

HOW TO MAKE PEOPLE COMMITTED TO ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGE: READINESS OR EMPOWERMENT?

Nabilla Qolby¹, Wustari L. Mangundjaya^{2*}

¹Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia, ²Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Bhayangkara
Jakarta Raya

Email: nabilaqolby@gmail.com¹, wustari.larasati@dsn.ubharajaya.ac.id^{2*}

Keywords:

affective commitment
to change, individual
readiness for change,
psychological
empowerment

Change is inevitable and imperative, hence affective commitment to change for employees is necessary when the organization makes a change. The aim of this study is to examine whether individual readiness for change or psychological empowerment can be the predictors of affective commitment to change. The study involving 315 banking employees in Jakarta used correlational design. The data were collected using Affective Commitment to Change, Individual Readiness for Change, and Psychological Empowerment Questionnaire. Data were analyzed using statistical regression techniques to observe the influence of predictor variables on the outcome variable. Results revealed that individual readiness for change and psychological empowerment and had significant positive relationship on predicting affective commitment to change. This study also showed that individual readiness for change is the stronger predictor of affective commitment for change compared to psychological empowerment. This study will be beneficial to the management and change leader in preparing the success of organizational change by developing people to be ready for organizational change.

1. INTRODUCTION

Organizational change is an ongoing and unavoidable process that has a significant impact on the organization's effectiveness and efficiency (Cunha-Cruz et al., 2017). Hence, the organization is required to make steady adjustments to change more efficiently and effectively. Therefore, the ability to make change is important to be owned by any leaders and organization, as changes and developments in an organization are imperative.

The organizations or companies that are able to adapt to change are the only ones that can survive the times and continue to grow (Mangundjaya, 2019). Meanwhile, making an organizational change is not easy. This is because not all changes in organizations can succeed (Mangundjaya, 2019). A study by Fulcher (2013) showed that 70% to 90% of changes in an organization have not been successfully implemented. Factors that determine the success of organizational change exist were from both internally and externally (Mangundjaya, 2019; Alolabi, Ayupp and Al Dwaikat, 2021), and one of the internal factors is employee. Employees are critical to the success of organizational changes and a significant factor in determining organizational change success. This is further supported by Mangundjaya, Utoyo, and Wulandari (2015) whose study showed that the success of organizational change comes from employees. This is because without any support from the employees, any change program being developed cannot be achieved with success. Hence, employees are in charge of implementing change. As a result, employees play an important role in the success of an organizational change, and it is critical to assess whether they are prepared to face the implementation of organizational changes or not (Alolabi, Ayupp, and Al Dwaikat, 2021).

Meanwhile, research has shown that the characteristics possessed by those who are committed to change can influence the success of organizational change. Conner and Patterson (quoted in Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002) revealed that employees' lack of commitment to change is the most common cause of organizational change failure. In addition, according to Mangundjaya (2019), the success of organizational change will be hampered if the employees are not committed to change. Thus, it can be stated that employees' willingness to change is a significant factor in ensuring the success of an organizational change.



According to Herscovitch and Meyer (2002), the commitment to change is a force (mindset) that binds an individual to a course of action deemed necessary for the success of a change initiative's implementation. Commitment to change is divided into affective commitment to change, continuous commitment to change, and normative commitment to change – all three reflect individual actions in providing support to the organization. Affective commitment to change reflects a desire to support change because of a belief in its inherent benefits. Continuous commitment to change reflects an understanding that there is a cost to pay if individuals fail to provide support for change. Normative commitment to change reflects a sense of obligation to support organizational change. In this regard, affective commitment to change has the greatest influence on the success of an organizational change (Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002). This research focuses on affective commitment to change, as affective commitment to change is considered the most important in an organizational change.

In addition, employees with affective commitment to change will bring positive behavior, such as cooperation, defending the organization, motivation to work, good relations between manager and staff, a positive outlook on the organization, good work performance, and good learning skills (Choi, 2011), whereas employees with normative or continuance commitment to change does not exhibit this behavior. Employees with affective commitment to change will continue to provide support for organizational change than employees with normative or continuance commitment to change who will only support organizational change as needed and if found liable. Recognizing the importance of affective commitment to change in the success of an organizational change instigate the need for research on what influences affective commitment to change among employees.

