in the model’s “diagnostics stage”.

Evidently, the human factor is a nuclear element of consideration in any OC process. In fact, the human side of organizations plays a multifarious role in this case, as it’s frequently associated as a reason for failure, but also, as a reason for success of OC programs (eg.: Schein, 1993; Nutt & Backoff, 2001), which raises tremendous questions regarding the way how to manage OC. As such, this is why dealing with the workforces in the context of OC programs is of maximum importance for pursuing the outcomes of any change program, and thus, of elevated degree of challenge for managers, notably to Human Resource (HR) managers. It is mainly due to this idea of relevance on the way people are considered when it comes to OC, that we can apply “the good, the bad and the villain” analogy. People have the capability of activating, delivering and even overcome the purposes, objectives and the processes of OC. People in organizations are the ones that will deliver, develop and apply work tasks, work procedures, new and improved ways of delivering and attaining goals, or the way how the protection of organizational value is due in customer relation.
People can have “the good” side of OC in their hands and be of paramount importance to any OC program. On the other hand, people can be in simultaneous one of the worst parts of OC, as the workforce also has the ability of blocking new procedures, new ways of delivering refreshed tasks or to align themselves with new roles in the organization, and even to produce counterproductive behavior. Thus, people can have “the bad” side of OC in their hands and represent one of the main reasons why so many OC programs fail. We can also observe this “the good and the bad” role by using the resistance to change arguments. Resistance to change is a long enduring concern of every manager when it comes to change programs. It’s one of the main reasons why change in organizations fails and simultaneously why change programs function due to people’s adhesion to change demands. Resistance to change is highly dependent on psychological factors (e.g., Neumann, 1989; Nutt & Backoff, 2001) that need to be controlled, such as uncertainty, defensive routines, self-interest perception, lack of identification with the purposes of change. The “good” and the “bad” side of people on OC processes are in some degree strongly dependant on resistance to change phenomena. Lastly, HR managers in particular have the difficult task of managing the complex nature of OC programs, and integrating different priorities at the same time in the same program. This calls for a clear need of managing people in order to sparkle its “good” side and prevent the “bad” side from showing up, but nevertheless, without having any warranty of success while doing so. Thus, people may have this “villain” side with them, implying that even with HR managers’ strong concerns for accompanying the workforces during OC programs, no warranty exists that people become a reliable resource in an OC process. HR managers’ influence on OC program’s development and the way how a change program is managed has a severe impact on its success. The human side of the organization should be highly considered by HR managers in several moments of the process, such as the way the program is designed and approached, allowing for the workers to participate and to have voice, or the way how internal communication is established allowing for the involvement of the organization as a whole with a clear sense of attaining an integrative approach to change processes (e.g., Goshal & Bartlett, 1996). As mentioned earlier, doing this is a complex and a difficult task for HR managers due to the need of integrating several urgent demands in OC processes, and signalizes the harsh nature of dealing with the workforces in OC, revealing how people can also have this “villain” side.

The issue that imposes at this point is how to control this role of uncertainty surrounding people in OC processes. Assuming this multi-role that is played by people in these processes, it seems relevant for managers to assure that the workforce is on the constructive side of change. Is it conceivable to assume that a guided organizational environment towards change is likely to enhance the workers’ involvement in the organization, and thus, to see OC as an organizational principle that serves as a trigger for relevant outputs as workers’ commitment and workers’ perceived support?

**Organizational commitment and perceived support in OC programs**

Organizational Commitment is an enduring area of dedication for HR managers, due to the positive impact that workers’ bond brings to the organization regarding dedication, productivity, extra-role behaviour or turnover intention (e.g., O’Reilly & Chatman, 1986; Sommers, 1995). By definition, commitment means workers’ positive responses to the organization based on their evaluation of workplace situation, and expresses itself at a behavioural or/and attitudinal level in a willingness to belong and to protect the organization (Aryee & Heng, 1990). It can also be defined as a psychological connection established between and individual and an organization (Kuehn & Al-Busaidi, 2002), manifesting itself in a strong identification between both (Schappe, 1998).
One of the most consensual approaches of study on organizational commitment refers to the Tri-Dimensional Model of Meyer and Allen (1991), conceiving three commitment components underlying three not mutually exclusive psychological states: continuance commitment – sense of belonging to an organization due to the evaluation of losses and benefits of abandoning or maintaining in the organization (should stay in the organization); normative commitment – sense of belonging to an organization due to a normative and loyalty judgement (must stay in the organization); affective commitment – sense of belonging to an organization due to a positive emotional and affective evaluation of the organization (the worker likes and wants to stay in the organization). Due to the relevance of commitment to HRM in organizations, several researchers have dedicated themselves to understand the consequents as well as the antecedents of each commitment dimension, despite affective commitment clearly receiving more attention over the years.

