Organizational Readiness for Digital Transformation

A Qualitative Study of Digital Change Implementation within a Pharmaceutical R&D Organization

Master's thesis in Management and Economics of Innovation
Master's thesis in Supply Chain Management

EVELYN WINROTH
KLARA ÖSTLING

DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT AND ECONOMICS
CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
DIVISION OF INNOVATION AND R&D MANAGEMENT
Gothenburg, Sweden 2026
www.chalmers.se

Master's thesis 2026

Organizational Readiness for Digital Transformation

A Qualitative Study of Digital Change Implementation within a Pharmaceutical R&D Organization

EVELYN WINROTH
KLARA ÖSTLING

Department of Technology Management and Economics
Division of Innovation and R&D Management
Chalmers University of Technology
Gothenburg, Sweden 2026

Organizational Readiness for Digital Transformation
A Qualitative Study of Digital Change Implementation within a Pharmaceutical R&D Organization
EVELYN WINROTH
KLARA ÖSTLING

Supervisor & Examiner: Petra Bosch-Sijtsema

Master's Thesis 2026
Department of Technology Management and Economics
Division of Innovation and R&D Management
Chalmers University of Technology
SE-412 96 Gothenburg
Telephone +46 31 772 1000

Gothenburg, Sweden 2026

Organizational Readiness for Digital Transformation
A Qualitative Study of Digital Change Implementation within a Pharmaceutical R&D Organization
EVELYN WINROTH
KLARA ÖSTLING
Department of Technology Management and Economics
Chalmers University of Technology

Summary

This thesis examines organizational readiness for digital transformation within the R&D function of a multinational pharmaceutical organization. As digital technologies increasingly reshape work processes, systems, behaviours, and decision-making, the study explores how employees and managers experience and respond to digital change in practice. Drawing on a qualitative case study based on 20 semi-structured interviews with employees and managers across sites in Sweden, the UK, Poland, and the USA, the study investigates how organizational readiness for digital transformation is shaped by communication, leadership, culture, and structural conditions.

The findings show that digital transformation is generally perceived as necessary and unavoidable, but that employees do not always understand how specific initiatives relate to their own roles and daily work. This creates a gap between organizational intentions and individual relevance. Readiness is further constrained by competing operational priorities, limited time, compressed implementation timelines, insufficient support structures, and fragmented communication. In addition, the study shows that trust, leadership, and organizational culture strongly shape how change is interpreted and enacted. Middle managers play an important role in translating strategic change into practical meaning for employees. Furthermore, the pharmaceutical organization's quality-focused and risk-aware culture supports compliance and patient safety, but may also limit experimentation and adaptability during digital transformation. In conclusion, the study shows that readiness for digital transformation is shaped not only by employee willingness, but also by structural, communicative, and cultural conditions within the organization.

The thesis contributes to the literature by conceptualizing readiness for digital transformation as an ongoing process shaped through communication, interpretation, and local organizational conditions rather than as a static organizational state. It also provides practical insights for organizations seeking to strengthen readiness by improving communication structures, creating clearer support networks for implementation, and balancing quality-focused structures with greater opportunities for learning and experimentation.

Keywords: change readiness, digital transformation, organizational readiness, pharmaceutical industry, change management.

Table of Content

1. Introduction

In recent years, the volume and pace of change have been comparable to the cumulative changes experienced throughout the entirety of human history (Carnall, 2007). Historically, the external environment surrounding organizations has been relatively stable, creating favourable conditions for managing change in a structured and predictable manner. However, as the pace of change has accelerated and become increasingly unpredictable, the effectiveness of traditional approaches to managing change has been challenged. A primary reason organizations experience increased change and are compelled to change their ways of working is digital transformation.

Digital transformation has emerged as one of the most critical strategic imperatives for organizations, often determining their long-term survival (Brazo et al., 2025). It goes beyond the mere adoption of new technologies and involves a fundamental reconfiguration of business models, organizational structures, processes, and value creation mechanisms (Verhoef et al., 2021). In this sense, digital transformation represents a comprehensive, organization-wide shift that introduces new business logics and ways of creating value. At the same time, rapid advances in digitalization are accelerating change, making it increasingly challenging for organizations to adapt at a comparable pace (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). Consequently, organizations are required to transform how their internal operations are conducted by integrating digital tools and processes (Hanelt et al., 2021).

Given the increasingly turbulent and innovation-driven business environment, change management has become essential for understanding how organizations can implement transformation while maintaining efficiency in ongoing operations, and is therefore widely regarded as a critical organizational capability (Cameron & Green, 2019). The emergence of change management has enabled organizations to develop more structured approaches for navigating and managing change processes leading to a significant evolution of change models in both theory and practice. These developments reflect organizations' growing need for systematic and adaptable frameworks to address complex and continuous change. However, despite the availability of methods and processes for managing change, organizations often struggle to achieve the intended outcomes of their change initiatives (Kotter, 2007). This has raised questions regarding the limitations of traditional change management approaches, especially in contexts where change is continuous, radical and embedded in daily work, making it increasingly unclear when and how such structures, models, and processes can be effectively applied.

This challenge is particularly complex because digital transformation simultaneously involves both technical and social change (Kherrazi & Roquilly, 2025). While technical change focuses on the implementation of new systems and technologies, social change reshapes the human dimension of organizations, including culture, behaviours, relationships, and ways of working. Employees are required to adapt their daily tasks, adopt new digital tools, and increasingly rely on data-driven decision-making. However, social change is often the most difficult aspect of digital transformation, as employees may resist due to fears of losing expertise or control, as well as attachment to established routines (Kherrazi & Roquilly, 2025). Therefore, effective change management is critical to facilitate a smooth transition and ensure the successful implementation of digital transformation initiatives.

Digital transformation does not only affect systems and technologies, but also employees, work practices, behaviours, and relationships. The human perspective is therefore critical to change outcomes, as it concerns how employees perceive, interpret, and respond to change, including whether they understand its purpose, feel capable of adapting, and are willing to engage in new ways of working. One response to this challenge is the concept of change readiness which captures the extent to which organizational members are psychologically and behaviourally prepared to implement and sustain change initiatives (Armenakis et al., 1993). By emphasizing psychological and behavioural preparedness, readiness provides a framework for linking individual experiences of change to broader organizational change processes.

In the context of digital transformation, change readiness becomes particularly important, as digital initiatives often require shifts in mindsets, routines, and competencies (Rafferty et al., 2013). Although readiness has been widely discussed, its application to digital transformation remains less developed. This shows a gap because digital transformation is often ongoing, iterative, and embedded in everyday work practices, making readiness a dynamic rather than static phenomenon. There is therefore a need for further empirical understanding of how readiness is experienced and developed in such contexts, and of how organizations can strengthen their capacity to implement and sustain digital transformation in practice.

1.3 Purpose & Research Questions

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of organizational change by focusing on change readiness within the organization. By identifying key barriers and facilitators, and by analysing how change initiatives influence employees, work practices, and organizational processes, the study aims to assess the current level of change readiness. Based on this assessment, the study seeks to generate insights into how future change management approaches can be designed and adapted more effectively. Such insights are essential for strengthening organizational competitiveness and enhancing the ability to respond to an increasingly dynamic and evolving external environment.

Accordingly, the study addresses the following research questions:

- *How is the current state of organizational readiness for digital transformation characterized within an organization?*

- *How can an organization strengthen its readiness to improve future digital change implementations?*

These research questions are examined within the context of a pharmaceutical company, specifically focusing on the R&D function within clinical manufacturing and supply.

1.4 Scope

The scope of the project is limited to a specific department within a pharmaceutical company focusing on manufacturing and supply chain management within clinical operations. This department includes providing clinical trials with medicinal products, making it a part of the pharmaceutical company’s R&D function. Given that this department is undergoing extensive digital transformation, it represents a relevant context for investigation in this research. The approach may not be generalizable to other pharmaceutical R&D sites since the research has been conducted on a single company and one specific department.

The empirical investigation primarily targets middle management and operational levels within the organization, as these groups play a key role in translating strategic change initiatives into daily practice. Employees working close to operational processes, together with their immediate managers, are central to how organizations respond emotionally to radical change (Huy, 1999) and are therefore the focus of this thesis. These groups are particularly important as they experience and enact change in day-to-day activities, offering valuable insights into organizational change readiness. Senior executive perspectives are not the primary focus, as the study aims to explore how change readiness is experienced closer to operational work processes. Given that the pharmaceutical company is a multinational organization, the study is situated within this type of global context and includes sites in England, Sweden, the USA, and Poland to capture potential geographical differences in organizational readiness.

2. Theoretical Framework

The following chapter presents the theoretical framework underlying the study. The purpose of the framework is to provide a conceptual basis for understanding how readiness for change can be interpreted in the context of digital transformation. As outlined in the introduction, digital transformation involves not only technological implementation but also changes in work practices, behaviours, relationships, and organizational processes. This makes it necessary to apply a theoretical perspective that captures both the human and organizational dimensions of change. Readiness is used as the central analytical concept because it helps explain how organizational members perceive, interpret, and respond to change, as well as how prepared they are to implement and sustain it. Since the study focuses on digital transformation in an organizational context, readiness is examined at both individual and organizational levels.

The chapter is structured in two main parts. First, it introduces change readiness and presents its central dimensions including the cognitive, affective, and behavioural components that shape whether employees are willing and able to engage in change. It also addresses organizational readiness in terms of shared commitment, efficacy, and structural capacity. Second, the chapter presents several contextual and organizational factors that influence readiness in practice. In particular, the framework highlights culture, communication, leadership, trust and contextual conditions as these factors are especially important in shaping how readiness develops during digital transformation.

Together, these perspectives provide a theoretical foundation for analysing how readiness for digital transformation is experienced and developed in practice. The framework also supports the purpose of the study by creating a basis for examining the current state of readiness within the organization and identifying how it can be improved in relation to future digital change initiatives.

2.1 Change Readiness

Organizational change has become a common and recurring feature of contemporary organizations. Despite substantial investments of time and resources, many change initiatives fail to achieve their intended outcomes (Kotter, 2007). One of the most consistently identified explanations for such failure is insufficient readiness for change prior to implementation (Holt & Vardaman, 2013; Shea et al., 2014). Change readiness refers to the extent to which individuals and organizations are psychologically and behaviourally prepared to engage in and implement change (Shea et al., 2014). This definition highlights two central components, first an emotional and cognitive orientation toward change, and second a behavioural intention to act (Weiner, 2009). It functions as a prerequisite for successful change implementation as it influences the degree to which members initiate, support and sustain change efforts over time (Shea, 2014).

Importantly, readiness is not synonymous with mere agreement. Rather, it reflects a comprehensive attitude shaped by the content of the change, the process through which it is implemented, the context in which it occurs, and the characteristics of those involved (Wang et al., 2023). It incorporates beliefs about the need for change, perceptions of the appropriateness of the proposed solution, confidence in collective capability and expectations regarding likely outcomes. Although readiness for change may appear intuitive, the construct is complex, multidimensional and multilevel, meaning that it is influenced by several interrelated dimensions operating at individual and organizational levels (Holt & Vardaman, 2013).