The varying levels of readiness to change in different organizations are determined by how members value change and the likely consequences it will have on their work environment (Von Treuer et al., 2018). Organizational change will cause a reaction among employees, and this reaction determines the success of an organizational change. Furthermore, Kottke, Pelletier, and Agars (2013) stated that in order to affect organizational change, leaders and employees must be prepared for change. In this regard, understanding the stages of organizational change and the factors that influence employees' willingness to change is required for change readiness. For this reason, it is important to prepare the employees for the changes so that they adapt affective commitment to change. Individual readiness to change refers to an individual's mental, psychological, or physical readiness to participate in their organization's development activities (Hanpachern, 1997). Individuals who exhibit readiness to change have a positive attitude toward organizational change; they participate or get involved in implementing change, and promoting or introducing changes to colleagues (Hanpachern, 1997). Previous researches (Mangundjaya & Gandakusuma, 2013; Mangundjaya, Utoyo & Wulandari, 2015; Guamaradewi & Mangundjaya, 2018) revealed a positive relationship between individual change readiness and affective commitment to change. Based on those findings, the first hypothesis in this study as follows:

Hypothesis 1: Individual readiness as a predictor on affective commitment to change.

It is well understood that change has both emotional and physical consequences for people, as change will bring uncertainty, ambiguity, insecurity, anxiety and negative perceptions about the organizations (Alolabi, Ayupp and Al Dwaikat, 2021; Mangundjaya, 2019). As a result, it is essential to communicate with employees how changes are likely to benefit the workforce condition and organizational environment (Alolabi, Ayupp and Al Dwaikat, 2021) as resistance to change is a significant impediment to an organization's readiness to implement new ideas. In this regard, employees can overcome it if the employee has psychological empowerment (Mangundjaya, 2019). Psychological empowerment will fulfill employees with a sense of self-empowerment, this will bring forth resistance to the change, which will affect the overall success of an organizational change. Psychologically empowered employees, according to theorists, will anticipate problems and act independently in the face of risk or uncertainty, exert influence over goals and operational procedures in order to produce high-quality work outcomes, and demonstrate persistence and resourcefulness in the face of obstacles to work goal achievement (Spreitzer, 2008).

Spreitzer (2008) defined psychological empowerment as a set of psychological states required for individuals to feel in control of their work. Psychological empowerment manifests from four dimensions (Spreitzer, 2008): meaningfulness (value possessed), competence (individual trust in the ability to perform work activities), self-determination (individual's perception when having to make a choice of initiating and regulating behavior), and impact (individual degree feels that his actions can affect his work). These four dimensions have their respective roles in psychological empowerment; the lack of one can reduce the integrity of the construct. In addition to meaning and self-determination, psychological empowerment assesses feelings of competence and impact. For these reasons, we predicted that psychological empowerment would be linked to improved task performance and organizational citizenship behaviors. In this regard, employees who feel empowered, according to psychological empowerment theory, are more likely to take an active approach to their work and go above and beyond the call of duty (Spreitzer, 2008).

Research by Mangundjaya (2015) it proved that psychological empowerment has a role and a positive impact on commitment to change, and found that psychological empowerment has a greater impact on affective commitment to change than normative commitment to change and continuance commitment to change. There are several factors that influence affective commitment to change, and these consist of external factors and internal factors. External factors include supervisor support and transformational leadership (Hechanova & Cementina-Olpoc, 2012; Neves, 2011). Individual internal factors include psychological empowerment, and individual readiness for change (Mangundjaya, 2014). Researchers discovered a significant correlation between psychological empowerment and commitment to change (Morin et al., 2016).

In this regard, the studies showed that in organizations where leaders develop employee's psychological empowerment, then employees commit to organizational change and believe that changes are legitimate for the success of the organization. In addition, affective commitment to change characteristics pertain to characteristics that come from within an individual. As mentioned earlier, psychological empowerment is also one of the internal factors that influence affective commitment to change. Based on these arguments, the second hypothesis as follows:

Hypothesis 2: Psychological empowerment as a predictor on affective commitment to change.

