



Readiness for organizational change scale: The adaptation and validation of the Indonesian version

Lala Septiyani Sembiring^{c,d,*}, Marina Sulastiana^{a,b,†}, Anissa Lestari Kadiyono^{a,b}, Zainal Abidin^{a,b}

^a Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Padjadjaran, Jatinangor, Sumedang, West Java 45363, Indonesia

^b Research Center of Human Capital & Organizational Development, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Padjadjaran, Jatinangor, Sumedang, West Java 45363, Indonesia

^c Doctoral Program of Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Padjadjaran, Jatinangor, Sumedang, West Java 45363, Indonesia

^d Department of Psychology, Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Andalas, Padang, West Sumatra 25127, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received 16 July 2024

Revised 13 October 2024

Accepted 31 October 2024

Available online 18 March 2026

Keywords:

managers,
readiness for organizational change scale,
state-owned enterprises,
validation

Abstract

This study aimed to adapt and validate the Readiness for Organizational Change Scale by Holt et al. in the Indonesian version. A total of 222 participants in this study were line and middle managers of state-owned cement manufacturing companies in Indonesia that were undergoing changes in restructuring and efficiency. Data were collected by online questionnaires through email. The adaptation process was guided by the International Test Commission (ITC). Validation was obtained through content validity based on the Aiken formula. The Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) and convergent validity were conducted through Pearson correlation. The Indonesian version of the Readiness for Organizational Change scale showed promising results. The Content Validity using the Aiken validity value indicates that the items had good values (0.80–0.95). The CFA results also meet the goodness of fit indicators at χ^2/df , which are RMSEA, CFI, NFI, RFI, AGFI, and GFI. Construct Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) on the dimensions were Appropriateness (CR=0.94, AVE=0.61), Managerial Support (CR=0.92, AVE=0.67), Change Efficacy (CR=0.89, AVE=0.59), and Personal Valence (CR=0.80, AVE=0.57). The convergent validity test reported that RFOC and its dimensions had a positive correlation with PsyCap and OCB, along with all their aspects. The Indonesian version of the Readiness for Organizational Change scale had good psychometric properties and evidence of validity, especially for employees in state-owned enterprises.

© 2026 Kasetsart University.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: lala20002@mail.unpad.ac.id (Sembiring, L. S.).

† Co-first authors.

Introduction

Organizational change is one of the hot-button topics on a global scale. This may appear either at individual levels or at the organization. In Indonesia, most state-owned or private companies are experiencing changes. The Regulation of the Ministry of State-Owned Enterprises (BUMN) in Indonesia No. Per - 8/mbu/08/2020 Strategic Plan of BUMN in 2020–2024, stated that merger and holding are strategies in BUMN company to enhance their values (BUMN, 2020). Due to these government regulations, many state-owned companies in Indonesia have undergone major changes, such as mergers or holdings, which require readiness to face these changes for both the organization and its employees so that the changes can run effectively. Thus, companies need to ensure that their employees are ready for organizational change.

At organizational levels, changes in strategic development and new processes, vision for the future, and changes in the company's prior systems will affect every organization member (Anderson, 2017). Readiness for organizational change is influential in the process of change. This may promote significant behaviors in organizational change, such as compliance, cooperation, championing, commitment to change, and persistence in making change (Bakari et al., 2017; Rafferty & Minbashian, 2019; Weiner, 2020).

Readiness for organizational change (RFOC) is the belief, attitude, and intention toward an organization's change and how it implements it (Armenakis et al., 1993). Moreover, this concept is related to employees' perception of their readiness for change and how it affects them and the organization (Eby et al., 2000; Jones, R. A., et al., 2005; Pranoto & Wakaliwe, 2013).

RFOC has four factors in determining readiness for organizational change: change process, which refers to stages in implementation, such as employee's involvement in the change; content is defined as how change is being introduced, commonly directed towards administration, procedural, technology or characteristics of organizational structure; change context involves certain conditions and surroundings in which an employee performs their function; and individual attributes which show individual differences that will affect how employees behave in certain changes (Holt et al., 2007). However, the RFOC instrument comprehensively explains employees' readiness for organizational change. RFOC measures perception, belief, and intention toward personal ability and the organization's capability to implement changes.