In what concerns the consequents of commitment, it is possible to identify several relevant impacts on organizational performance indicators, such as turnover intention (eg.: Somers, 1995), career satisfaction (eg.: Shieh, 2014), employee satisfaction (eg.: Ahmad, Iqbal, Javed & Hamad, 2014), job satisfaction (eg.: Gomes, 2009; Sezgin & Agar, 2012; Adekola, 2012), job performance (Fu & Deshpande, 2014) and even productivity (Osa & Amos, 2014). In what regards the commitment predictors, researchers have been building up diverse and globally consistent research regarding several commitment predictors, such as cultural values (eg.: Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001), job characteristics (Bhuian & Menguc, 2002), supervisory support (Kang, Gatling & Kim, 2015), diversity training (Sohail, Rehman, Haq, Iqbal & Adeel, 2011), internal marketing (Ahmad & Al-Borie, 2012), career-oriented mentoring (Aryee & Chay, 2005), work motivation or also leadership styles (Sawar, Muntaz, Batool & Ikram, 2015).

Interesting to argue at this point is that despite the plethora of predictors and consequents of commitment and of its relevance for HRM, there is little record of its clear association with OC programs in organizational studies. Evidently, practitioners are well aware of the opportunity in involving workers in change processes, due to resistance to change phenomena (eg.: Foster, 2010), but what happens when an organization is guided towards change as part of its DNA? Can OC work as a workers’ involvement predictor? Is this a direct relation or is it conceivable to have a processual mechanism? Following this reasoning, literature explains that the support the organization can generate surrounding its workers has a relevant impact on the way the workers affiliate to the organization, and there are empirical evidences demonstrating the articulation between commitment and perceived support (eg.: Eisenberger, Fasolo & Davis-Lamastro, 1990).

Organizational support can be defined as the employees’ perception about the support and the organization’s concern regarding his person and well-being in the context of work (Allen et al., 2003). It can also be defined as a perception based on the assurance that the organization will provide aid when or if is needed to develop the job demands effectively, as well as to deal with stressful situations or uncertainty scenarios (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). On the basis of organizational support theory across literature, seems to be Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964), arguing that support is dependent on an exchange that is established between the organization and its workers, called the norm of reciprocity. As Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) mention, “the norm of reciprocity allows employees and employers to reconcile distinctive orientations” (p.698), that will naturally occur in organizational scenarios, in which some exchanges take place, such as workers’ loyalty, effort, competences application or dedication for financial and social rewards. Applying the reciprocity norm implies that if a person treats the other well, it is likely that a reciprocal behaviour will take place. In organizational scenarios, similar situation also occurs, in which both parts (employee and employer) engage in a mutual beneficial treatment based
on the reciprocity norm’s application in the relationship, shaping the very same relationship, and foreseeing positive outputs.

Over the years, several researchers have manifested interest over the issue of perceived support regarding both its antecedents as well as its consequents. As for the antecedents, it’s possible to identify several predictors, such as fairness (Shore & Shore, 1995), job demands and autonomy (Eisenberger, Rhoades, & Cameron, 1999), organizational characteristics (Asgari, Silong, Ahmad & Samah, 2008). Regarding the consequents, it is possible to identify relevant outputs associated with perceived support, such as feelings of obligation to the organization (Shore & Wayne, 1993), satisfaction (Eisenberger, Cummings, Armelo & Lynch, 1997), avoidance turnover intentions (Wayne, Shore & Liden, 1997; Gomes, Duarte & Neves, 2009), organizational commitment (Eisenberger, Fasolo & Davis-Lamastro, 1990), reduced perception of organizational entrapment (Shore & Tetrick, 1991), organizational citizenship behaviour (Pohl, Battistelli & Librecht, 2013).

**Study hypothesis and research model**

It seems relevant to pinpoint at this moment that despite of the diversity of perceived support predictors, little seems to be known concerning the predictive role of OC programs in perceived support. Despite this fact, we are encouraged to believe that a relevant association between OC programs and an OC environment in the organization may produce a relevant impact on workers’ support based on the existing and documented association between organizational characteristics and support (eg.: Dekker and Barling, 1995; Asgari, Siling, Ahmad & Samah, 2008). We believe that theoretically, OC programs orientation in an organization can have the status of a characteristic, and as such, can work as a predictor of perceived support.