According to Mangundjaya (2015), intrinsic motivation factors influence employees throughout all stages of organizational change. This means that allowing employees to participate and contribute during organizational change will result in higher employee satisfaction. Previous studies showed that psychological empowerment and individual readiness for change influence affective commitment to change (Mangundjaya, 2013) The researchers of this study want to further look into how psychological empowerment and individual readiness to change can predict the characteristics of affective commitment to change among employees. It is suspected that the individual readiness to change can predict affective commitment to change better than psychological empowerment. To achieve affective commitment to change, employees need individual readiness to change. This is in line with Conner and Patterson (quoted in Herscovitch & Meyer, 2002) where employees will not reach the commitment stage before going through the preparatory phase by influencing individual readiness for change. Although both have an influence on the commitment to change, but when employees have psychological empowerment or feel they have control over their work roles, the readiness to change is embedded in this stage. Based on these discussions, the following hypothesis as follows:

Hypothesis 3: Individual readiness for change has a higher score compares to psychological empowerment on predicting the affective commitment.

For this study, researchers examined permanent employees who work in banking institutions, both private-owned and government-owned, in Jakarta, Indonesia. The selection of banking employees is in accordance with the usage of technology, where market presence is based on the advancement of technology, i.e., financial technology (Fintech). Myers, Hulks, and Wiggins (2012) revealed that the presence of competitors is one of the motivations for an organization to make developments and changes. In Indonesia, Fintech has begun to develop, with as many as 135 to 140

finance companies using Fintech in Indonesia, an increase of 78% from 2007 (Maharesi, 2017). The presence of Fintech encourages the banking industry to make changes. In addition, Fintech brings forth anxiety among banking employees, such as losing their jobs. Employees need to contribute to changes to avoid being affected by the negative effects (Waringin, 2017). Based on the previous explanation where affective commitment to change is essential to the success of an organizational change, there is a need to examine affective commitment to change among banking employees.

2. METHODS

This study is quantitative research. Correlational research design is used to look into the potential of predictor variables, that is, psychological empowerment and individual readiness to change, to influence affective commitment to change. Participants were employees who work in both private and government banking institutions in Jakarta, who are experiencing organizational changes where they currently work, have working experience in the banking industry for at least two years, who are permanent (not outsourced) employees, and have graduated from at least high school or equivalent. Non-probability sampling technique was used; the method for sampling was convenience or accidental sampling.

The measuring instruments used are found in Affective Commitment to Change in Commitment to Change Inventory by Herscovitch and Meyer (2002), which has been adapted in Indonesia. This was used by Mangundjaya (2015). The validity and reliability were tested ($\alpha = 0.83$) statistically in measuring affective commitment to change. This measuring instrument uses a Likert scale; 1 pertains to “strongly disagree” and 6 pertains to “strongly agree” for behaviors considered “favorable” and 1 pertains to “strongly agree” and 6 “strongly disagree” for behaviors considered “unfavorable.”

Individual Readiness for Change Scale (READ III) developed by Hanpachern (1997) and adapted in Indonesia was used to measure an individual readiness to change. This measuring instrument was used by Mangundjaya (2013). The validity and reliability were tested ($\alpha = 0.92$) statistically in measuring individual readiness to change. This includes a multidimensional measuring instrument that consists of three dimensions, namely rejection, participation, and promotion, with each dimension having five items. This measuring instrument use a Likert scale as a form of response: 1 means “strongly disagree” and 6 means “strongly agree” for items considered “favorable” and 1 means “strongly agree” and 6 “strongly disagree” for items considered “unfavorable.”