These distinctive features make RFOC better than other instruments, which only include personal valuation toward change in themselves (Bouckennooghe et al., 2009; Cunningham et al., 2002; Hanpachern et al., 1998).

The RFOC consists of four main dimensions: (1) appropriateness aligns with content and context; (2) management relates to the support dimension; (3) change efficacy; and (4) personal valence represents personal attributes. RFOC scale by Holt is commonly used in Indonesia (Asbari, M. et al., 2021; Azzuhri, 2018; Emsza et al., 2016; Mahendrati & Mangundjaya, 2020; Novitasari et al., 2020; Resdasari Prasetyo et al., 2021; Rindipati & Hinduan, 2021; Tsalits & Kismono, 2019). However, no published articles have been found which provide the adaptation and validation process of this instrument in the Indonesian version. The only adaptation scale in non-English translation found was from Omer Çalışkan for educational levels in Türkiye (Çalışkan, 2019), which was conducted in an educational setting with teachers as subjects. There is evidence of construct validity and divergent validity, but it does not include evidence of content validity. Considering the limited adaptation and development of the RFOC scale in various countries and settings, this is an opportunity to provide psychometric properties for this instrument. Therefore, in this adaptation and validation study in the Indonesian version, additional evidence of content validity will be provided with different research settings and respondents, namely, employee in state-owned companies. Adaptation in the Indonesian version is expected to support researchers in developing a study of readiness for organizational change in Indonesia.

This study aimed to adapt and validate the RFOC scale to the Indonesian version. Content validity was analyzed by using the Aiken formula, construct validity using Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), and convergent validity by testing the correlation between RFOC with Psychological Capital (PsyCap) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB), and convergent validity by examining the correlation between RFOC and Psychological Capital (PsyCap) and Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB). Based on previous research, results show that PsyCap correlated to RFOC (Almizan gani et al., 2020; Kirrane et al., 2017; Lizar et al., 2015; Ming-Chu & Meng-Hsiu, 2015; Munawaroh & Meiyanto, 2017). RFOC may decrease employee resistance to change (Kwahk & Kim, 2008; Ming-Chu & Meng-Hsiu, 2015), and high resistance to change employees show lower OCB. (Artanti et al., 2016; Beal et al., 2013).

Methodology

The adaptation procedure followed the International Test Commission (ITC Guidelines for Translating and Adapting Tests (Second Edition), 2017), including (1) Writing to Daniel T. Holt as the original scale developer (correspondence author) through email to obtain permission to adapt the RFOC scale into Indonesian; (2) Translation into the Indonesian language by two lecturers of industrial and organizational psychology, fluent in both English and Indonesian; (3) Back translation by two translators, who were sworn translator and native working as a lecturer in Indonesia; (4) Expert review by involving five industrial and organizational psychology lecturers to examine the content and methodology; and (5) Try out to 20 employees experiencing company change—lastly, the process of collecting validation evidence.

Participants and Procedure

This research was conducted on 4 state-owned operating companies under a cement manufacturing holding company. Massive changes were taking place such as restructuring and efficiency as a consequence of the formation of a holding company that houses several of these operating companies. Meanwhile, Indonesia is one of the largest cement producers in Southeast Asia, so it has an important role in the economy of Indonesia. Participants in this study were line and middle managers, permanent employees with a minimum of one year of tenure, and willing to participate in this research. We assumed that employees at the managerial level would have a unique perception of changes, and have more responsibility in implementing changes than staff. Participants with a minimum of one year of tenure were expected to have a basic understanding of the context of their company.

The companies helped us to send the questionnaire link via email to all potential participants who met the criteria, and employees who were willing as participants to fill out the questionnaire provided. Before completing the questionnaire, participants were required to read the research explanation and show willingness to participate. As a result, there were 222 participants in this study.

Instruments

Four elements of the RFOC scale by Holt, et al. (Holt et al., 2007), such as appropriateness, management support, change efficacy, and personal valence, were measured by 25 items of the RFOC scale. Respondents were given responses ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree).