Change readiness is often parted in two main sections, individual readiness and organizational readiness (Rafferty et al., 2013). Individual readiness for change refers to a person's cognitive, emotional, and intentional orientation toward a specific organizational change (Wang et al., 2023). It reflects the extent to which an individual believes change is necessary, perceives it as appropriate, feels capable of contributing to it, and intends to support its implementation (Holt et al., 2007). Although organizational change is often discussed at the collective level, it ultimately depends on the attitudes and actions of individuals. Therefore, individual readiness forms the psychological foundation upon which collective readiness is built.

Organizational readiness, in contrast, refers to the collective capability and willingness of organizational members to successfully implement change (Weiner, 2009). Unlike individual readiness, which focuses on the attitudes and perceptions of individual employees, organizational readiness represents a shared organizational state that reflects the overall preparedness of the organization for change. It develops when employees collectively believe that change is necessary and that the organization has the resources, structures, and capabilities required to implement it effectively (Holt & Vardaman, 2013; Weiner, 2009).

2.1.1 Cognitive and Affective Building Blocks of Readiness

A central building block of readiness lies in its cognitive components, which share how individuals interpret and evaluate change (Rafferty et al., 2013). First, individuals must perceive the need for change, recognizing a gap between the current and desired state (Holt & Vardaman, 2013). Second, perceived appropriateness reflects whether individuals believe the proposed change is the correct response to the identified problem (Armenakis et al., 1993; Holt et al., 2007). Third, change valence refers to the extent to which individuals expect the change to produce beneficial outcomes for themselves or the organization (Shea et al., 2014). These cognitive evaluations influence how employees assess the relevance and value of change initiatives and shape their willingness to engage in them. At the organizational level, similar shared beliefs contribute to collective commitment toward change (Weiner, 2009).

However, readiness is not purely cognitive as it also includes an affective component (Rafferty et al., 2013). Individuals may experience a range of emotions such as enthusiasm, optimism, anxiety, or uncertainty when confronted with change. Positive emotions, including hope and confidence, can facilitate readiness, while negative emotions such as fear or cynicism may reduce it (Wang et al., 2023). These emotional responses influence whether individuals are inclined to accept and adopt new ways of working. When shared across employees, these affective reactions contribute to the overall emotional climate of the organization, thereby shaping organizational readiness.

2.1.2 Efficacy, Commitment, and Structural Capacity

Another key building block of readiness is efficacy, which refers to beliefs about capability (Weiner, 2009). At the individual level, self-efficacy describes a person’s belief in their ability to perform behaviours required by the change, including learning new skills, adapting behaviours, and managing uncertainty (Holt & Vardaman, 2013). At the organizational level, this extends to change efficacy, which reflects employees shared belief that they collectively possess the knowledge, skills, and resources needed to implement change successfully (Weiner, 2009). High levels of efficacy increase confidence and persistence in the face of challenges.

Commitment to change is a central dimension of organizational readiness, reflecting employees' willingness to support and engage in change initiatives (Rafferty et al., 2013). Within organizational readiness, commitment is closely linked to the efficacy component and can be understood as capturing the employee perspective within a broader collective context. Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) define commitment to change as a mindset that binds individuals to actions necessary for successful change implementation, highlighting its strong influence on change outcomes. Accordingly, commitment extends beyond simple behavioural compliance and includes both cognitive and affective alignment with change objectives.

At the organizational level, change commitment refers to the shared determination among organizational members to implement a change initiative (Weiner, 2009). When employees collectively value the change and believe it will benefit the organization, they are more likely to invest effort and remain engaged throughout the implementation process (Rafferty et al., 2013). Together with change efficacy, commitment forms a core component of organizational readiness and serves as a key predictor of successful change implementation (Weiner, 2009).

In contexts such as digital transformation, where established routines and competencies are challenged, commitment becomes particularly critical (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). From an evolutionary perspective, individuals may initially hold negative perceptions of change, as it can threaten existing patterns of competence or identity (Heim & Sardar-Drenda, 2020). Humans often exhibit inherent scepticism toward change, which underscores the importance of understanding, training, and support in fostering a constructive change mindset. Consequently, developing strong commitment among employees becomes a crucial leadership task, as it helps align individual attitudes with organizational change objectives and enhances overall readiness for change.

In addition to psychological factors, readiness is also shaped by structural capacity (Holt & Vardaman, 2013). Organizational readiness is a multidimensional construct that includes both psychological and structural elements (Holt & Vardaman, 2013). Structural elements refer to the systems and resources that support change implementation, such as funding, communication systems, policies, technological infrastructure, and employee training programs (Castro-Villarreal et al., 2014; Holt & Vardaman, 2013). Without adequate structural support, even highly motivated employees may struggle to implement change effectively (Holt & Vardaman, 2013; Weiner, 2009). Thus, readiness requires both the willingness of individuals and the capacity of the organization.

2.1.2.1 Sustainability in Change Readiness

Beyond the initial implementation phase, the ability to sustain change over time becomes a critical consideration. While change readiness focuses on the preparedness to engage in and implement change, sustainability concerns whether new ways of working are maintained and embedded in everyday organizational practices (Buchanan et al., 2005). Research suggests that many change initiatives fail not during implementation, but in the period following it, when organizations revert to previous routines or lose momentum. This indicates that the factors shaping readiness, such as efficacy, commitment, and structural capacity, remain equally important after implementation. For example, sustained commitment supports continued engagement with new practices, while structural capacity ensures that employees have the necessary resources and systems to maintain change in practice. Without ongoing alignment between these psychological and structural elements, there is a risk that implemented changes are not fully integrated into the organization and may gradually diminish over time (Buchanan et al., 2005). In this sense, sustaining change can be understood as a continuation of change readiness, where the same underlying mechanisms must persist beyond the initial phase of change to ensure long-term effectiveness.

This perspective can be expanded through Clausen and Kragh's (2019) concept of deep structures, which refers to enduring and organizational patterns that influence whether change is sustained. These structures include relationships, communication patterns, shared narratives, emotions, and leadership behaviours. From this view, change may fail to last not because employees resist it, but because existing cultural continue to keep old ways of working. Trust, leadership, and culture therefore shape how change is received. When trust is low or leadership behaviour creates fear, uncertainty, or inconsistency, employees may respond cautiously and return to familiar routines (Clausen & Kragh, 2019). Sustaining readiness for change therefore requires attention not only to implementation plans and resources, but also to the deeper social and cultural conditions that influence whether employees continue to enact the change.

2.2 Aspects Influencing Readiness

Readiness for change is influenced by several contextual and organizational factors (Rafferty et al., 2013). Leadership, communication, culture, involvement, and trust play a central role in shaping readiness at both individual and organizational levels. These factors influence how employees understand change, whether they feel capable of adapting to it, and whether they are willing to support its implementation. When leaders clearly communicate the need for change and involve employees in planning and implementation, employees are more likely to develop positive attitudes toward change (Rafferty et al., 2013). Similarly, access to training, information, and supportive leadership strengthens individuals' efficacy beliefs and preparedness (Castro-Villarreal et al., 2014).

Trust within the organization is another critical factor influencing readiness. When employees trust leadership, organizational systems, and the direction of the organization, they are more likely to cooperate and support change initiatives (Holt & Vardaman, 2013; Rafferty et al., 2013). High levels of trust strengthen both collective commitment and collective efficacy, reinforcing organizational readiness (Weiner, 2009). Conversely, low levels of trust can weaken communication and consequently undermine change efforts.

2.2.1 The Impact of Organizational Culture on Change Readiness

Organizational culture constitutes a foundational yet intangible dimension of an organization. Schein (2010) describes culture through three interconnected levels: artifacts, stated values, and basic underlying assumptions. Artifacts are the visible expressions of culture such as language, routines, office layouts, digital systems, and formal behaviours. Stated values refer to the principles, goals, and strategies that the organization stands for. Basic underlying assumptions represent the deeper beliefs about how the organization works, what behaviours are considered appropriate, and how challenges should be handled. Together these levels shape how employees interpret and respond to organizational change (Olafsen, 2021).

This perspective is important in the context of change readiness because readiness is influenced not only by formal change initiatives but also by the cultural assumptions that guide everyday behaviour (Olafsen, 2021). Since culture operates partly beneath the surface it is often difficult to assess directly. Instead, cultural development is commonly interpreted through observable indicators such as behavioural norms, employee attitudes, engagement patterns, and openness toward new ways of working (Holt et al., 2007). Artifacts can therefore function as visible signals of deeper cultural orientations and may be used to assess whether a cultural environment supports or constrains change. In this regard Cameron and Quinn (2011) argue that an aligned organizational culture can function as a competitive advantage by supporting performance, consistency, and engagement. At the same time, the failure of many planned change initiatives is frequently attributed to a neglect of the organization's culture.

Taken together, these perspectives show that organizational culture is dynamic rather than static, and that it is not created solely by top management but continuously shaped through leadership practices and everyday interactions among employees. Instead, it is continuously shaped through leadership practices and everyday interactions among employees. This means that culture is socially constructed in practice while also shaping how employees make sense of organizational events. During change initiatives, this becomes particularly important since change often challenges established routines and assumptions (Abrantes et al., 2024). When new systems, processes, or responsibilities are introduced, employees understand them through the cultural context that already exists in the organization. For this reason, organizational culture is central to understanding how receptive an organization is to change.

In addition Olafsen et al. (2021) demonstrate a link between organizational culture and individual readiness for change, showing that cultural environments characterized by flexibility and supportive norms are associated with stronger employee commitment to change. Such environments foster affective commitment which reflects a genuine belief in and support for change initiatives. Olafsen et.al (2021) findings further indicate that supportive cultural contexts strengthen employees' change self-efficacy, meaning their perceived capability to successfully engage in transformation processes. Culture therefore influences not only employees' attitudes toward change but also their perceived ability to contribute to its implementation.

2.2.1.1 Organizational Culture in a Regulated Context

Beyond leadership and internal interactions, external conditions also shape organizational culture (Wang et al., 2023). In highly regulated industries such as pharmaceuticals, regulatory frameworks, strict confidentiality requirements and the critical responsibility for patient safety create strong norms around accuracy, compliance, and risk reduction (Sopow & Sushkova, 2025). These conditions often support a hierarchical culture in which stability, control, and predictability are highly valued (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). In such settings, routines and standardized processes are seen as safeguards for quality, which can contribute to a culture where errors are viewed as unacceptable. Although these norms are essential for maintaining safety and quality, they can simultaneously create challenges in change contexts. A culture with low tolerance for mistakes may act as a restraining force by reinforcing fear of the unknown and a strong attachment to established routines (Abrantes et al., 2024). This can reduce employees' willingness to experiment, question existing processes, or engage in innovative practices even though such behaviours are often necessary for successful transformation.