Psychological Empowerment Questionnaire (PEQ) compiled by Spreitzer (2008), which has been adapted in Indonesia, was used to measure the psychological empowerment variable. This was also used by Mangundjaya (2019). The validity and reliability were tested ($\alpha = 0.91$) statistically in measuring psychological empowerment. This includes a multidimensional measuring instrument that consists of four dimensions: meaningfulness, competence, self-determination, and impact. Each dimension consists of four items. This measuring instrument use a Likert scale as a form of response, with 1 referring to “strongly disagree” and 6 to “strongly agree”; no items considered “unfavorable” on the PEQ.

Data from this study were analyzed using the IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences program. The data analyses used were descriptive analysis and correlational analysis. Correlational analysis was used to find the potential of predictor variables, i.e., psychological strength and individual readiness to change to influence the outcome, i.e., affective commitment to change.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Analysis

Table 1 shows the mean and standard deviation of each variable.

Table 1. Descriptive Analysis of Affective Commitments to Change, Psychological Empowerment and Individual Readiness for Change variables

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Score	Maximum Score
----------	------	--------------------	---------------	---------------



Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Score	Maximum Score
Affective Commitment to Change	4.9	0.53	3.3	6
Psychological Empowerment	4.6	0.52	3.2	6
Individual Readiness for Change	4.8	0.40	3.5	5.9

Based on the results shown in Table 1, with a scale ranging from one to six, the first variable, namely, affective commitment to change, has an average score or mean of 4.9 (SD = 0.53), which is higher than the middle value of the measuring instrument, that is, 3.5. This shows that the rate of respondents exhibiting affective commitment to change is quite high. The lowest score is 3.3 and the highest score is 6 for the variable affective commitment to change. For the variable psychological empowerment, it has an average score or mean of 4.6 (SD = 0.52), which is higher than the middle value of the measuring instrument, i.e., 3.5. This shows that the respondents have a high rate of psychological empowerment. The lowest score is 3.2 and the highest score is 6 for the variable psychological empowerment. The variable individual readiness to change has an average score or mean of 4.8 (SD = 0.40), which is higher than the middle value of the measuring instrument, i.e., 3.5. This shows that respondents have a rate of individual readiness to change that is quite high. The score is between 3.5 and 5.9 for the variable individual readiness for change.

Table 2. Demographic Analysis on the Three Variables

Demographic Variables	N	Affective Commitment to Change			Psychological Empowerment			Individual Readiness for Change		
		Mean	SD	Sig.	Mean	SD	Sig.	Mean	SD	Sig.
Gender										
Female	147	4.89	0.51	0.96	4.62	0.49	0.70	4.78	0.37	0.87
Male	168	4.89	0.54		4.65	0.53		4.79	0.43	
Education										
Sr. High School	11	4.54	0.22	0.09	4.84	0.64	0.30	4.86	0.34	0.15
Diploma	14	4.91	0.58		4.68	0.61		4.97	0.28	
Undergraduate	263	4.92	0.51		4.61	0.51		4.78	0.40	
Post Graduate	27	4.79	0.69		4.75	0.42		4.68	0.45	
Position										
Staff	268	4.86	0.50	0.02*	4.61	0.51	0.33	4.77	0.39	0.11
Section Head	20	5.21	0.64		4.73	0.48		4.98	0.40	
Dept. Head	23	4.95	0.59		4.75	0.53		4.81	0.44	
Division Head	4	5.12	0.76		4.90	0.29		4.93	0.68	
Age										
15–24 y.o.	20	4.75	0.53	0.46	4.75	0.54	0.53	4.79	0.38	0.13
>24–44 y.o.	270	4.90	0.53		4.62	0.51		4.77	0.40	
>44–55 y.o.	25	4.93	0.57		4.68	0.53		4.93	0.38	
Lengths of works										
2–10 years	274	4.86	0.52	0.00**	4.63	0.51	0.27	4.76	0.30	0.00**
>10 years	41	5.13	0.49		5.73	0.46		4.94	0.33	

*Significant at $p < 0.05$ (one-tailed); **significant at $p < 0.01$ (one-tailed)

Note: *N* = Sample; *SD* = Standard Deviation; *Sig.* = Significance.