PsyCap, measured by using the Psychological Capital Questionnaire (PCQ-24), consisted of 24 items assessing four dimensions: self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resiliency—response range from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). (Luthans et al., 2007) A translated questionnaire in the research was done by Wirawan (Wirawan et al., 2021) with $\alpha = 0.90$ and CFA result (CMIN/DF = 2.6, RMSEA = 0.07, CFI= 0.90).

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) was developed using the self-report technique (Podsakoff et al., 2000). OCB was measured by Indonesian adapted by Sulastiana in an internal service context, namely, CO-OCB (Puswiartika et al., 2019), which comprised seven dimensions: helping behavior, sportsmanship, organizational loyalty, organizational compliance, individual initiative, civic virtue, and self-development. Twenty-eight items were used to recognize OCB level through a 5-point Likert scale (1= Never, and 5=Always). The Alpha Cronbach was 0.94, and the CFA result showed a good fit (RMSEA=0.075, SRMR = 0.016, CFI=0.987).

Results

Analysis of demographic variables using the T-test and ANOVA showed no significant differences in RFOC in age, sex, and education. However, RFOC in job experience and job position showed differences. The longer the time of working experience, the lower the RFOC. Higher RFOC was found in participants with 1–10 years of working experience and tended to be lower in the working range of 11–20 years and 21–30 years. In addition, a higher position level reported higher readiness for change. Compared to the lower-position employees, the middle manager was more ready to change than the line managers. The T-test and ANOVA are shown in [Table 1](#).

Table 1 Demographic of Participants

Demographic Variable	M (SD)		
	RFOC	PsyCap	OCB
Gender			
Male (n=200)	5.65 (0.83)	4.06 (0.46)	4.19 (0.46)
Female (n=22)	5.04 (0.93)	4.07 (0.22)	4.10 (0.43)
Age Group (years)			
21-30 (n= 11)	5.61 (0.76)	4.10 (0.23)	4.32 (0.29)
31-40 (n= 53)	5.55 (0.85)	3.94 (0.39)	4.15 (0.46)
41-50 (n= 126)	5.60 (0.89)	4.01 (0.45)	4.17 (0.47)
51-58 (n = 32)	5.85 (0.65)	4.16 (0.38)	4.26 (0.40)
Tenure (years)			
1. 1-10 (n=70)	5.82 (0.67)*	4.18 (0.43)*	4.26 (0.45)
11-20 (n= 53)	5.62 (0.88)	4.07 (0.40)	4.17 (0.48)
21-30 (n= 99)	5.50 (0.91)	3.40 (0.42)	4.14 (0.45)
Education			
Senior high school (n=71)	5.53 (0.85)	3.95 (0.38) *	4.16 (0.44)
Associate (3 years diploma) (n=23)	5.71 (0.95)	4.03 (0.42)	4.11 (0.47)
Bachelor (n=104)	5.60 (0.71)	4.11 (0.46)	4.19 (0.48)
Master (n=24)	5.93 (0.50)	4.18 (0.31)	4.29 (0.36)
Position			
Middle manager (n=63)	5.90 (0.58)*	4.22 (0.40)**	4.31 (0.42)*
Line manager (n= 159)	5.51 (0.90)	4.00 (0.42)	4.16 (0.43)

Note: * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

Abbreviation: RFOC: Readiness for Organizational Change; PsyCap: Psychological Capital; OCB: Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Content Validity

Content validity was measured using Aiken's V (Aiken, 1980). This research involved five industrial and organizational psychology lecturers from universities in Indonesia with a minimum TOEFL score of 500 and an IELTS minimal score of 6 to assess item relevance. Assessment ranges from 1 (irrelevant) to 5 (very relevant), then evaluated using Aikens' V. The V value for all items ranged from 0.80-0.95, which showed a good value.

Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Results of CFA showed $\chi^2 = 510.79$ ($p = .000$), $\chi^2/df=1.90$, which indicated good fit models, this showed by $\chi^2/df < 3$ (Schermele-Engel et al., 2003). RMSEA value ≤ 0.08 . (McDonald & Ho, 2002), all CFI, NFI, and RFI values were more than 0.90. (Bentler,

1990). Nevertheless, AGFI and GFI were in marginal fit (0.80–0.90). Based on the test results from the goodness of fit index, which are RMSEA, CFI, NFI, RFI, AGFI, and GFI, it can be concluded that this research model is good fit, which explains that there is a match between empirical data and theory.

The result of the goodness of fit is shown in [Table 2](#).

Construct Reliability (CR) testing and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) showed a good construct from the dimensions of Appropriateness (CR=0.94, AVE=0.61), Managerial Support (CR=0.92, AVE=0.67), Change Efficacy (CR=0.89, AVE=0.59), and personal valence (CR=0.80, AVE=0.57).

Based on the CFA model, all items had a loading factor in the range of .63–0.92. Loading factor in Appropriateness ranged from 0.63–0.90; management support 0.65–0.92; change efficacy 0.64–0.86; personal valence of 0.68–0.88. More details can be seen in [Table 3](#).

Table 2 Goodness of Fit Criteria

Model	χ^2	df	p value	AGFI	GFI	CFI	NFI	RFI	RMSEA	SRMR
222 participants	510.79	268	0.00	0.81	0.84	0.99	0.98	0.97	0.064	0.043

Abbreviation: AGFI: Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index; GFI: Goodness of Fit Index; CFI: Comparative Fit Index; NFI: Normed Fit Index; RFI: Relative Fit Index; RMSEA: Root Mean Square Error of Approximation; SRMR =Standard Root Mean Residual

Table 3 Loading in Particular Items

Dimensions	Items	Loading
Appropriateness	1	0.67
	2	0.63
	3	0.86
	4	0.86
	5	0.84
	6	0.90
	7	0.77
	8	0.67
	9	0.71
	10	0.87
Management Support	11	0.86
	12	0.80
	13	0.92
	14	0.92
	15	0.73
	16	0.65
Change Efficacy	17	0.72
	18	0.64
	19	0.75
	20	0.83
	21	0.81
	22	0.86
Personal valance	23	0.68
	24	0.88
	25	0.70

Convergent Validation

Convergent validation of the RFOC scale was adapted in Indonesian and tested using the correlation of PsyCap and OCB instruments. The correlation value can be seen in Table 4 and Table 5, showing that RFOC was

correlated positively and significantly with PsyCap and OCB. Moreover, the correlation between RFOC and PsyCap was higher than the correlation between RFOC and OCB.

Discussion

This research was initiated by the adaptation process of RFOC, which followed the guide by the International Test Commission (ITC). By adaptation process, 25 items of the instruments were used. The translation and back-translation process showed no difference from the original instrument. In addition, expert judgments using Aiken’s V also showed good results with a score of 0.80-0.95.

Moreover, the CFA result demonstrated that every item in the RFOC scale had a good contribution (0.63-0.92). Items 13 and 14, grouped as management support dimension, scored the highest. Generally, managerial support will be very helpful in fulfilling the employee’s role, especially in a shifting era with more challenges (Kirrane et al., 2017; Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004).

Table 5 Correlation between RFOC, PsyCap, and OCB

	RFOC	PsyCap	OCB
RFOC	1		
PsyCap	.601**	1	
OCB	.519**	.692**	1

Note: **p* < .05, ***p* < .01

Abbreviation: RFOC: Readiness for Organizational Change; PsyCap: Psychological Capital; OCB: Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Table 4 Correlation between Dimensions of RFOC, Psy Cap, and OCB