2.2.1.2 Culture in Multinational Organizations

In multinational organizations, culture becomes more complex because it is necessary to distinguish between organizational culture and national culture (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). While organizational culture refers to shared assumptions and norms developed within the organization to cope with internal and external challenges, national culture reflects broader societal patterns that shape how individuals interpret authority, collaboration, communication, and uncertainty (Schein, 2010). Hofstede's cultural dimensions provide one way of understanding how such differences may influence employees' expectations of leadership and communication across different sites (Kolman, et.al, 2003). Similarly, the GLOBE framework broadens this perspective by distinguishing between cultural values, referring to what people believe "should be," and cultural practices, referring to what people perceive "is" (Javidan et.al, 2006). This distinction is useful as employees in different locations may share formal corporate values while still experiencing local practices and communication norms differently.

For multinational organizations this means that a unified corporate culture may coexist with meaningful local variation in how change is interpreted and enacted (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). While corporate values may aim to create a unified organizational culture, local environments, leadership practices, and external pressures shape how that culture is experienced at individual sites. As a result, a global organization may contain variation between locations even when its overarching principles remain consistent. These differences are often influenced by national culture which can affect preferences for direct or indirect communication, expectations of managerial authority, and the degree to which employees feel comfortable questioning decisions or acting autonomously (Kolman, et.al, 2003). Distinguishing between organizational and national culture makes it possible to analyse whether barriers to change arise from internal organizational norms, from industry conditions, or from broader societal expectations shaped by the local context.

2.2.2 The Impact of Communication on Change Readiness

Communication becomes particularly important during organizational change because change creates uncertainty. Employees are often required to understand not only that change is taking place, but also why it is necessary, how it will be implemented, and what consequences it will have for their own work (Sopow & Sushkova, 2025). To reduce uncertainty during change, effective communication can help clarify the purpose, content, and implications of the change. Communication therefore supports change readiness by reducing ambiguity and helping employees make sense of the change process (Weick, 1995). Communication also contributes to aligning employees with the broader direction of the organization.

Sopow and Sushkova (2025) show that successful change management is associated with the extent to which mission, vision, and goals (MVG) are communicated and embedded throughout the organization. This suggests that communication is important not only for explaining specific change initiatives but also for connecting them to a broader organizational purpose that employees can understand and support. Effective communication in this context should not be understood simply as the amount of information provided. Instead, it can be viewed as a multidimensional process that depends on what is communicated, how it is communicated, when it is communicated, and whether it is perceived as credible and relevant by employees. Abrantes et al. (2024) identify several key dimensions of organizational change communication including scope, content, channels, timing, and contextual variables such as honesty and credibility. This suggests that communication is effective when it helps employees understand both the purpose of the change and its practical implications while at the same time creating trust in the change process.

Communication should begin early and continue throughout the change process (Abrantes et al, 2024). Initial communication triggers awareness while continuous communication sustains engagement and prevents reinforcing of negativity. Initial communication helps create awareness and frame the need for change, while ongoing communication sustains engagement and reduces the risk that uncertainty will be filled by speculations or negative interpretations.

Matos Marques Simoes and Esposito (2014) argue that different forms of communication play different but complementary roles in change processes. Mass communication can ensure consistency in the overall message whereas interpersonal communication enables dialogue, clarification, and the possibility to address concerns directly. This is particularly important in relation to resistance since employees are more likely to accept change when they are given opportunities to ask questions, express concerns, and understand how the change relates to their own situation.

Despite its importance, communication during change also involves a lot of challenges. Since organizational change often creates conditions of uncertainty where information is continuously evolving, communication must balance the need to provide sufficient information with the need to maintain credibility (Abrantes et al, 2024). Too little communication may increase uncertainty while too much communication based on unclear or changing information may undermine trust in leadership. This tension can be understood through Weick's (1995) concept of sensemaking which highlights how employees continuously interpret organizational events in order to understand what they mean for their work. Sensemaking is described as the process through which individuals interpret uncertain or unexpected events and give them meaning (Weick, 1995). In organizational change, employees interpret messages, compare them with their own experiences, and discuss them with others to understand what the change means for their work. Communication therefore supports sensemaking when it is clear, timely, and connected to employees' daily tasks. By reducing ambiguity and helping employees relate the change to their own roles, effective communication can strengthen readiness and engagement. In contrast, fragmented or inconsistent communication may weaken employees' understanding of the change and reduce their willingness to support it.

2.2.2.1 Middle Managers as Translators of Change

Communication during change is closely linked to the role of managers in particular middle managers. Managers are often perceived as the most immediate and credible contact persons during change and therefore function as key intermediaries between senior leadership and employees (Abrantes et al., 2024). In this context, middle managers often occupy a demanding position, and their role extends beyond passing on information. They need to interpret broader strategic messages and translate them into forms that employees can relate to in their daily work. Balogun and Johnson (2004) show that middle managers are important actors in organizational change because they both make sense of the change themselves and influence how others understand it. Through interaction with senior managers and peers, they interpret and adapt change messages and thereby help turn strategic change into everyday practice. This becomes especially important in situations where change is still evolving, and complete clarity is not possible. Middle managers are often expected to provide direction and reassurance even when aspects of the process remain uncertain (Balogun & Johnson, 2004). Their ability to explain change in a credible way, address employees' concerns, and connect overall strategic goals to local realities can strongly influence how change is perceived within teams. As a result, managers' communicative role becomes relevant for change readiness since employees' willingness to engage in change is often shaped by how well their immediate managers help them understand and navigate uncertainty.

3. Method

This chapter presents the methodological choices that guided the study and explains how the research was conducted. It outlines the overall research approach, the case study design, and the methods used for data collection and analysis. In addition, the chapter discusses how trustworthiness and ethical considerations were addressed throughout the research process, as well as the limited use of AI as a writing support tool. Together, these sections provide the foundation for assessing the quality, transparency, and relevance of the study.

3.1 Methodology Approach

This study was grounded in a constructionist research paradigm, which assumed that reality was not objective and fixed, but rather socially constructed through individuals' experiences, interactions, and interpretations (Bell et al., 2022). From this perspective, knowledge was understood as subjective and context-dependent, meaning that organizational phenomena, such as digital transformation, were shaped by how they were perceived and experienced by those involved (Fodouop Kouam Arthur William, 2024).

In line with this stance, a qualitative research approach was adopted to gather empirical insights and understand participants' perspectives. Qualitative research aimed to explore, interpret, and communicate meanings from participants' viewpoints, often expressed in their own words (Ruona, 2005). This approach was particularly suitable for capturing individuals' perceptions, experiences, and interpretations within real-world contexts (Adeoye-Olatunde & Olenik, 2021). Furthermore, qualitative research enabled the study to connect theoretical frameworks with practical observations, allowing for a deeper understanding of complex organizational phenomena (Dubois & Gadde, 2002).

By analysing employee interviews alongside academic literature, the study provided insight into the organization's current conditions and expectations surrounding the upcoming changes, and proposed how the implementation could be carried out most effectively. At the beginning of the research process, a pre-study was conducted to gain fundamental knowledge regarding both the research topic and the organization. This was carried out through meetings with employees to understand their current experiences and perceptions related to the subject.

Through this process, valuable insights were obtained to support the continuation of the project and to identify potential interviewees for further research.

The study followed an abductive research approach (Bell et al., 2022; Ruona, 2005), in which systematic combining was applied as a more precise analytical logic guiding how the research was conducted (Dubois & Gadde, 2002). Rather than starting from predefined hypotheses, abductive reasoning enabled explanations to be developed through continuous interaction between empirical observations and theoretical concepts. In practice, this took the form of a nonlinear and iterative process, where empirical data, theoretical frameworks, and the evolving research problem were continuously matched and rematched, in line with the principles of systematic combining (Dubois & Gadde, 2002). Throughout the study, the direction of the research developed as new insights emerged, allowing both the problem formulation and analytical framework to be refined based on findings from the case company. This flexible approach enabled a closer alignment between theory and practice and supported the exploration of interdependencies within the organizational context.

3.2 Research Design: Case Study

This study adopted a case study research design. A case study could be defined as an in-depth and detailed examination of a single case within its real-life context (Bell et al., 2022). The case typically consists of an organization, process, or phenomenon, with the aim of generating a rich and holistic understanding rather than producing statistically generalizable results.

The case study approach was appropriate for this research, as it enabled an in-depth exploration of digital transformation and organizational change within a specific organizational setting. Case studies are particularly useful for examining complex business networks and contextual dynamics, where multiple factors interact simultaneously (Dubois & Gadde, 2002).

However, case studies are often criticized for their limited generalizability, as findings are closely tied to a specific context (Dubois & Gadde, 2002). Additionally, the interpretive nature of qualitative research introduces a risk of researcher bias. Despite these limitations, the case study design was considered suitable for achieving the study’s exploratory and context-sensitive objectives.

For this case study, the case company represents a global organisation with a long operational history and a strong organizational culture shaped by well-established structures and routines. As part of its multinational structure, the company maintains several research and development (R&D) sites worldwide. An R&D site represents a distinct location within a multinational corporation's innovation network, with the primary mission of conducting research and development activities (Chen et al., 2025). This case study will focus on the R&D sites of the case company.

Operating in a highly regulated pharmaceutical environment, the case company is currently undergoing extensive digital transformation that affects both processes and ways of working. While such digital initiatives are necessary to remain competitive, they also challenge existing practices and require shifts in mindsets and behaviours. This makes the ability to manage change and the readiness of organizational members to engage with and sustain it, particularly important. Examining organizational readiness in the context of this case company therefore provides a relevant opportunity to understand how large and mature organizations respond to continuous digital transformation.

3.3 Data collection

Data collection was carried out through qualitative methods to gain an in-depth understanding of employees' experiences, perceptions, and interpretations of the organizational change process. The primary method used was semi-structured interviews, which allowed participants to describe their views in their own words while enabling the researcher to explore relevant themes in greater depth.

3.3.1 Semi-Structured Interviews

Semi-structured interviews were used as the primary qualitative data collection method. This method could be described as a process in which data was co-produced through interaction between the researcher and the participant, where the researcher's questions and interpretations influenced how the data was understood and analysed (Järvinen & Mik-Meyer, 2020).

Semi-structured interviews were characterized using a flexible interview guide containing open-ended questions aligned with the study objectives, while allowing the interviewer to adapt the wording, sequence, and depth of questions depending on participants' responses (Bryman, 2016). This format ensured consistency across interviews while remaining responsive to new insights that emerged during the interview process. Rather than restricting responses to predefined categories, participants were able to express their views in their own words, generating rich and nuanced data (Kallio et al., 2016).