Table 2 shows that in affective commitment to change, only position and lengths of works that have correlation with affective commitment to change, as gender, education and age has not significantly correlated. It can be said that the longer employee stayed in the organization and the higher position they hold, these will make them having hire affective commitment to change. Meanwhile, there are not any demographic variables that have correlated with psychological empowerment. Further, in terms of individual readiness for change, only lengths of works that have correlated with individual readiness for change, and gender, age, educational level, lengths of works



have not correlated with psychological empowerment. Further, the results also showed that only lengths of works who have correlated with individual readiness for change, and the rest of demographic variables had not correlated.

Intercorrelation Analysis

The results of the intercorrelation analysis is shown in Table 3. It was the correlation between the variables and demographic profile.

Table 3. Intercorrelation Analysis

No.	Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Affective Commitment to Change	4.59	0.53	1							
2	Individual Readiness for Change	4.8	0.4	0.57*	1						
3	Psychological Empowerment	4.6	0.52	0.19*		1					
4	Gender	-	-	0.35	0.23	0.37	1				
5	Age	-	-	0.28	0.43	0.39	0.18	1			
6	Education	-	-	0.46	0.41	0.45	0.12	0.2	1		
7	Longevity	-	-	-	0.39*	-0.05	0.09	0.39*	0.23	1	
8	Position	-	-	-	0.36*	0.40	0.05	0.13*	0.36*	0.47**	1

**Significant at $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed), *Significant at $p < 0.05$ (2-tailed)

Table 3 shows a positive correlation between affective commitment to change, individual readiness for change, and psychological empowerment. Meanwhile, on demographic variables it showed that longevity had positive correlation with individual readiness for work, and position had positively correlated with individual readiness for change and the rest of variables did not have any correlation with affective commitment, individual readiness for change or psychological empowerment.

Table 4. Analysis of Regression Correlation between Affective Commitments to Change, Psychological Empowerment, and Individual Readiness to Change

	Affective Commitments to Change				
	R	R ²	ΔR^2	β	Sig. (p)
Psychological Empowerment	0.193 **	0.037	0.034	0.193	0.001 **
Individual Readiness for Change	0.573 **	0.328	0.326	0.573	0.000 **

*Significant at $p < 0.05$ (one-tailed); **Significant at $p < 0.01$ (one-tailed)

Table 4 shows that psychological empowerment and affective commitment to change have a positive and significant correlation, $r = 0.193$, $p = 0.001$, one-tailed. Individuals who have a high score on a psychological empowerment will also have a high score on affective commitment to change. The significance column shows a significance value or p of 0.001; this shows that psychological empowerment can significantly and positively predict affective commitment to change ($\beta = 0.193$, $p < 0.01$). This value indicates that with an increase in psychological empowerment of one standard deviation (0.52), affective commitment to change increases by 0.19 standard deviations. The result of R^2 shows a value of 0.037, meaning 3.7% of the variance in the score of affective commitment to change can be explained by the presence of psychological empowerment, while 96.3% of other variances are explainable by other factors.

Furthermore, based on Table 4, individual readiness to change and affective commitment to change had a positive and significant correlation, $r = 0.573$, $p = 0.000$, one-tailed. Individuals who

have a high score on individual readiness for change will also have a high score on affective commitment to change. Based on the significance column, the significance value or p is 0.000, this indicates that the variable of individual readiness for change significantly and positively can predict affective commitment variables to change ($\beta = 0.573$, $p < 0.01$). This indicates that by increasing individual readiness to change by one standard deviation (0.40), affective commitment to change increases by 0.57 standard deviations. Result R^2 show a value of 0.328, meaning that the 32.8% variance score of affective commitment to change can be explained by the individual readiness for change, while 67.2% of other variances are explainable by other factors.