	AP	MS	CE	PV	H	E	R	O	HB	SM	OL	OC	II	CVR	SD
AP	1														
MS	.880**	1													
CE	.815**	.754**	1												
PV	.776**	.748**	.699**	1											
H	.520**	.514**	.623**	.435**	1										
E	.531**	.483**	.652**	.411**	.837**	1									
R	.499**	.500**	.600**	.450**	.800**	.499**	1								
O	.343**	.361**	.352**	.320**	.564**	.518**	.532**	1							
HB	.424**	.392**	.488**	.298**	.576**	.570**	.582**	.425**	1						
SM	.354**	.278**	.391**	.289**	.456**	.399**	.471**	.430**	.658**	1					
OL	.356**	.340**	.431**	.276**	.518**	.475**	.511**	.405**	.672**	.658**	1				
OC	.438**	.392**	.497**	.317**	.571**	.588**	.574**	.407**	.737**	.621**	.697**	1			
II	.452**	.422**	.511**	.325**	.615**	.611**	.583**	.451**	.821**	.676**	.743**	.752**	1		
CVR	.434**	.402**	.544**	.352**	.577**	.595**	.557**	.486**	.775**	.641**	.623**	.691**	.739**	1	
SD	.476**	.456**	.526**	.359**	.547**	.535**	.512**	.368**	.742**	.593**	.578**	.677**	.730**	.697**	1

Note: **p* < .05, ***p* < .01

Abbreviation: AP: Appropriateness; MS: Managerial Support; CE: Change Efficacy; PV: Personal Valance; H: Hope; E: Efficacy; R: Resilience; O: Optimist; HB: Helping Behavior; SM: Sportsmanship; OL: Organizational Loyalty; OC: Organizational Compliance; II: Individual Initiative; CVR: Civic Virtue; SD: Self-development.

This research reported that the change process factor manifested in managerial support contributed to the highest value in the RFOC scale.

Analysis for the value of Construct Reliability (CR) and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) represents acceptable results in such dimensions: of appropriate (CR=0.94, AVE=0.61), managerial support (CR=0.92, AVE=0.67), change efficacy (CR=0.89, AVE=0.59), and personal valency (CR=0.80, AVE=0.57). The results have similarities to Holt's analysis: coefficient alphas were .80 for appropriateness, 0.79 for management support, 0.79 for change efficacy, and 0.65 for the personal valence score (Holt et al., 2007). In conclusion, the reliability of the adapted scale was relatively similar to the original RFOC scale.

The personal trait is the factor used in convergent validity testing (Armenakis et al., 2007; Çalıřkan, 2019; Holt et al., 2007) In this research, PsyCap was chosen as a personal factor positively correlated to the dimensions of RFOC. The correlation between PsyCap and RFOC was 0.6, and every aspect of PsyCap has a positive correlation with the dimension of RFOC. Psychological capital as personal resources will develop a person's emotional reaction toward change, which may affect their attitude and behavior toward change (Luthans et al., 2015).

The following instrument used in convergent validity testing was OCB. Attitude towards change will directly affect the level of OCB in employees (Chih et al., 2012) RFOC as an attitude towards change may form OCB behavior supporting the implementation of change. The correlation between OCB and RFOC was 0.51. In addition, every dimension of OCB and RFOC was significantly correlated.

Moreover, this research showed that the level of RFOC might vary in working duration and job level. The longer the work duration, the higher the RFOC level. This is because employees with a longer tenure are expected to have more experience facing changes in the company in the past. The implication is that employees with longer tenure will be better prepared to deal with organizational change.

Higher position levels also showed a higher RFOC, A similar research result was found by Tredway (2004) in a medical services and research company. Employees with higher managerial levels are usually more involved in decision-making regarding the implementation of change so they are more likely to support what they help to create, and they will take responsibility to participate in the process of further change.

This research is expected to enrich the reference of research in the adaptation and validation of RFOC,

which is very limited. The study conducted in a Turkish education setting described that RFOC has a proper adaptation and validity. In addition, Holt researched the RFOC scale in private and public government institutions. Meanwhile, the present research was conducted in a state-owned manufacturing company. In particular, this study also provides benefits for researchers and Human Resources practitioners in Indonesia who need an instrument to measure individual readiness in the face of organizational change, which has been adapted into the Indonesian version and has good validity evidence.

Conclusion and Recommendations

The adaptation and validation process of the RFOC scale into Indonesian showed promising results. Statistical analysis of empirical data obtained also indicated that this instrument had validity criteria and reliability, notably in state-owned companies.