This method was particularly appropriate as the research questions required an in-depth understanding of employee perspectives (Creswell & Poth, 2018). An interview guide was developed to ensure alignment with the study objectives, consisting of open-ended questions addressing key research areas (Kallio et al., 2016). While the guide provided a consistent framework, flexibility was maintained to explore relevant themes raised by participants. Furthermore, semi-structured interviews were advantageous in organizational contexts where participants had varying roles, expertise, and experiences (Adeoye-Olatunde & Olenik, 2021). The adaptability of the method allowed follow-up questions to be tailored to each participant while still addressing common themes, thereby enhancing the relevance and depth of the data collected.

3.3.1.1 Selecting Interviewees

Selecting appropriate respondents was a crucial step, as the quality and relevance of interview data depended largely on who was included in the study (Alshenqeeti, 2014).
A purposive sampling strategy was applied, where participants were selected based on their relevance to the research topic (Bell et al., 2022). Selection criteria included employees' roles within the organization, their level of involvement in the change process, and their ability to provide meaningful insights into the phenomenon under investigation.

To ensure a balanced perspective, individuals with extremely strong negative or positive attitudes towards change were not prioritized, as such perspectives might have led to overly biased interpretations (McClam et al., 2023). Instead, participants who could provide reflective and nuanced insights were selected. Initial contacts established during the pre-study were also used to identify suitable interviewees within the organization.

A total of 20 semi-structured interviews were conducted across four organizational sites in Sweden, the UK, Poland, and the USA. The sample included both operational employees and their immediate managers in order to capture perspectives from both managerial and non-managerial levels. Of the 20 respondents, 11 held managerial positions and 9 did not. The distribution of respondents across sites was designed to reflect the organization's geographical spread and to ensure representation from sites of different relative sizes. The interviews ranged from 30 to 60 minutes in length, with most lasting between 45 and 60 minutes. Depending on the location of the respondent and practical circumstances, interviews were conducted either in person at site or online via Microsoft Teams. This approach enabled the inclusion of participants from multiple locations while ensuring a coherent and flexible interview process.

Table 1: Overview of Interview Respondents

Respondent	Location (Country)	Manager?	Duration
R1	Sweden	No	45 min
R2	Sweden	No	45 min
R3	Sweden	No	1 h
R4	Sweden	No	1 h
R5	UK	No	45 min
R6	Poland	Yes	1 h
R7	Sweden	Yes	1 h
R8	UK	No	1 h
R9	USA	No	1 h
R10	Sweden	Yes	1 h
R11	UK	No	45 min
R12	Poland	Yes	1 h

R13	Sweden	Yes	1 h
R14	Poland	Yes	1 h
R15	USA	Yes	1 h
R16	UK	Yes	1 h
R17	Sweden	Yes	1 h
R18	UK	No	30 min
R19	Poland	Yes	1 h
R20	UK	Yes	1 h

3.4 Data Analysis

The analysis followed an abductive and thematic approach, combining empirical observations with theoretical interpretation. The collected data were analysed in several stages. First, each interview was summarized individually to identify key points and initial patterns. These summaries were then compared across interviews to identify recurring issues and similarities.

The analysis was inspired by Braun and Clarke's thematic analysis framework (Braun & Clarke, 2006), which involved familiarization with the data through repeated reading, generating initial codes, grouping codes into categories, identifying and refining themes, and interpreting these themes in relation to the research objectives. During the coding process, segments of text were assigned labels representing recurring ideas or issues. These codes were then grouped into broader categories, forming the basis for theme development.

Themes represented patterns of meaning that captured shared experiences and perspectives among participants (Lochmiller, 2021). The process was iterative and interpretive, requiring the researchers to move beyond description to identify underlying meanings and relationships within the data (Ahmed et al., 2025).

Following this, the data were structured into four main themes, which facilitated a clearer understanding of the findings and enabled a structured presentation of the empirical results. The empirical findings were then analysed in relation to existing theoretical frameworks, allowing for connections between theory and practice to be identified. Finally, the results were compared with existing literature in the discussion chapter, contributing to both practical insights for the case company and theoretical contributions to the academic field.

Thematic analysis is inherently reflexive, meaning that researchers actively shape the analytical process (Ahmed et al., 2025). Therefore, continuous reflection on assumptions and interpretations was carried out throughout the study to ensure transparency and analytical rigor. This approach allowed for both descriptive and explanatory insights, making it suitable for linking empirical findings with theoretical frameworks.

3.5 Trustworthiness

In this study, trustworthiness was ensured through a transparent, systematic and reflexive research process, guided by the criteria of credibility, transferability, dependability and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Nowell et al., 2017).

Credibility was strengthened by thorough engagement with the interview material. Both researchers conducted the interviews, where one primarily asked questions while the other took detailed notes, ensuring attentiveness to participants' expressions. Interview notes were reviewed multiple times, and interpretations were continuously discussed between the researchers to challenge assumptions and refine themes. Where relevant, participants were given the opportunity to clarify or elaborate on their statements to ensure that interpretations reflected their intended meanings.

To further improve credibility, a form of stakeholder or practitioner validation was performed, whereby the preliminary findings derived from the semi-structured interviews were presented during a structured meeting with professionals within the case company. This approach aligns with established qualitative validation strategies such as expert judgement and collaborative review, which are commonly used to assess the relevance, clarity, and accuracy of collected data (Sánchez-Guardiola Paredes et al., 2021). By involving professionals who possess contextual knowledge and practical experience, the study ensured that the interpretations were grounded in organizational reality and aligned with industry practices.

The reasoning for conducting validation in this way was firstly due to it allowing the verification of whether the data accurately represented the operational context and experiences within the organization. Secondly, it provided an opportunity to identify potential misinterpretations, omissions, or biases in the analysis. Engaging professionals in the validation process also contributes to enhancing the practical relevance of the findings, as their feedback can refine interpretations and ensure that conclusions are meaningful for real-world application (Sánchez-Guardiola Paredes et al., 2021).

During the validation meeting, the analysed data and emerging themes were systematically presented to the participating professionals. They were encouraged to critically reflect on the findings, confirm their accuracy, and provide feedback on their completeness and relevance. This interactive process enabled the identification of areas requiring clarification or adjustment and facilitated the incorporation of practitioner insights into the final analysis.

Transferability was supported by providing rich, contextual descriptions of participants, settings and research procedures. The thesis describes the steps taken during recruitment, interviewing and analysis. By offering detailed descriptions of the research context and analytical process, readers are enabled to assess whether the findings may be applicable to similar contexts.

Dependability was achieved by clearly documenting each stage of the research process. This included describing the development of the interview guide, data collection procedures, transcription practices and the process of coding and finding themes. Analytical decisions were recorded and discussed throughout the process, creating a transparent and clear process.

Confirmability was ensured through continuous reflexivity and close grounding of findings in the data. The researchers critically reflected on their own assumptions and how these might influence interpretations. Themes were supported with direct quotations from the interviews, demonstrating that conclusions were derived from participants’ accounts rather than researcher bias.

Sample size strongly affects the trustworthiness of research because it determines whether findings are based on sufficient and meaningful evidence (Marshall et al., 2013). For this thesis, 20 interviews with interviewees were conducted, which was a sample size selected to allow in depth exploration while remaining manageable for thorough analysis. By ensuring that themes began to repeat and no substantially new insights emerged, the credibility and trustworthiness could be strengthened.

In addition, the scope of the study has been influenced by both practical and ethical constraints. Due to confidentiality requirements, access to certain types of internal data was restricted, and some information has therefore been either omitted or anonymized. Furthermore, the limited timeframe of this research could constrain the depth of the analysis.

3.6 Ethics

The research has been conducted in accordance with established ethical principles for business research as described by Bell et al. (2022). According to Bell et al., (2022) ethics in research can be understood through four main principles: ethics as a continuous responsibility, avoidance of harm, privacy, confidentiality and anonymity, and power relationships and vulnerability. Given the organizational context of this study and the sensitivity of change-related topics certain attention has been paid to issues of confidentiality and anonymity. Interview data will therefore be treated confidentially and any identifying information will be removed or anonymized in reporting. Participants will not be identifiable in the thesis and references to specific roles or units will be presented at an aggregated level in order to reduce the risk of identification. As the interviews may involve discussions of organizational change that could evoke uncertainty or concern among participants, efforts will be made to minimize potential discomfort. Interviews will be conducted in a respectful manner and participants will not be required to answer questions they find uncomfortable. Furthermore, awareness of potential power imbalances between the researchers and participants has guided the interview approach with an emphasis on openness, respect, and sensitivity throughout the research process. By adhering to these ethical principles the study aims to ensure responsible and respectful research practice while protecting the integrity of all participants involved.

3.7 Use of AI

The use of artificial intelligence (AI) in this report was limited to supporting the writing process, specifically through correcting grammar and improving language clarity. AI tools were utilized to enhance the academic quality of the text, ensuring consistency and readability. Importantly, AI was not used to generate any content or assist in the interpretation or analysis of the findings. All substantive aspects of the research, including conceptual development, data analysis, and conclusions, were carried out independently by the authors to maintain academic integrity.

4. Empirical Findings

This chapter presents the empirical findings from the interviews, focusing on employees' perceptions of digital transformation. It covers the gap between organizational necessity and individual relevance, challenges related to readiness and implementation, issues in communication and sensemaking, and the role of trust, leadership, and organizational culture in shaping responses to change.

4.1 Gap Between Organizational Necessity and Individual Relevance

A central theme emerging from the interviews is that *digital transformation* is widely perceived as *inevitable* and *necessary* by the pharmaceutical company's employees, yet its *meaning* and *relevance* are not always clearly understood at the individual level. Several respondents describe change not as a choice, but as something that must be accepted and adapted to. As one participant expressed it:

“You can't really fight change” (R8),

reflecting a general sentiment that transformation is *unavoidable*. This view is reinforced by the perception that technological development continues at an accelerating pace, where one interviewee noted change will never be as slow as it is now. Together, these perspectives illustrate that employees recognize digital transformation as a *continuous* and *unavoidable process* rather than a temporary initiative. This sense of inevitability is also closely connected to how employees perceive the role of digital tools in their work. Respondents frequently emphasized that new technologies are not only beneficial, but *necessary* to remain effective and responsible in their roles. One participant expressed this clearly by stating that:

“The tools are available; it would be irresponsible not to use them” (R7).

This highlights a pragmatic perspective, where engagement with digital transformation for some is driven less by enthusiasm and more by a sense of *obligation*. Similarly, another respondent summarized this view by explaining how change is a necessity, reinforcing the idea that transformation is not optional but required for both organizational and individual performance. However, a theme became clear where those who had a personal interest in digital tools see the personal benefit of evolving in digital transformation, thereby being driven by enthusiasm, though very few respondents had this consensus.

Despite this broad acceptance, the interviews reveal a recurring challenge in understanding the *purpose* and *direction* of transformation initiatives. Several participants questioned the rationale behind certain changes, expressing uncertainty about their objectives and outcomes. This is captured in the recurring question:

“Why are we doing this?” (R14).