Moreover, Table 5 provides an overview of the influence of both variables, the sense of psychological empowerment and individual readiness to change, at the same time toward affective commitment to change. Based on Table 5, it can be seen that the overall R^2 value of the influence of psychological empowerment and individual readiness for change is equal to 0.580, with an R^2 value of 0.337 and F of 39.333. Based on the significance column, it can be seen that these two variables have a significant influence on affective commitment to change. Thus, it can be concluded that the psychological empowerment and individual readiness for change have an influence on affective commitment to change ($R^2 = 0.337$, $F = 39.333$, $p = 0.000$), where 33.7% of the variance scores of affective commitment to change can be explained by a sense of psychological empowerment and individual readiness for change, while 66.4% of other variances are explained by other factors. Individuals who have a high score on a psychological empowerment and an individual readiness for change will also have a high score on affective commitment to change.

Table 5. The Results of Regression Analysis

No.	Variables	Affective Commitment to Change				
		r	R^2	ΔR^2	β	Sig (p)
1.	Psychological Empowerment (Psy. Emp.)	0.180**	0.064		0.180	0.001*
2.	Individual Readiness for Change (IRFC)	0.558**	0.336		0.558	0.000**
3.	Psy. Emp. + IRFC	0.580**	0.337			0.000**
4.	Psychological Empowerment			0.026	0.015	0.759
5.	Individual Readiness for Change			0.328	0.554	0.000**
		$F = 39.334$				

*Significant at $p < 0.05$ (one-tailed); **significant at $p < 0,01$ (one-tailed)

Table 5 revealed that psychological empowerment as a predictor on affective commitment, with β score 0.180 significant at $p < 0.05$. Thus hypothesis 1 (one) , was accepted. Further, its showed that Individual readiness for change also was an indicator of Affective commitment to change with β score 0.558 significant at $p < 0.01$. Thus hypothesis 1 (one) , was accepted

Table 5 also provides an overview of how the comparison between psychological empowerment and individual readiness to change in influencing affective commitment to change when they are combined. Large changes in the value of variance affective commitment to change due to the influence of a sense of psychological empowerment is equal to 0.026, with coefficient beta a amounting to 0.015 and significance of 0.759 ($R^2 = 0.026$, $\beta = 0.015$, $p > 0.01$). Meanwhile, major changes in the value of the variance of affective commitment to change due to the influence of the individual readiness to change coefficient is 0.328 with the beta a psychological empowerment of 0.554 and significance of 0.000 ($R^2 = 0.2328$, $\beta = 0.554$, $p < 0.01$). It can be concluded that, Individual Readiness for Change had a higher score compared to psychological empowerment . Hence, hypotheis 3 was accepted.

Seeing the value between the two variables, it can be said that the readiness of individuals to change has more potential in predicting affective commitment to change among individuals as compared to psychological empowerment. This indicates that the Hypothesis 3 of this study is accepted. Researchers also performed calculations using the regression method hierarchical multiple regression, where regression analysis is carried out in stages, to see how much contribution is given to psychological empowerment and individual readiness to change to affective commitment to change when calculated simultaneously. The results showed the same amount stated at the Table 5.

The results of this study indicate that psychological empowerment positively and significantly can predict affective commitment to change. This is in line with the findings of Mangundjaya (2019) who found that psychological empowerment has a positive correlation with commitment to change, including the dimensions of affective commitment to change. Thus, a higher sense of psychological empowerment will increase affective commitment to change.

Table 6. Regression Analysis Hierarchy Against Affective Commitment to Change

	Affective Commitment to Change				
	<i>R</i>	<i>R</i> ²	ΔR^2	β	<i>Sig. (p)</i>
<i>Step1</i>	0.179	0.032	0.026		
Position				0.036	0.564
Tenure				0.159	0.012
<i>Step2</i>					
Position	0.580**	0.337	0.328		
Tenure				0.025	0.628
Psychological Empowerment				0.079	0.136
Individual Readiness for Change				0.015	0.759
				0.554	0.000**
F = 39.334					

*Significant at $p < 0.05$ (one-tailed), **significant at $p < 0.01$ (one-tailed)

The findings of this study also revealed that individual readiness to change can predict affective commitment to change in a positive and significant way. This is in line with Mangundjaya's (2013) research that found that individual readiness to change has contributed to commitment to change. In addition, Mangundjaya (2013b) also found that one of the factors that influence commitment to change is individual readiness to change. This can occur through active participation and the encouragement of colleagues in the event of a change. In addition, when an employee feels ready for change, he will have a commitment to the changes in his organization. This is in line with Hanpachern's (1998) findings that employees will participate more in the change program when they have individual readiness to change. Thus, it is assumed that, if the individual readiness to change is high, affective commitment to change is high.