There were limitations in this research, The questionnaire was distributed online as the company suggested having a broader distribution in four operating companies in 3 different areas on different islands, which was also found more efficient for the employees. However, the online questionnaire was found to be inconvenient since the instrument has many questions. The online questionnaire was also more challenging because the direct communication with the researcher was limited, even though the researcher had found some solutions to this problem.

Along with organizational change in companies, especially in state-owned companies in Indonesia, this scale is expected to be useful for researchers and HR practitioners focusing on employee readiness for organizational change in Indonesian companies. Further research should be conducted on different samples with various industrial settings and also conducted in various countries so that the results can be compared, as well as enriching research in the adaptation and validation of the RFOC Scale.

Ethical Approval

The research used quantitative research ethics from the Ethical Commission of Universitas Padjadjaran (ethic clearance No: 913/UN6.KEP/EC/2021). Prospective participants have been given information and informed consent in an e-questionnaire. The information includes an explanation of the nature and reasons for the research, information that their participation is voluntary, they can

withdraw at any time, and there are no consequences if they choose not to participate. They were also informed that the answers or responses they provided were anonymous, so tracing to individuals was impossible. Participants could also discuss any matters from the research by contacting the researcher's telephone number or email provided.

Acknowledgments

This research was funded by a research assistance program from Andalas University as part of the funding for the first author's doctoral study program at the Faculty of Psychology, Padjadjaran University, Jatinangor, Sumedang, West Java, Indonesia.