Such statements indicate that while employees accept the need for transformation in principle, they do not always perceive a clear connection between strategic initiatives and their own daily work. This creates a disconnect where transformation is acknowledged at a conceptual level but remains difficult to interpret in practice.

Another important aspect highlighted in the interviews is the perception of inefficiencies and lack of standardization in current ways of working. Multiple respondents pointed out that existing processes are fragmented and inconsistent, which reinforces the perceived need for digital transformation. This observation strengthens the argument for transformation, as employees *recognize* that improvements in standardization and structure are necessary to enhance efficiency and reduce complexity. At the same time, the observation also illustrates that transformation is, according to interviewees, often justified by existing organizational shortcomings rather than a clearly articulated future vision.

The interviews also indicate that employees struggle to relate transformation initiatives to their own roles, particularly when their work is distant from the end-user or broader organizational purpose. One respondent described this challenge by referring to the common expression “think about the patient,” explaining that

“When you are far away from the patient, it is not always easy to understand; you need to be able to understand it from your own role.” (R8).

This highlights the difficulty of translating abstract or value-driven messages into concrete *meaning* at the individual level.

4.2 Readiness Constrained by Priorities, Implementation and Support

A barrier to readiness identified in the interviews is the *lack of time* and *competing priorities*. Employees are expected to manage ongoing operational responsibilities while simultaneously engaging in transformation activities, such as learning new systems, completing training sessions, and contributing to implementation processes. In practice, operational work is consistently prioritized, leaving limited capacity for change-related efforts. This constraint is not described as a lack of willingness to engage in change, but rather as a *lack of opportunity*. Several participants emphasize that while they recognize the importance of digital transformation, the demands of *daily operations* limit their ability to actively participate in implementation processes. As one interviewee expressed it:

> "You don't really have much say in the bigger decisions." (R10).

This challenge is further intensified by the number of initiatives being introduced simultaneously and within a relatively short period of time which creates a sense of *overload*. Rather than allowing employees to adapt gradually, change is often experienced as continuous and compressed. Interviewees described this as both *overwhelming* and *difficult to manage* in parallel with everyday work. As one participant explained:

"They´re trying to learn how to crawl and run at the same time, it feels really forced" (R7),
"Oh no here comes another one" (R4).

These accounts suggest that the pace and volume of ongoing change reduce employees' capacity to engage with each initiative. As a result, engagement with change is often postponed or deprioritized which may slow adoption and reduce the overall effectiveness of transformation efforts. The constraints on readiness are further reinforced by how digital systems are piloted and introduced. A recurring theme in the interviews is the perceived gap between the *expected value* of new systems and their *functionality* at the time of implementation. Systems are often described as being introduced at an early stage, requiring employees to learn, test, and identify issues simultaneously. Participants frequently explained this by referring to the short and pressured time span between piloting and full implementation. In some cases, piloting was delayed while implementation was brought forward, resulting in the two processes occurring almost at the same time. This creates *confusion* and *inefficiencies* as employees are expected to adapt to new tools while still relying on existing processes.

Another important aspect highlighted in the interviews is the lack of sufficient support structures during implementation. Employees often express uncertainty about where to seek help when issues arise, and support is not always readily accessible. Training is described as either poorly timed or insufficiently aligned with the practical demands of daily work, which limits employees' ability to effectively learn and apply new systems. One interviewee captured this need by stating:

> "Help the organization rather than saying the organization should help" (R16).

This reflects a perception that employees are expected to manage change largely on their own, rather than being actively supported through it. Several participants express a need for more structured and localized support, such as the presence of super-users or designated contact persons who can provide guidance during rollout. The absence of such support mechanisms increases the burden on individual employees to resolve issues independently further constraining readiness. Taken together, these findings indicate that readiness is shaped not only by employees' attitudes toward change, but also by the organizational conditions under which change is implemented. Limited time, competing priorities, implementation practices, and insufficient support structures interact to constrain employees' ability to engage with and adopt digital transformation initiatives.

4.3 Unbalanced Communication Creates a Barrier for Understanding

A pattern emerging from the interview data is that communication surrounding change is experienced as *fragmented*, *uneven*, and *difficult to navigate*. Respondents describe how information is distributed across multiple channels, such as meetings, emails, internal platforms, and town halls, without a clear structure that connects these different sources into a coherent whole. Rather than receiving a consolidated overview, employees are often required to *piece together information themselves*. This creates a situation where understanding becomes dependent on individual effort and chance, for example being present in specific meetings or actively searching through platforms. As a result, different respondents report having access to different pieces of information, leading to inconsistent levels of awareness across the organization.

This *fragmented communication* is further reinforced by the absence of a standardized approach to how change is communicated. Respondents highlight that communication varies depending on who is responsible for delivering it, which affects both the clarity and depth of information provided. Some describe receiving clear explanations and opportunities for dialogue, while others encounter vague or incomplete messages. This inconsistency makes it difficult to form a shared understanding, particularly when multiple initiatives are introduced simultaneously. The lack of *uniformity* also contributes to uncertainty regarding where to find reliable information, as there is no single, trusted source that provides a comprehensive overview of ongoing changes.

Another recurring theme is the *imbalance* between the amount of information shared and its practical usefulness. While communication is often described as frequent or even extensive, it is frequently perceived as *too general* and lacking in actionable detail. Respondents' express difficulties in understanding how changes will affect their daily work, indicating a gap between high-level messaging and practical implications. This creates a disconnect where employees are informed that change is happening, but not how or when it will unfold. As one respondent described, it becomes "so difficult to find the how and the when" (R16) illustrating how the absence of concrete details limits the ability to interpret and prepare for change.

The *timing* and *continuity of communication* also emerged as important challenges. Several respondents describe how information is either provided too late and close to implementation, or concentrated at the beginning of an initiative without sufficient follow-up. This disrupts the ability to build understanding over time, as employees are either forced to react quickly or lose track of changes as they evolve. In some cases, communication is perceived as *sporadic* or *unpredictable*, making it difficult to rely on a steady flow of updates. This contributes to situations where changes are experienced as sudden, even when they have been previously communicated.

In addition, respondents highlight limitations in opportunities for *interaction* and *clarification*. Although formal channels such as town halls and large meetings are frequently used, they do not always allow for questions or dialogue. This restricts employees' ability to *interpret* and *contextualize* the information they receive. Several respondents emphasize the importance of being able to ask questions when information is unclear, raising concerns such as whether "people [can] ask questions when they don't have enough information" (R20). When such opportunities are limited, employees are left to interpret messages independently, which increases the risk of misunderstanding.

A further issue relates to the perceived *restriction* and *selectivity* of information sharing. Some respondents describe an:

"Atmosphere of secrets" (R19),

where not all information is communicated openly. This creates *uncertainty* and can lead to *speculation* filling the gaps left by official communication. In such contexts, employees may question what is being withheld and why, which complicates their ability to form a clear and reliable understanding of change. At the same time, there is an expressed tension between *transparency* and *timing*, as some respondents acknowledge that:

"There is a time for every bit of information" (R17),

indicating that communication must also be carefully managed to avoid overload or unnecessary concern.

The *volume* of communication itself is also identified as a challenge. While information is often available, respondents describe difficulties in processing and keeping up with it, particularly when multiple changes occur simultaneously. Large amounts of information spread across different platforms require employees to *actively filter and prioritize content*, which increases the likelihood that important details are missed. This overload does not necessarily improve understanding according to respondents, instead, it can reduce engagement and contribute to selective awareness, where employees focus only on what appears immediately relevant.

Finally, the findings suggest that communication is not only *unevenly distributed* across channels, but also across *roles* and *teams*. Some respondents report having better access to information due to their position or proximity to specific initiatives, while others rely on indirect or delayed communication. This creates *disparities* in understanding within the organization, where employees may have different interpretations of the same change. In response to these challenges, several respondents emphasize the importance of openness and responsiveness in communication, reflected in statements such as:

“Better to overcommunicate than surprise” (R3) and “Anything I can answer, I will answer.” (R15).

4.4 Trust, Leadership, and Cultural Context Shape Responses to Change

The findings indicate that employees’ responses to digital transformation are influenced by *trust*, *leadership*, and *the broader organizational context*. In general, there is a relatively high level of trust in senior leadership which provides a foundation for accepting the overall direction of change. However, this trust does not *automatically translate* into readiness at the operational level where change is experienced in practice. *Middle managers* play a key role in shaping how change is *understood* and *translated* into practice within teams. Positioned between strategic decision-making and daily operations they are responsible for *translating* organizational initiatives into concrete actions for employees. This role places significant demands on managers as they are expected to provide *clarity*, address *concerns* and maintain employee confidence often in situations where information is incomplete or continuously evolving. One interviewee described this responsibility by emphasizing the need to help employees understand their role in relation to broader organizational goals:

“Its not clear sometimes for them to see how they can contribute to the organizations goal. I had to create that mindset, the business mindset” (R13).

Their ability to guide employees through *uncertainty* and provide direction could therefore be seen as critical for how change is perceived. In addition to guiding employees through change, middle managers must manage their own reactions and avoid allowing their personal views to negatively influence others. As one manager expressed it:

"As a manager, our change curve cannot affect someone else's curve.” (R16).

The *global context* of the organization further shapes how change is experienced across sites. Differences in *communication practices*, *engagement levels*, and *local conditions* suggest that readiness is not uniform but influenced by the culture of each geographical location. Interviewees describe cultural differences between sites that affect how change is approached in practice. For example, the Polish site is described as having a more execution-oriented mindset where focus is often placed on daily operational work and direct results, while longer-term perspectives are more easily deprioritized. In contrast, the Swedish site is described as being characterized by critical questioning and transparency, and as being "good at raising stuff." These differences suggest that employees' mindsets toward change may be shaped by local norms and ways of working which in turn influence how change initiatives are received and discussed.

Another difference that emerged in the interviews relates to the *geographical location of the leadership team*. Since the leadership group is based in the UK site employees at other sites perceive communication there as faster and more *immediate*, contributing to a stronger sense of involvement. For employees outside the UK the physical distance from leadership appears to create a barrier to engagement. As one interviewee noted:

> "You will think twice when you do not meet them everyday in the office" (R12).

This suggests that proximity to leadership affects not only access to information, but also the sense of *connection* and *involvement* in organizational change.

In addition to leadership and geographical context the findings show that organizational culture influences how employees *approach* change. The interviews suggest a risk-aware and quality-focused culture which is expected in a highly regulated industry. This is reflected in statements such as "people want to be correct." While this mindset supports quality it may limit experimentation and adaptability. Employees may therefore be more cautious when using new systems and less willing to try new ways of working if mistakes are seen as problematic. However, interviewees also describe efforts to challenge this tendency within their teams. One manager explained that a key message to employees is to:

"Dare to try and fail, explore ideas even though it might not work out in the end"

(R9).