In addition, other results showed that individual readiness to change can be a strong predictor of affective commitment to change as compared to psychological empowerment. This is because to achieve commitment to change, employees will need individual readiness to change. These results are in accordance with Conner's (in Mangundjaya, 2013) concept of the stage of commitment which explains that there are two stages before reaching the commitment stage, and these are the preparation stage and the acceptance stage. The preparation phase will be the initial stage where individuals experience organizational change. This stage is where the effects of the changes can be observed, including the level of awareness of individuals on the changes. Thus, individuals will not reach the commitment stage unless they have individual readiness to change. In addition, although both psychological empowerment and individual readiness to change can predict affective commitment to change, exhibiting psychological empowerment does not necessarily mean the individual will have individual readiness to change.

This study also found two demographic variables that influence affective commitment to change, which is position and tenure. This study discovered that the higher an individual's position in an organization and the longer he/she works there, the more likely he/she has an affective commitment to change. This is in line with the findings of Mangundjaya et al. (2015) that there is an association between position and tenure in an organization with affective commitment to change. Furthermore, the employee is described as having been able to understand and explore the condition

of himself and also the work in his organization, so the employee has recognized his company and can respond to changes in his organization well.

Some limitations that need to be considered as evaluation material for further research were found; these include research respondents. This research focuses only on financial institutions, specifically banks. This results of this study cannot be generalized to populations in other institutions. The disproportionate number of each characteristic, such as gender, educational attainment, position, age, and length of work also are reasons why these results cannot be used as basis for generalization. In addition to disproportion, the location of respondents is limited to the vicinity of Jakarta. Another limitation is with regards to changes experienced. In this study, the organizational changes experienced by respondents were mostly changes in the company's strategic plan, the development of information technology (IT), and the restructuring of their organization. Changes need to be considered because it can affect organizational change and also individual characteristics, such as affective commitment to change. It may give different results if the content of changes is different from the three changes mentioned. Next is the possibility of the occurrence of *social desirability* or the tendency of respondents to choose answers appropriate to or according to social norms. Some respondents may think this research will influence the assessment of their performance in their organization. The researcher does not specify about the employee's status is in the organization, which might be permanent or outsourcing employees. However, although they are permanent employees but they have already worked for several years in the company.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This study aims to determine whether psychological empowerment and the individual readiness to change can become the predictors of affective commitment to change. Based on the results of data analysis, psychological empowerment and the individual readiness for change can positively and significantly predict affective commitment to change. These results indicate that if psychological empowerment of an individual is high, his/her affective commitment to change is also high; this has been found to be similar to individual readiness to change. It can be said that the two variables, that is, psychological empowerment and individual readiness to change can become the predictors of affective commitment to change. In addition, the findings of this study also revealed that individual readiness to change can better predict affective commitment to change than psychological empowerment. This study's findings highlighted the importance of individual readiness for change, psychological empowerment, employee commitment, and employee involvement during organizational change. These are important concepts for organizational management to consider when influencing employees and ensuring the success of organizational change. Furthermore, the findings of this study will also add to the body of literature by providing knowledge that is useful to scholars and organizations in protecting employees to resist the organizational change. Moreover, the leaders must accept full responsibility for organizational change and understand the role of commitment to change in the relationship between individual readiness for change, employees' psychological empowerment and affective commitment to change in order to collaborate with employees to initiate changes that will ensure the organization's long-term viability.