Following this line of reasoning and the pointed theoretical considerations, with this paper we are pointing out that people have a multi-role positioning in OC processes. As a way of characterizing the various demands managers develop when it comes to dealing with people in OC processes, we have used “the good, the bad and the villain” analogy, in order to point out that it is of paramount relevance for managers to assure that people play a constructive role within change programs. Facing this, we are conceiving that an organizational environment towards change is likely to enhance workers’ involvement to the organization. Accordingly, we are proposing the first study hypothesis:

**H1: Organizational change programs orientation predicts employee commitment as well as employee perception of organizational support**

In addition, there are some relevant indications in literature showing that predicting employee commitment may not be a simple direct path. Several researchers have showed that commitment determination is indirect (eg.: Gomes, 2009; Sulu, Ceylan & Kaynak, 2010; Susanj & Jacopec, 2012) and may also depends on moderating factors (eg.: Zhan, Wang & Yao, 2013; Bal, De Lange, Zacher, Van der Heiden, 2015). Also, Meyer and Smith (2010) present a very interesting study, proposing that the relation between HRM practices and commitment is mediated by perceived support. Based on this specific study, we are proposing similar variable positioning in our model, as we find that perceived support may play a mediating role to predict commitment. It seems theoretically plausible that the organizations’ orientation towards change may lead to commitment, but this can be due to a more distal path, where the support the organization is able to provide to workers triggers their commitment. Accordingly, we are proposing the second study hypothesis:

**H2: The relation between organizational change programs orientation and employee commitment is mediated by perceived organizational support**

Hence, we are proposing the following model of analysis:
Research methodology

Sample and Procedure
This correlational study had the data collected in the hotel business industry, specifically, participants belonging to a major international Hotel Business chain operating in Portugal, in which all permanent employees (n=211) were invited to participate. Using this industry in this study is related to a reason of opportunity due to the fact that the Hotel Business area is highly compromised with quality procedures, and thus, with strong tendency towards organizational change processes.

The instrument was constructed observing criteria to control for the impact of potential systematic errors (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003). Concerns were taken on controlling errors derived from: (a) the items’ characteristics (item adaptation had in consideration the need to be clear and specific; the equidistance between all points of the scale used was assured); (b) context of the items (the instrument dimension was optimized in order to match the study’s purposes; combinations of items of different constructs in the same sections of the questionnaire).

Regarding the sample’s characteristics, a total of 152 employees have voluntarily participated in the survey (response rate= 72.1%). The majority of respondents were male (54.9 %), and aged between thirty one and forty years old (43.4%), and all participants were full time workers (100%). Regarding tenure, participants had employment with the organization of: five years or less - 32.9%; between six and fifteen years - 38.8%; more than sixteen years - 27.3%. Participants were from different areas in the organization, which included workers from front office (22.8%), housekeeping (12.4%), food and beverage (31.5%), and management areas (8.5%).

Regarding the procedure, participants completed an individual and confidential survey during working hours in a room provided by the Hotel. Respondents were also instructed to place their surveys in a closed container. The survey’s instructions informed that the aim was to understand their opinions regarding the internal social climate and have clearly assured that the responses were confidential and anonymous.

Research tools
The data collected in this study integrated an organizational climate survey. Amongst other measures, the survey the following:

*Organizational change programs orientation* (predictor variable): three items based on Rafferty & Griffin (1996) (α=.68) were used. Sample item includes: “In this organization change programs are always happening”. The items were measured using a seven point scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree).
**Perceived organizational support** (mediator variable): perceived support was assessed using six items adapted from Eisenberger and colleagues (1986) \((\alpha=.91)\). Sample item includes: “This organization is available to help me whenever I have a problem”. Respondents expressed their level of agreement with each item using a seven point scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree).

**Affective organizational commitment** (dependant variable): four items were taken from Meyer and Allen (1997) were used to build this measure \((\alpha=.78)\). Sample item includes: “This organization has a great personal meaning for me”. Items were measured using a seven point scale from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 7 (Strongly Agree).