This indicates an awareness that a highly quality-focused culture may need to be balanced with greater openness to learning and experimentation if digital transformation is to be successfully implemented.

5. Discussion

Existing literature on digital transformation highlights the increasing need for organizations to adapt to the increasingly dynamic environment (Verhoef et al., 2021). As digital transformation is ongoing and embedded in daily work it places increasing demands on employees to interpret, respond to and implement change. This makes organizational readiness for change critical to evaluate and the following discussion tries to address this gap by examining how organizational readiness is experienced within a multinational organizational context (Weiner, 2009; Holt & Vardaman, 2013). By linking the findings from interviews with theoretical perspectives the discussion aims to provide an understanding of how readiness is communicated, interpreted, supported, and enacted in practice as well as trying to answer the research questions.

5.1 Main Dimensions for Organizational Readiness for Digital Change

The findings highlight several key dimensions of organizational readiness which are elaborated in the following chapter:

- The gap between conceptual alignment and practical implementation, where organizational intentions do not fully translate into everyday engagement.
- The role of structural capacity, including competing priorities and limited support, in constraining employees' ability to engage with change.
- The importance of communication for understanding, where fragmented communication limits employees' ability to understand and act on change initiatives.
- The influence of trust, leadership, and organizational culture in shaping how change is perceived, interpreted, and sustained over time.

5.1.1 The Gap Between Organizational Intentions and Daily Engagement

As presented in the empirical findings, organizational readiness for digital transformation appears to be more strongly expressed at a conceptual level than it is reflected in everyday practice. While the organization recognizes the importance of change and communicates alignment with digital transformation goals, this awareness does not consistently translate into engagement or sustained implementation among employees. In other words, there seems to be a gap between what is understood by the employees and what is done in practice, meaning that readiness exists more in principle than in practice.

From a theoretical standpoint, change readiness refers to the extent to which individuals and organizations are both psychologically and behaviourally prepared to implement change. This involves more than simply recognizing the need for change, it also includes emotional commitment and a willingness to act while seeing the personal benefits in the form of change valence (Holt & Vardaman, 2013; Rafferty et al., 2013; Shea et al., 2014). The empirical findings partly reflect this, as employees generally acknowledge that digital transformation is necessary. However, this recognition does not always lead to action, suggesting that deeper aspects of readiness are not fully developed. This disconnect can be better understood by distinguishing between agreement and readiness. The literature emphasizes that agreeing with the need for change is not the same as being ready for it. Readiness involves motivation, capability, and a willingness to act (Wang et al., 2023). In this case, employees often agree with the organization's direction, however, they still show hesitation or limited behavioural change. This suggests that the organization may be overestimating its readiness by confusing shared understanding with actual preparedness.

A similar pattern can be seen in relation to efficacy. Research discusses the importance of both individual self-efficacy and collective change efficacy in shaping readiness, as these influence whether employees feel capable of carrying out change (Weiner, 2009; Holt & Vardaman, 2013). However, the findings indicate that many employees feel uncertain about their ability to adapt to new digital tools and processes. This creates a situation where readiness is communicated at a strategic level but not fully internalized at the operational level, where change takes place.

5.1.2 How Structural Capacity Shapes Engagement with Change

The empirical findings suggest that organizational readiness for digital transformation is not only shaped by employees' attitudes but also influenced by the structure within the organization. Although many employees show a willingness to engage with change, their ability to do so is frequently constrained by existing systems and processes. This indicates that readiness is not purely a psychological phenomenon but is closely tied to the structural context in which change takes place (Holt & Vardaman, 2013; Weiner, 2009). From a theoretical perspective, organizational readiness is typically understood as a multidimensional concept that includes both psychological preparedness and structural capacity. Structural capacity refers to the systems and resources, together with policies and infrastructures that enable employees to carry out change effectively (Holt & Vardaman, 2013; Castro-Villarreal et al., 2014). These elements are essential for turning willingness into action, as even highly motivated individuals may struggle to engage with change if the necessary support structures are not in place (Weiner, 2009).

The empirical findings support this view, showing that structural constraints play a key role in limiting readiness in practice. Employees often face rigid processes and complex organizational procedures that slow down or complicate the implementation of digital initiatives. As a result, a gap is created between the intended direction of change and the day-to-day operations. This issue can be further understood by looking at structural capacity as an enabler of change. Theory emphasizes that access to appropriate training and organizational support systems is critical for enabling change-related behaviours (Holt & Vardaman, 2013). However, the empirical data suggests that these forms of support are not always aligned with the demands of digital transformation. Employees may lack sufficient time or compatible systems to fully engage with new digital processes. This mismatch between what is provided and what is needed limits their ability to act, and in turn constrains overall readiness.

The findings also highlight the connection between structural conditions and perceived efficacy. Although efficacy is often treated as a psychological factor, it is influenced by the environment in which employees operate (Holt & Vardaman, 2013; Weiner, 2009). When systems are overly complex or resources insufficient, employees may experience change as difficult or overwhelming. This can lower their confidence in their ability to contribute, ultimately weakening overall readiness (Weiner, 2009). In this case, the findings suggest that reduced confidence is not due to a lack of motivation, but rather to structural limitations that make effective action more difficult.

5.1.3 The Role of Communication in Understanding Change

The empirical findings highlight communication as a key mechanism through which employees understand and engage with digital transformation. Rather than only serving to share information, communication plays a central role in shaping how change becomes meaningful within the organization. The findings suggest that differences in how change is communicated have an impact on how employees make sense of it and how actively they engage with transformation initiatives.

From a theoretical perspective, communication is especially important in times of organizational change because it helps reduce uncertainty and supports employees in interpreting both the purpose and implications of change (Weick, 1995; Sopow & Sushkova, 2025). Change initiatives often bring uncertainty, which in turn forces employees to make sense of why the change is occurring and how it will affect their own roles. In this sense, effective communication supports readiness by helping employees make sense of change and align their understanding with organizational goals (Rafferty et al., 2013). The empirical findings strongly reflect this perspective. Employees' engagement with digital transformation appears closely tied to how clearly and consistently change is communicated. When communication is coherent and explains the purpose and direction of digital initiatives, employees are better able to understand the bigger picture and see how their work contributes to broader organizational goals. This supports the idea that communication helps link individual roles to overall objectives, thereby strengthening engagement (Sopow & Sushkova, 2025).

At the same time, the findings show that communication is not always experienced as clear or relevant. When messages are fragmented or remain at an abstract level, employees struggle to translate transformation goals into something concrete in their daily work. This makes it harder for them to engage meaningfully with change initiatives. This observation aligns with theory, which emphasizes that communication must not only inform, but also be timely and relevant to employees' specific contexts (Abrantes et al., 2024). When these qualities are missing, communication can create confusion rather than clarity, and may even contribute to disengagement.

Another important insight is that communication influences not only how employees understand change, but also how involved they feel in the process (Rafferty et al., 2013). The literature suggests that involving employees through communication increases their sense of ownership and willingness to support change (Rafferty et al., 2013). In the empirical context, employees who experience open and interactive communication, where they can ask questions and provide input, tend to be more engaged. In contrast, one-way or top-down communication limits opportunities for interaction, which can reduce employees' sense of involvement.

The findings also show that communication shapes how employees perceive the alignment between what the organization says and what it does. When communication is consistent with observed actions and decisions, it strengthens trust and creates a more coherent understanding of change. However, when there is a mismatch between what is communicated and what is experienced in practice, employees may begin to question the credibility of the message, which can undermine engagement. This reflects theoretical perspectives that highlight the importance of consistency and credibility in communication for effective sensemaking (Weick, 1995).

Finally, the empirical data suggests that communication needs to be ongoing rather than limited to initial change announcements. Theory emphasizes that communication is a continuous process that evolves alongside change initiatives to support ongoing interpretation and adjustment (Rafferty et al., 2013). As gathered through the interviews, however, communication does not always maintain this continuity. As a result, employees may experience gaps in understanding as the transformation progresses. Over time, this can lead to declining engagement, as employees lack the updated information and guidance needed to understand ongoing changes.

5.1.4 How Trust, Leadership, and Culture Shape Change

The empirical findings suggest that trust, leadership, and organizational culture play an important role in shaping how employees perceive and respond to digital transformation. Rather than influencing readiness through formal structures alone, these factors work on a deeper level by shaping how employees interpret change and how they feel about it. This highlights that the success of transformation efforts depends not only on what is implemented, but also on how it is experienced within the organization.

According to theory, trust is a key component of organizational readiness, as it affects both information sharing and employees' willingness to support change (Holt & Vardaman, 2013; Rafferty et al., 2013). When employees trust leadership and organizational systems, they are more likely to engage with it. The empirical findings reflect this, showing that employees' reactions to digital transformation are closely tied to their level of trust in the organization's direction and decision-making. When trust is high, employees tend to approach change with openness and acceptance. In contrast, lower levels of trust often lead to scepticism and reduced engagement.

Leadership also plays a central role in shaping how change is received by mainly influencing how it is interpreted. The literature highlights that leaders are critical in guiding employees through uncertainty and building commitment to change (Rafferty et al., 2013). In the empirical context, leadership behaviours affect how employees assess the importance of digital transformation. When leaders are seen as open and supportive, employees are more likely to view change as legitimate and necessary. On the other hand, inconsistent actions or unclear direction from leadership can create ambiguity, which may lead to uncertainty or resistance (Rafferty et al., 2013).

Organizational culture represents another important factor in shaping how change is received. Culture influences the underlying assumptions and norms through which employees interpret what is happening around them (Schein, 2010). The findings suggest that cultural characteristics affect employees' openness to digital transformation. For example, cultures that emphasize stability and risk avoidance can make change more difficult as it limits experimentation. This aligns with theory showing that low tolerance for uncertainty can increase fear of failure and attachment to existing ways of working (Abrantes et al., 2024). At the same time, more flexible and supportive cultures can strengthen readiness by encouraging learning and confidence (Olafsen et al., 2021). The empirical findings reflect this, as employees working in environments that promote learning and collaboration tend to be more open to digital initiatives. This suggests that culture shapes not only attitudes toward change, but also employees perceived ability to engage with it.

An important insight from the findings is how closely trust, leadership, and culture are connected, and how together they shape both the initial response to change and its long-term sustainability. Trust is often built through consistent leadership behaviour, while leadership both reflects and reinforces organizational culture. Together, these elements create a broader context in which employees interpret and respond to change. This aligns with theoretical perspectives that view readiness as the result of interconnected relational and cultural factors (Rafferty et al., 2013). It also reflects Clausen and Kragh's (2019) argument that change is influenced by deeper organizational structures, such as relationships, communication patterns, shared narratives, emotions, and leadership practices, which can either support or hinder the sustainability of change. The findings show that when these factors are aligned, employees are more likely to respond positively and stay engaged over time. In contrast, when there is misalignment between the factors, it can create confusion and weaken engagement. This supports the idea that sustaining change requires ongoing consistency between what the organization says, what it does, and what it values (Buchanan et al., 2005; Clausen & Kragh, 2019).