REFERENCE

- [1] Alolabi, Y. A., Ayupp, K., and Al Dwaikat, M., "Issues and implications of readiness to change issues and implications of readiness to change," *Adm. Sci.* 2021, Vol. 11, No. 4, 140; <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci11040140>, 2021.
- [2] Choi, M., "Employees' attitudes toward organizational change: A literature review," *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 50, No. 4, pp: 479–500. DOI: 10.1002/hrm.20434, 2011.
- [3] Cunha-Cruz, J., Milgrom, P., Colleen E., Huebner, Scott, J. A., Ludwig, S., Dysert, J., Mitchell, M., Allen, G., and Shirtcliff, R. M., "Care delivery and compensation system changes: A case study of organizational readiness within a large dental care practice



- organization in the United States,” *BMC Oral Health*, Vol. 17, pp: 1–9. DOI:10.1186/s12903-017-0448-4, 2017.
- [4] Fulcher, J. D., “An analysis of the common reasons for organizational change failures: An exploration of the contributing roles of the individual, the leader, and the environment, (*Dissertation*),” University of Maryland University College, 2013.
- [5] Guamaradewi, N. G. and Mangundjaya, W. L., “The impact of individual and organizational readiness to change on affective commitment to change,” *Journal Management Asset Infrastruktur & Fasilitas*, Vol. 2, No. 2. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12962/j26151847.v2i2.4340>, 2018.
- [6] Hanpachern, C., Morgan, G. A., & Griego, O. V., “An extension of the theory of margin: A framework for assessing readiness for change,” *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 339–350. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.3920090405>, 1998.
- [7] Hechanova, R. M. and Cementina-Olpoc, R., “Transformational leadership, change management, and commitment to change: A comparison of academic and business organizations,” *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp: 11–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-012-0019-z>, 2012.
- [8] Herscovitch, L. and Meyer, J. P., Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 87, No. 3, pp: 474–487, <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.474>, 2002.
- [9] Kottke, J. L., Pelletier, K. L., and Agars, M. D., “Measuring follower confidence in top leadership direction,” *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 34, pp: 292–307. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2011-0062>, 2013.
- [10] Maharesi, Y., “Fintech dan transformasi industri keuangan,” <https://www.pwc.com/id/en/media-centre/pwc-in-news/2017/indonesian/fintech-dan-transformasi-industri-keuangan.html>, 2017.
- [11] Mangundjaya, W. L., “Leadership, empowerment, and trust on affective commitment to change in state-owned organisations,” *International Journal of Public Sector Performance Management*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp: 46–62. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJPSPM.2019.09668>, 2019.
- [12] Mangundjaya, W. L. H., Utoyo, D. B., and Wulandari, P., “The role of leadership and employee’s condition on reaction to organizational change,” *Procedia, Social and Behavioural Science, Global Conference on Business & Social Science-2014, GCBSS-2014, 15th &16th December, Kuala Lumpur*, Vol. 172, pp: 471–478, 2015.
- [13] Mangundjaya, W., “The predictor of affective commitment to change: Attitude vs individual readiness for change,” *Romanian Economic and Business Review*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp: 198–203, 2013.
- [14] Meyer, J. P. and Morin, A. J., “A person-cantered approach to commitment research: Theory, research, and methodology,” *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, Vol. 37, No. 4, pp: 584–612. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2085>, 2016.
- [15] Myers, P., Hulks, S., and Wiggins, L., “*Organizational change: Perspectives on theory and practice*,” United Kingdom: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- [16] Neves, P., “Building commitment to change: The role of perceived supervisor support and competence,” *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 20, No. 4, pp: 437–450. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13594321003630089>, 2011.
- [17] Spreitzer, G. M., “Taking stock: A review of more than twenty years of research on empowerment at work,” in J. Barling & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Behaviour*, pp: 54–72. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2008.
- [18] Von Treuer, K., Karantzas, G., McCabe, M., Mellor, D., Konis, A., Davison, T. E., and O’Connor, D., “Organizational factors associated with readiness for change in residential aged care settings,” *BMC Health Services Research*, Vol. 18, pp: 1–6. DOI: 10.1186/s12913-018-2832-4, 2018.
- [19] Waringin, T. D., “Dampak Fintech ke Karyawan Bank,” <https://finance.detik.com/moneter/d-3732295/dampak-fintech-ke-karyawan-bank>, 2017.