**Research findings**

The Harman test was conducted to assure that the collected data do not account for significative amount of common method bias (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Lee & Podsakoff, 2003). Table I shows the correlation matrix of the study variables, presenting also the means, standard deviations, and the reliabilities for all variables. It is possible to verify that organizational change programs orientation is positively and meaningfully correlated with affective perceived organizational support \((r = .661)\), as well as with organizational commitment \((r = .347)\). These evidence provides relevant clues regarding the support for the study’s first hypotheses, foreseeing the prediction of organizational change programs orientation for employee commitment as well as employee perception for organizational support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Antiquity</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Org. Change</th>
<th>Org. Support</th>
<th>Affective Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antiquity in organization</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.820**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Change</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>.68(^{(a)})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-.069</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.661**</td>
<td>.91(^{(a)})</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Commitment</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>.217**</td>
<td>.347(^{**})</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.347(^{**})</td>
<td>.549(^{**})</td>
<td>.78(^{(a)})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{**}\)Correlation is significative at \(p<.01\)

\(^{(a)}\)Cronbach Alpha

Furthermore, our study propose the existence of a mediation effect of perceived support in the relation between organizational change programs orientation and employee commitment (H2). In order to test this mediation effect, we’ve followed Baron and Kenny’s (1986) linear regression method. According to the authors indications, we’ve developed three regression equations to test for the existence of perceived support mediation effect, as the following conditions should be assured: (1) the predictor variable (organizational change programs orientation) should affect the mediator variable (organizational support) in the first regression equation (step one); (2) the predictor variable should be affected by the dependent variable (organizational commitment) in the second equation (step two); (3) the mediator variable should affect the dependent variable in the third regression equation (step three).

We have made the option of controlling on each step of the mediation testing, the effect of antiquity in the organization and of age in the relations between variables, as control variables. Following the steps of the procedure, it was possible to verify that organizational change programs orientation and organizational support (step one) were positively related \((\beta=.646; \ p<.01)\) (Table II).
Table II – Step one: regression of the mediator on the predictor variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antiquity in org.</td>
<td>-.026</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>-.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>1.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antiquity in org.</td>
<td>-.409</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Support</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>7.818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependant Variable: organizational change programs orientation

For the second step, it was verified that organizational commitment and organizational change programs orientation have also revealed positive relation ($\beta = .429; p < .01; R^2 Adjust. = .235$) (Table III).

Table III – Step two: regression of the predictor on the criteria variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antiquity in org.</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>1.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antiquity in org.</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>1.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Change</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>4.509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependant Variable: affective commitment

As for the third step, when controlling organizational support (table IV) the relation between organizational change programs orientation and organizational commitment became non-significant ($\beta = .027; p > .05$), and the effect of organizational support in organizational commitment was positive and significant ($\beta = .613; p < .01; R^2 Adjust. = .452$). These results reveal a full mediation effect of perceived support in the relation between organizational change programs orientation and organizational commitment, and hence providing evidences for the validation of our second hypothesis.

Table IV – Step three: regression of the predictor on the criteria, controlling the mediator variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antiquity in org.</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>1.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antiquity in org.</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>1.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>-.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Change</td>
<td>.594</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td>4.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antiquity in org.</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>2.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>-.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational Change</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.252</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In order to have an added value to our analysis, we’ve also tested the mediation effect with Sobel Test (Sobel, 1982), proposing the following equation for estimating the indirect effects: \( Z\text{-value} = \frac{a \times b}{\sqrt{b^2 \times s_{a}^2 + a^2 \times s_{b}^2}} \), which enables testing the effect a mediator carries in the relation between an independent and a dependent variable (MacKinnon, Warsi & Dwyer, 1995).

This test should be seen as complementary to the mediation steps that we’ve followed based on Baron & Kenny (1986), as it seems to permit evaluating in a more direct way the existence of indirect effects, as Sobel test is pointed as a restrictive test (being more robust to collinearity issues (despite our collinearity diagnostics have always showed Tolerance levels above .950)). In this study, the Sobel Test value was \( Z=4.68180277 / p=0.001 \). Figure II shows the simplified results of the proposed model.

**Figure II – Simplified Model of Analysis with results**

The results found account for a positive and significative full mediational effect of perceived organizational support in the relation between organizational change programs orientation and organizational commitment. This means that an organizational environment guided towards change can be seen as a way of enhancement of workers’ valid thoughts and ideas for the organization, and thus, work as a trigger for organizational commitment. This relation seems also to be developed due to a more distal path, in which perceived support plays a very important role. Perceived support mediates this relationship, implying that the way how an organization develops its change processes and guides itself for continuous change leads to a perception that the organization invests in its own development, explaining the mediational role of support. This will explain why workers are committed to the organization, and why an organization guided towards change can trigger workers’ commitment.

In light of these results, having organizational change programs seem to be a strong mechanism to develop workers’ commitment, and thus, to stimulate the workforce to be on “the good” side of change, preventing the occurrence of people playing “the bad and the villain” roles.