5.2 How the organization can strengthen readiness

Building on the discussion presented in 5.1, the findings indicate that organizational readiness for digital transformation is shaped not only by employees' attitude but also by structural conditions, communication structures and the broader organizational context. While readiness appears relatively strong at a conceptual level there are several gaps that emerge in how change is understood and supported in practice.

In line with the second research question, this section shifts focus from current state to action. The following analysis presents key areas where organizational readiness can be improved. These recommendations aim to address the misalignment between organizational direction identified in the empirical findings.

5.2.1 Create a Network for Implementing Change

The findings suggest that readiness may be strengthened by creating a more structured network for translating and implementing change across organizational levels (Rafferty et al., 2013). Although employees generally recognize that digital transformation is necessary many still struggle to understand how specific initiatives relate to their own daily work. This indicates that strategic messages are not always translated into forms that are meaningful at the operational level. In line with theory, readiness depends not only on recognizing the need for change but also on perceiving it as relevant, appropriate, and manageable in relation to one's own role (Holt et al., 2007). When this link is weak, change risks remaining abstract rather than actionable in daily work (Weiner, 2009).

The findings show that middle managers play a central role in bridging this gap. Positioned between strategy and operations they help employees connect broader organizational goals to their daily work. This is consistent with Balogun and Johnson (2004) who show that middle managers are not simply channels for top-down communication but active interpreters of change. Their work also suggests that in geographically dispersed organizations, local interactions between managers and employees often have a more direct influence on how change is understood and enacted than communication from senior leadership. This implies that readiness is strengthened not only through communication from the top but through ongoing local interpretation. The need for a more structured network is further reinforced by the way implementation currently appears to take place. The findings suggest that testing and rollout are sometimes compressed into the same phase, creating confusion and increasing the difficulty of managing change alongside daily tasks. Employees are expected to learn, test, and adapt while implementation is already ongoing, which limits their ability to engage.

This highlights the importance of establishing a structured network of change translators, including middle managers and more standardized change supporters who are formally tasked with supporting interpretation and implementation (Holt et al., 2007). Such a network would embed change more clearly in the organization's structural capacity rather than leaving translation and implementation to individual initiative. The network would therefore support employees not only in understanding why change is happening but also in how to act during implementation. Employees often express uncertainty about where to turn when problems arise especially during rollout. A structured network could address this by making support more local and visible (Wang et al., 2023).

This becomes especially important in a multinational context where readiness varies between sites. Since readiness is a multilevel construct individuals may be personally positive toward change while still belonging to teams or sites with weaker collective readiness (Rafferty et al., 2013). A structured network could therefore function as a synchronizing mechanism that reduces variation across the organization while still allowing for local adaptation. This may be especially valuable where local site cultures shape change differently. Overall, the organization may improve readiness by moving from broad strategic messaging and compressed rollout toward a more systematic structure that helps employees understand, test, and enact change in their local context.

5.2.2 Improve Communication Structure and Dialogue

Even if a structured network for implementing change is established, its effectiveness depends on how communication supports it (Holt et al., 2007). As identified in section 5.1.3, fragmented communication limits employees' ability to make sense of digital transformation. Employees receive information through multiple channels but often without a clear structure that connects messages into a coherent whole. As a result, understanding becomes dependent on individual effort rather than organizational support which weakens sensemaking and makes it more difficult for employees to form a shared understanding of the change process (Weick, 1995). In line with theory, communication supports readiness when it reduces ambiguity, explains both the purpose and consequences of change, and creates opportunities for clarification (Armenakis et al., 1993).

To strengthen readiness communication may therefore need to be more coherent across scope, content, and channels (Abrantes et al., 2024). First, the scope of communication needs to be clearer in relation to who needs what information and when. This is important both to avoid information gaps and to reduce overload in a context where employees are already managing multiple simultaneous changes. Second, the content of communication needs to be more concrete and more clearly connected to daily work. Rather than remaining at a general level, messages should explain why the change is taking place, what it means in practice, when it will happen, who is affected, and where employees can turn for support. Third, the channels of communication need to be used more strategically. Mass communication may be useful for consistency but interpersonal communication is necessary for clarification, contextualization, and feedback.

This becomes particularly important in relation to the limited opportunities for dialogue described in the interviews. Employees express difficulties in asking questions, clarifying uncertainty, or discussing how change should be understood in their own context. A more coherent communication structure could help address this by making dialogue a more integrated part of the change process, acknowledging employees' interpretive rights rather than just their voice (Matos Marques Simoes & Esposito, 2014). In this sense, dialogue becomes a way of reducing uncertainty and strengthening local understanding rather than leaving employees to construct meaning on their own.

Interactive communication is especially relevant in digital transformation, where change is not a one-off event but is ongoing, iterative, and embedded in everyday work (Verhoef et al., 2021). Under such conditions, communication should be treated as a continuous process through which shared meaning is constructed and maintained over time (Abrantes et al., 2024). The findings also indicate that trust in leadership provides a foundation for accepting change but that this trust may weaken when communication is perceived as selective, delayed, or too vague. For this reason, the organization needs not only more structured communication but also communication that is perceived as honest, timely, and credible.

5.2.3 Balance Quality Culture with Experimentation and Learning

The findings suggest that the organization can strengthen readiness by creating a better balance between its existing quality-focused culture and a greater openness to experimentation and learning. Employees describe a culture shaped by high standards, correctness, and caution which is understandable in a highly regulated pharmaceutical context. This orientation, characteristic of a hierarchy culture, supports consistency, compliance, and patient safety, all of which are critical in the studied setting (Cameron & Quinn, 2011), but may limit employees willingness to test new systems or adopt unfamiliar ways of working.

This can be understood through Schein's (2010) view of organizational culture as a pattern of basic assumptions that a group has learned while coping with external adaptation and internal integration. Since the current quality-focused culture has historically been effective it has become embedded as the correct and legitimate way of working. This means that the caution toward experimentation may not simply reflect unwillingness to change but rather rooted assumptions that deviation from established routines is risky (Schein, 2010). From a readiness perspective this is important because employees may respond cautiously not out of resistance but because they are acting in line with what the organization has historically taught them is correct. To strengthen readiness, leadership therefore needs to show that new ways of working are not in conflict with the organization's core values but can be equally valid for maintaining long-term effectiveness under conditions of digital transformation (Weiner, 2009). Digital transformation requires not only control and accuracy but also adaptation, testing and iterative development (Olafsen, 2021). When mistakes are primarily viewed as failures rather than as part of the learning, employees may become less willing to engage with the new systems which can constrain readiness.

Another way to strengthen readiness would therefore be to complement the existing quality culture with a stronger learning-oriented logic during change implementation (Olafsen, 2021). One way to address this is to create conditions where experimentation can take place in a controlled manner. For example, designated "practice fields" may allow employees to test new tools and ways of working without affecting regulated daily operations (Cameron &

Quinn, 2011). This can help employees engage with change in a safer way and make experimentation more suitable in a highly controlled environment. At the same time, the organization needs to communicate a clearer acceptance of initial mistakes as a part of the learning process. This can strengthen psychological safety where employees feel able to test, ask and adjust without fear of the consequences. In practice, learning-oriented behaviour needs to be actively supported and legitimized rather than just quietly accepted (Wang et al., 2023). If learning and experimentation are to be integrated into the organizational culture, leaders need to demonstrate this in practice, for example by being open about uncertainties, adjustments, and lessons learned during implementation. This way new behaviours can gradually become more aligned with existing cultural values (Schein, 2010).

This issue is also relevant in a multinational context, as research indicates that large organizations spanning different geographic areas often possess unique missions and goals that may differ from the overarching corporate vision (Sopow & Sushkova, 2025). As Javidan et al. (2006) argue it is essential to distinguish between values, what people believe should be, and practices, how things are done in the workplace. In a global organization employees across sites may share the same broad organizational values around quality, safety, and transformation, while local practices for collaboration, communication, and decision-making still differ (Cameron & Quinn, 2011). For that reason, the organization should not assume that a uniform global message about experimentation and learning will be interpreted in the same way everywhere. Communication regarding vision and mission is highly open to interpretation depending on the nature of the specific workplace unit and employee roles (Sopow & Sushkova, 2025). As discussed before strengthen readiness requires not only a global message but also local interpretation. Allowing local support to contextualize change within their environment may therefore support better alignment between organizational direction and daily tasks.

6. Conclusion

This study aimed to examine organizational readiness for digital transformation by addressing two research questions: how the current state of readiness is characterized, and how readiness can be strengthened in practice. By combining empirical findings from a multinational pharmaceutical R&D context with established theoretical perspectives on change readiness, the study provides both analytical and practical insights into how organizations respond to continuous digital change.

How is the current state of organizational readiness for digital transformation characterized within an organization?

Regarding the first research question, the findings show that organizational readiness for digital transformation is stronger in principle than in practice. While employees generally recognize the necessity and inevitability of digital transformation, this awareness does not consistently translate into engagement or action in daily work. Instead, readiness is constrained by a combination of structural conditions, fragmented communication, and challenges in translating strategic initiatives into locally meaningful practices. This indicates that agreement with change should not be equated with readiness, as readiness also requires the capability and opportunity to act.

The findings further show that readiness is shaped through the interaction of multiple dimensions. Structural conditions, such as competing priorities and limited support, constrain employees' ability to engage with change. Communication practices influence how employees interpret and make sense of transformation initiatives, while trust, leadership, and organizational culture shape how change is perceived and sustained over time. Together, these factors demonstrate that readiness is not a static state but a dynamic and relational process that evolves through ongoing interaction between individuals and organizational structures.

How can an organization strengthen its readiness to improve future digital change implementations?

Regarding the second research question, the study identifies three key areas through which organizational readiness can be strengthened. First, the development of structured networks for implementing change can support the translation of strategic initiatives into operational practice, which favorably can be done by the role of middle managers and local support functions. Second, more coherent and dialogical communication can enhance employees' ability to understand and engage with change, which reduces uncertainty and supports shared sensemaking. Third, balancing a quality-focused culture with greater openness to experimentation and learning can enable organizations to maintain compliance and reliability while also supporting adaptation in the context of digital transformation.

Taken together, these findings suggest that strengthening readiness requires moving beyond one-size-fits-all approaches toward more solutions adapted to context and locally embedded strategies. In large, multinational organizations, readiness is not only driven by formal structures and top-down communication but also by how change is interpreted and supported in everyday work practices across different organizational settings.

From a theoretical perspective, this study contributes to the literature on change readiness by highlighting the importance of translation and interpretation in digital transformation contexts. While prior research focuses on psychological and structural dimensions, the findings show that readiness is also shaped by how organizations connect strategic intent with operational reality. This extends current understanding by highlighting readiness as an ongoing process of sensemaking, coordination, and local adaptation, particularly in complex and highly regulated environments.