References

- Aiken, L. R. (1980). Content validity and reliability of single items or questionnaires. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 40(4), 955–959. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316448004000419>
- Almizan Gani, A., Soeharso, S. Y., Wicaksana, S. A., & Asrunputri, A. P. (2019). Pengaruh Psychological capital terhadap readiness to change pada karyawan penjaga gardu tol di Jabodetabek [Effect of psychological capital on readiness to change among toll gate employees in Jabodetabek] *Ekonomi & Bisnis*, 18(2), 85–96. <https://doi.org/10.32722/eb.v18i2.1992> [in Indonesian]
- Anderson, D. L. (2017). *Organizational development “The process of leading organizational change”* (4th ed.). SAGE Publication.
- Armenakis, A. A., Bernerth, J. B., Pitts, J. P., & Walker, H. J. (2007). Organizational change recipients' beliefs scale: Development of an assessment instrument. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(4), 481–505. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886307303654>
- 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>
- Artanti, D. R., Rozak, H. A., & Tjahjaningsih, E. (2016). The effect of psychological capital and resistance to change against performance, mediated by behavior, citizenship. *International Conference of Banking, Accounting, Management and Economics*, 478–484.
- Asbari, M., Dylmoon Hidayat, D., & Purwanto, A. (2021). Managing Employee Performance: From Leadership to Readiness for Change. *International Journal of Social and Management Studies (IJOSMAS)*, 2(1), 74–85. <https://doi.org/10.5555/ijosmas.v2i1.12>
- Azzuhri, M. (2018). Techno-structural intervention and its effect on readiness for change in the Indonesian government-owned corporation. *International Journal of Public Sector Performance Management*, 4(4), 482–497. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPSM.2018.095253>
- Bakari, H., Hunjra, A. I., Attiq, S., Khuhro, R. A., Khan, A. S., & Kouser, R. (2017). Authentic leadership in the context of organizational change, insights from Pakistani health sector organizations. *Asian Journal of Scientific Research*, 10(4), 372–379. <https://doi.org/10.3923/ajsr.2017.372.379>
- Beal, L., Stavros, J. M., & Cole, M. L. (2013). Effect of psychological capital and resistance to change on organisational citizenship behaviour. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 39(2 SPL), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v39i2.1136>
- Bouckennooghe, D., Devos, G., & Van Den Broeck, H. (2009). Organizational change questionnaire-climate of change, processes, and readiness: Development of a new instrument. *Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied*, 143(6), 559–599. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980903218216>
- BUMN. (2020). *Peraturan Menteri Badan Usaha Milik Negara RI Nomor:PER8/MBU/08/2020 Tentang Rencana Strategis Kementerian Badan Usaha Milik Negara Tahun 2020-2024* [Regulation of the Minister of State-Owned Enterprises of the Republic of Indonesia Number: PER8/MBU/08/2020 Concerning the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of State-Owned Enterprises for 2020-2024]. Accessed on April 25, 2024, from [https://infoperaturan.id/peraturan-menteri-badan-usaha-milik-negara-nomor-per-08-mbu-08-2020/\[in Indonesian\]](https://infoperaturan.id/peraturan-menteri-badan-usaha-milik-negara-nomor-per-08-mbu-08-2020/[in Indonesian])
- Çalışkan, Ö. (2019). Readiness for organizational change scale: Validity and reliability study. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 25(4), 663–692. <https://doi.org/10.14527/kuey.2019.016>
- Chih, W.H.W., Yang, F.H., & Chang, C.K. (2012). The Study of the Toward Organizational Outcomes of Attitude Antecedents and Change. *Public Personnel Management*, 41(4), 597–618. <https://doi.org/10.1177/009102601204100402>
- Cunningham, C. E., Woodward, C. A., Shannon, H. S., MacIntosh, J., Lendrum, B., Rosenbloom, D., & Brown, J. (2002). Readiness for organizational change: A longitudinal study of workplace, psychological and behavioural correlates. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1348/096317902321119637>
- Eby, L. T., Adams, D. M., Russell, J. E. A., & Gaby, S. H. (2000). Perceptions of organizational readiness for change: Factors related to employees' reactions to the implementation of team-based selling. *Human Relations*, 53(3), 419–442. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700533006>
- Emsza, B., Eliyana, A., & Istyarini, W. (2016). The Relationship Between Self Efficacy and Readiness for Change: The Mediator Roles of Employee Empowerment. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(3), 201–206. <https://doi.org/10.5901/mjss.2016.v7n3s1p201>
- Hanpachern, C., Morgan, G. A., & Griego, O. V. (1998). An extension of the theory of margin: A framework for assessing readiness for change. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, 9(4), 339–350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.3920090405>
- Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Harris, S. G. (2007). Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of a scale. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(2), 232–255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886306295295>
- Jones, R. A., Jimmieson, N. L., & Griffiths, A. (2005). The Impact of Organizational Culture and Reshaping Capabilities on Change Implementation Success: The mediating Role of Readiness for Change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(2), 361–386. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2005.00500.x>
- Kirrane, M., Lennon, M., O'Connor, C., & Fu, N. (2017). Linking perceived management support with employees' readiness for change: the mediating role of psychological capital. *Journal of Change Management*, 17(1), 47–66. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2016.1214615>
- Kwahk, K. Y., & Kim, H. W. (2008). Managing readiness in enterprise systems-driven organizational change. *Behaviour and Information Technology*, 27(1), 79–87. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01449290701398475>
- Lizar, A. A., Mangundjaya, W. L. H., & Rachmawan, A. (2015). The Role of Psychological Capital and Psychological Empowerment on Individual Readiness for Change. The. *Journal of Developing Areas*, 49(5), 343–352. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jda.2015.0063>

- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). Psychological capital: developing the human competitive edge. In *Psychological Capital: Developing the Human Competitive Edge*.
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2015). *Psychological Capital and Beyond*. Oxford University Press, 317.
- Mahendrati, H. A., & Mangundjaya, W. (2020). *Individual Readiness for Change and Affective Commitment to Change: The Mediation Effect of Technology Readiness on Public Sector*. 431(First 2019), 52–59. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200407.010>
- McDonald, R. P., & Ho, M. H. R. (2002). Principles and practice in reporting structural equation analyses. *Psychological Methods*, 7(1), 64–82. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.7.1.64>
- Ming-Chu, Y., & Meng-Hsiu, L. (2015). Unlocking the black box: Exploring the link between perceive organizational support and resistance to change. *Asia Pacific Management Review*, 20(3), 177–183. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apmr.2014.10.003>
- Munawaroh, L., & Meiyanto, I. S. (2017). Peranan Psychological Capital terhadap Kesiapan Individu untuk Berubah yang Dimoderatori oleh Persepsi Dukungan Organisasi [The Role of Psychological Capital on Individual Readiness to Change Moderated by Perceived Organizational Support]. *Jurnal Psikologi*, 44(3), 185. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jpsi.25381> [in Indonesian]
- Novitasari, D., Goestjahjanti, F. S., & Asbari, M. (2020). The Role of Readiness to Change between Transformational Leadership and Performance: Evidence from a Hospital during COVID-19 Pandemic. *APMBA (Asia Pacific Management and Business Application)*, 9(1), 37–56. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.apmba.2020.009.01.4>
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative Fit Indexes in Structural Models. *Psychological bulletin*, 107(2), 238–246. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.2.238>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Paine, J. B., & Bachrach, D. G. (2000). Organizational Citizenship Behaviors: A Critical Review of The Theoretical and Empirical Literature and Suggestions for Future Research. *Journal of Management*, 26(3), 513–563. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/014920630002600307>
- Pranoto, T., & Wakaliwe, W. (2013). *Restrukturisasi BUMN Menjadi Holding Company* [State-Owned Enterprises Restructuring Becomes Holding Companies]. Lembaga Manajemen FEUI, Jakarta (ID): UI Press. [in Indonesia]
- Puswariatika, D., Hinduan, Z. R., Sulastiana, M., & Harding, D. (2019). Measuring Customer-Oriented Organizational Citizenship Behavior on the Employees of Railway Transportation Service Provider. *Binus Business Review*, 10(2), 105–112. <https://doi.org/10.21512/bbr.v10i2.5277>
- Rafferty, A. E., & Minbashian, A. (2019). Cognitive beliefs and positive emotions about change: Relationships with employee change readiness and change-supportive behaviors. *Human Relations*, 72(10), 1623–1650. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726718809154>
- Resdasari Prasetyo, A., Nurtjahjanti, H., & Ardhiani, L. N. (2021). Impact of Changes in Teaching Methods During the COVID-19 Pandemic: The Effect of Integrative E-Learning on Readiness for Change and Interest in Learning Among Indonesian University Students. *International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning*, 22(2), 87–101. <https://doi.org/10.19173/irrodl.v22i2.5143>
- Rindipati, E. H., & Hinduan, Z. R. (2021). The Effect of Battalion Commander's Leadership Style on Readiness To Change Among Soldiers of Infantry Battalion X in Indonesia. *Jurnal Pertahanan: Media Informasi Tig Kajian & Strategi Pertahanan Yang Mengedepankan Identity, Nasionalism & Integrity*, 7(1), 113. <https://doi.org/10.33172/jp.v7i1.1192>
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293–315. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.248>
- Schermelleh-Engel, K., Moosbrugger, H., & Müller, H. (2003). Evaluating the Fit of Structural Equation Models: Tests of Significance and Descriptive Goodness-of-Fit Measures. In *Methods of Psychological Research* (Vols. 8, Issues 2, pp. 23-74). Department of Psychology - University of Koblenz-Landau. <https://doi.org/10.23668/psycharchives.12784>
- ITC Guidelines for Translating and Adapting Tests (Second Edition). (2017). *International Journal of Testing*, 18(2), 101–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15305058.2017.1398166>
- Tredway, R. (2004). *A merger case study of learning and change: Exploring the relationships between learning styles and change orientation to enhance learning interventions* [Doctoral dissertation, North Carolina State University].
- Tsalits, A. H., & Kismono, G. (2019). Organizational culture types and individual readiness for change: evidence from Indonesia. *Diponegoro International Journal of Business*, 2(2), 86. <https://doi.org/10.14710/dijb.2.2.2019.86-95>
- Weiner, B. J. (2020). A theory of organizational readiness for change. *Handbook on Implementation Science*, 215–232. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781788975995.00015>
- Wirawan, H., Jufri, M., & Saman, A. (2021). The effect of authentic leadership and psychological capital on work engagement: the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 41(8), 1139–1154. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-10-2019-0433>