**Conclusions:**
This study has had in its basis a very simple idea. OC represents a long and enduring effort for managers and for organizations to be competitive. In nowadays competitive markets, organizational change is one valid way of stimulating the way how an organization behaves in its markets, deals with its customers, explores new market ideas or takes on new and innovative ways of doing things. As such, OC is not an
option for competitive organization, on the contrary, it is mandatory for organizational survival and development. Accordingly, managers should be prepared to see change as something natural and unavoidable in global markets, and also as something demanded both from the inside and the outside of the organization.

When managers deal with the problems of planning and making OC programs, one of the key issues implies dealing with the workers. As such, we have picked an adapted movie title called “the good, the bad and the villain”, to help explain the variety of roles people can play in an OC program. As such, we have made efforts in showing why managers and organizations in general should make solid programs in order to get the people on the “good side” of OC programs and prevent the appearance of “the bad and the villain” sides. Our results help explain how can managers deal with this issue in particular, showing that a good environment towards change predicts employee commitment, and that developing support mechanisms close to the workers is a solid way of stimulating “the good” side of people in OC processes.

Our study raises some theoretical, empirical and practical questions. On the theoretical level, it was possible to locate and use some relevant theoretical findings to help contextualize the relevance of researching over the main topic of HRM and organizational change, which surprisingly, when compared to other topics surrounding HRM, the available theoretical knowledge linking people management and OC programs is somewhat passed over. As such, our study may represent a form of contribution to help pinpointing the relevance of HRM within change programs, as it has specificities that seem worthy of strong investments for HRM researchers. At this point, we would like to stress out the importance that HR managers may have within OC programs, and of their contributions to help involve people in the requisites of change orientations. Addingly, this may also represent a very interesting way of conciliating the area of Internal Communication within these aspects, as those professionals have a set of practices that surely help maintain people in “the good” side of change.

Regarding the empirical aspects, our study is a correlational study, using a mediational testing approach to examine if and why OC programs orientation can stimulate workers’ commitment to the organization. We were able to find this association, and also explain that this relation is due to a more distal path, in which perceived support plays an important mediational role. With this result, we were able to bring some added information to the OC area of research, but also to the organizational behaviour and HRM areas as well. As such, our empirical setting was a simple one, and designed to provide a response to an also simple idea of understanding the association between OC programs orientation and employee commitment. We were able to find several empirical suggestions in literature regarding the association between support and employee commitment, but to our knowledge we have found no record of a study attempting to search for the predictive abilities of OC programs orientations on support and workers commitment.

**Practical suggestions:**

In what concerns the practical issues surrounding our study, we believe that our results raise some interesting challenges for managers. First of all, our results seem to fundament the centrality of HR managers in OC programs. As known, the resistance to change phenomena represent huge challenges for organizations, and as such, the early involvement of HR managers in OC programs may help diminishes the emergence of OC regressive steps.

Our results also emphasize that when it comes to dealing with people in OC programs, the Internal Communication professionals seem to play a very interesting part of action. These professionals deal with
communication planning and activities towards the internal publics (workers), and work especially connected with workers’ informational needs. As such, they can have a tremendous role in OC programs. Internal Communication professionals have the ability of using and working the information that exists and is developed in the organization. As such, remembering that perceived support is important to validate the predictive relationship between OC programs orientation and employee commitment, the way how information is handled in OC programs is surely a resource of paramount importance. Following this alignment, we find here a strong argument to advise managers to include HRM and IC professionals in a collaborative nature within OC programs.

Study limitations and future research suggestions
Regarding the limitations of our study, it is important to remember at this point, that in what regards to the internal validity of the study, it is obviously not immune to systematic common method error inserted by the organizational contexts, despite all procedures and tests made (e.g.: Harman test) to control their occurrence. The study has also generalization limitations, as the results obtained may not be generalized towards all kinds of organizations or even all kinds or organizations within the hotel business industry. In addition, our study was theoretically driven, meaning that alternative explanations for employee commitment determination may be found, as well as the variables positioning in the model of analysis. Despite this fact, it we are convinced that the theoretical and empirical foundations of our study were properly prepared and justified.

In what concerns recommendations for future research, we would like to advise researchers sharing similar research interest to replicate this study in the same industry, but also in other industries as a way of analysing the stability of these results. We would also like to recommend the addition on Internal Communication as a new variable in the model. Researching over the issue of understanding the nature of Internal Communication within a model of analysis close to what we have proposed seems to be a relevant study to accomplish, as it would bring light under the importance Internal Communication can play when it comes to deal with “the good, the bad and the villain” side of people in OC processes.
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