Future research could build on this study in several ways. Since this thesis is based on a single case study, comparative studies across organizations or industries contexts could provide a broader understanding of how readiness for digital transformation is shaped under different conditions. In addition, future studies could explore the role of middle managers in greater depth, particularly how they translate strategic change into everyday practice in multinational organizations.

References

Abrantes, A. C. M., Bakenhus, M., & Ferreira, A. I. (2024). The support of internal communication during organizational change processes. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 37(5), 1030–1050. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-06-2023-0222

Adeoye-Olatunde, O. A., & Olenik, N. L. (2021). Research and scholarly methods: Qualitative research. Journal of the American College of Clinical Pharmacy, 4(2), 191–203. https://doi.org/10.1002/jac5.1386

Ahmed, S. K., Mohammed, R. A., Nashwan, A. J., Ibrahim, R. H., Abdalla, A. Q., Ameen, B. M. M., & Khdhir, R. M. (2025). Using thematic analysis in qualitative research. *Global Media and Communication Insights*, 100198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.glmedi.2025.100198

Alshenqeeti, H. (2014). Interviewing as a data collection method: A critical review. English Linguistics Research, 3(1), 39–45. https://doi.org/10.5430/elr.v3n1p39

Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating readiness for organizational change. Human Relations, 46(6), 681–703. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679304600601

AstraZeneca. (2026a). Our company. https://www.astrazeneca.com/our-company.html

AstraZeneca. (2026b). Our strategic R&D centres. https://www.astrazeneca.com/r-d/our-strategic-r-d-centres.html

AstraZeneca. (2026c). AstraZeneca in Gothenburg. https://www.astrazeneca.com/our-company/our-locations/gothenburg.html

Balogun, J., & Johnson, G. (2004). Organizational restructuring and middle manager sensemaking. Academy of Management Journal, 47(4), 523–549.

Bell, E., Bryman, A., & Harley, B. (2022). Business research methods (6th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Boonstra, J. (2023). Reflections: From planned change to playful transformations. Journal of Change Management, 23(1), 12–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2022.2151149

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77–101.

Brazo, P., Velicia-Martín, F., Palos-Sanchez, P., & Roldán, J. L. (2025). Thrive or dive: Navigating the waves of mandatory digital transformation. European Business Review, 37(3), 486–516. https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-03-2024-0097

Bryman, A. (2016). Social research methods (5th ed.). Oxford University Press.

Cameron, E. & Green, M. (2019). Making sense of change management. 5. uppl. Kogan Page.

Cameron, K.S. and Quinn, R.E. (2011). Diagnosing and Changing Organizational Culture Based on the Competing Values Framework, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, Vol. 3

Chen, C., Mu, J., & Liu, G. (2025). Do off-site R&D institutions matter for corporate exploratory innovation? International Journal of Finance & Economics. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2022.2151149

Creswell, J. W., & Poth, C. N. (2018). Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Dubois, A., & Gadde, L.-E. (2002). Systematic combining: an abductive approach to case research. Journal of Business Research, 55(7), 553-560. www.sciencedirect.com. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0148-2963(00)00195-8

Fodouop Kouam Arthur William. (2024). *Interpretivism or constructivism: Navigating research paradigms in social science research*. International Journal of Research Publication, 143(1). https://doi.org/10.01431220246122

Hanelt, A., Bohnsack, R., Marz, D., & Antunes Marante, C. (2021). A systematic review of the literature on digital transformation: Insights and implications for strategy and organizational change. Journal of Management Studies, 58(5), 1159–1197. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.12639

Heim, I., & Sardar-Drenda, N. (2020). Assessment of employees' attitudes toward ongoing organizational transformations. Journal of Organizational Change Management, 34(2), 327–345. https://doi.org/10.1108/JOCM-04-2019-0119

Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Harris, S. G. (2007). Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of a scale. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 43(2), 232–255. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886306295295

Holt, D. T., & Vardaman, J. M. (2013). Toward a comprehensive understanding of readiness for change: The case for an expanded conceptualization. Journal of Change Management, 13(1), 9–18.

Huy, Q. N. (1999). Emotional capability, emotional intelligence, and radical change. Academy of Management Review, 24(2), 325–345. https://doi.org/10.2307/259085

Javidan, M., House, R. J., Dorfman, P. W., Hanges, P. J., & Sully de Luque, M. (2006). Conceptualizing and measuring cultures and their consequences: A comparative review of GLOBE's and Hofstede's approaches. Journal of International Business Studies, 37(6), 897–914. https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jibs.8400234

Järvinen, M., & Mik-Meyer, N. (Eds.). (2020). Qualitative Analysis: Eight Approaches for the Social Sciences. Sage Publications.

Kallio, H., Pietilä, A. M., Johnson, M., & Kangasniemi, M. (2016). Systematic methodological review: Developing a framework for a qualitative semi-structured interview guide. Journal of Advanced Nursing, 72(12), 2954–2965. https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.13031

Kherrazi, S., & Roquilly, C. (2025). Managing digital transformation in contemporary contexts: Are classical change management frameworks still relevant? Journal of Change Management, 25(2), 85–115. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2025.2494508

Kolman, L., Noorderhaven, N. G., Hofstede, G., & Dienes, E. (2003). Cross-cultural differences in Central Europe. Journal of Managerial Psychology, 18(1), 76–88. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940310459600

Kotter, J. P. (2007). *Leading change: Why transformation efforts fail*. Harvard Business Review, 85(1), 96–103.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. SAGE Publications.

Lochmiller, C. R. (2021). Conducting thematic analysis with qualitative data. *The Qualitative Report, 26*(6), 2029–2044.

Marshall, B., Cardon, P., Poddar, A., & Fontenot, R. (2013). Does sample size matter in qualitative research? A review of qualitative interviews in IS research. *Journal of Computer Information Systems, 54*(1), 11–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/08874417.2013.11645667

Matos Marques Simoes, P., & Esposito, M. (2014). Improving change management: How communication nature influences resistance to change. *Journal of Management Development, 33*(4), 324–341.

McClam, M., Workman, L., Dias, E. M., Walker, T. J., Brandt, H. M., Craig, D. W., Gibson, R., Lamont, A., Weiner, B. J., Wandersman, A., & Fernandez, M. E. (2023). Using cognitive interviews to improve a measure of organizational readiness for implementation. BMC Health Services Research, 23, 93. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-09005-y

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406917733847

Olafsen, A. H., Nilsen, E. R., Smedsrud, S., & Kamaric, D. (2021). Sustainable development through commitment to organizational change: The implications of organizational culture and individual readiness for change. Journal of Workplace Learning, 33(3), 180–196. https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-05-2020-0093

Rafferty, A. E., Jimmieson, N. L., & Armenakis, A. A. (2013). Change readiness: A multilevel review. Journal of Management, 39(1), 110–135. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312457417

Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. Academy of Management Review, 46(1), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072

Ruona, W. E. (2005). Analyzing qualitative data. Research in organizations: Foundations and methods of inquiry. 223(263), 233-263.

Sánchez-Guardiola Paredes, C., Aguaded Ramírez, E. M., & Rodríguez-Sabiote, C. (2021). Content validation of a semi-structured interview to analyze the management of suffering. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18*(21), 11393. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182111393

Schein, E.H. (2010). Organizational Culture and Leadership, Jossey-Bass, Hoboken, NJ, Vol. 4.

Shea, C. M., Jacobs, S. R., Esserman, D. A., Bruce, K., & Weiner, B. J. (2014). Organizational readiness for implementing change: A psychometric assessment of a new measure. Implementation Science, 9(7).

Sopow, E., & Sushkova, M. Y. (2025). Communication of mission, vision, and goals: The key to successful change management in changing times. International Journal of Business Communication, 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1177/23294884251377038

Verhoef, P. C., Broekhuizen, T., Bart, Y., Bhattacharya, A., Dong, J. Q., Fabian, N., & Haenlein, M. (2021). Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and research

agenda. Journal of Business Research, 122, 889–901.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.09.022

Wang, T., Olivier, D. F., & Chen, P. (2023). Creating individual and organizational readiness for change: Conceptualization of system readiness for change in school education. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 26(6), 1037–1061.

Ward, J., & Elvin, R. (1999). A new framework for managing IT-enabled business change. Information Systems Journal, 9(3), 197–221. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2575.1999.00052.x

Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *MIS Quarterly, 26*(2), xiii–xxiii.

Weick, K. E. (1995). Sensemaking in organizations. Sage Publications.

Weiner, B. J. (2009). A theory of organizational readiness for change. Implementation Science, 4(1), Article 67. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-4-67

Appendix 1: Interview Questions Template

Background

1) What is your current role and position within the organization?
    a) How long have you been working at the organization?
    b) Which site or office are you based at, and have you worked at the same site throughout your time within the organization?
    c) Why did you want to join the organization?

2) What do you think about learning new things?

3) Has your way of working undergone significant digital changes in recent years?
    a) Have these affected your perceptions of upcoming changes? How?
    b) Has this affected your confidence in adapting to digital changes?

Perception of Change

4) Do you believe there is a need for digital change in your way of working in the future?
    a) Are there any barriers/driving forces to why you are thinking that way?

5) How do you balance your daily work and learning new things?
    a) Are prioritizations made? If so, what kind of?

6) Do you expect your ways of working to be affected by digital initiatives?
    a) How do you think your way of working will be affected?

7) How are you able to customize/affect/influence upcoming changes to fit your ways of working?
    a) In what ways?
    b) How would you like to be involved in future changes?

8) How is information about change typically communicated within your department?
    a) Is there a typical way?
    b) What do you think of this type of communication?
    c) Could this be improved (e.g. clarity, transparency, goal, cohesive information)?

9) How do you communicate change to your team (Question to team manager)?

10) Do you feel that you have enough support when new ways of working are implemented?
   a) Is there any additional support you would like?

11) How confident are you in leadership's ability to successfully introduce and manage new initiatives?

Change in a Geographical Context

12) How do you think the culture of your site affects the change mindset among your team?
   i) Does the culture strengthen or hinder the implementation of change? In what ways?

13) Do you perceive differences in how change is handled (e.g. communicated, implemented, supported etc) across different geographical offices? Why?
   i) What are the main barriers/driving forces to these differences eg culture, language, communication?

Future Changes

14) Do you feel that there is sufficient support available to successfully implement future changes?
   i) Are there any additional resources or support that would help you succeed?

15) In an ideal world all the conditions are provided (eg. you have enough time, information) what would still stop you from changing?
   i) What will then motivate you?

The End

16) Is there any question we have not asked that you believe is important for us to consider?

17) If we realize that we have missed something or need clarification, would it be possible to contact you again?

DEPARTMENT OF SOME SUBJECT OR TECHNOLOGY
CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
Gothenburg, Sweden
www.chalmers.se

CHALMERS
UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY