



**SURAT PERJANJIAN PENUGASAN
DALAM RANGKA PELAKSANAAN PROGRAM**

Hibah Publikasi Internasional Terindeks untuk Tugas Akhir Mahasiswa (Hibah PITTA)

Tahun Anggaran 2017

Nomor: 721/UN2.R3.1/HKP.05.00/2017

Pada hari ini Senin tanggal Dua Puluh bulan Maret tahun Dua Ribu Tujuh Belas (20-03-2017), kami yang bertanda tangan di bawah ini :

- 1. Prof. Dr. Heri Hermansyah, S.T., M.Eng.** : Direktur Riset dan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat Universitas Indonesia, dalam hal ini bertindak untuk dan atas nama Universitas Indonesia (UI), yang berkedudukan di Gedung *Integrated Laboratory and Research Center* (ILRC) Lantai *Mezzanine*, Universitas Indonesia, Kampus Baru UI Depok, 16424, untuk selanjutnya disebut **PIHAK PERTAMA**;
- 2. Dr. Wustari L. Mangundjaya, M.Org Psy, S.E., Psikolog.** : Dosen Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Indonesia, dalam hal ini bertindak sebagai Pengusul dan Penerima Hibah PITTA Tahun Anggaran 2017 untuk selanjutnya disebut **PIHAK KEDUA**.

PIHAK PERTAMA dan **PIHAK KEDUA**, secara bersama-sama sepakat mengikatkan diri dalam suatu Perjanjian Pelaksanaan Penugasan Program Hibah Publikasi Internasional Terindeks untuk Tugas Akhir Mahasiswa Tahun Anggaran 2017 (yang selanjutnya disebut sebagai Hibah PITTA) berlandaskan pada Surat Keputusan Rektor Universitas Indonesia Nomor: 0705/SK/R/UI/2017 tentang Penetapan Penerima Hibah Publikasi Internasional Terindeks untuk Tugas Akhir Mahasiswa Universitas Indonesia Tahun Anggaran 2017, dengan ketentuan dan syarat-syarat sebagai berikut:

Pasal 1

Ruang Lingkup Penugasan

PIHAK PERTAMA memberi tugas kepada **PIHAK KEDUA**, dan **PIHAK KEDUA** menerima tugas tersebut dari **PIHAK PERTAMA**, untuk melaksanakan Penugasan Program Hibah Publikasi Internasional Terindeks untuk Tugas Akhir Mahasiswa Tahun Anggaran 2017 (Hibah PITTA) dengan judul "**Peran Kepemimpinan Transformasional dan Kepercayaan Terhadap Komitmen untuk Berubah**".

Pasal 2

Dana Hibah PITTA

- (1) Besarnya dana untuk melaksanakan program dengan judul sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 1 adalah sebesar **Rp79.000.000,00** (*Tujuh puluh sembilan juta rupiah*) sudah termasuk pajak.
- (2) Dana Hibah PITTA sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) dibebankan pada Anggaran Universitas Indonesia.

Pasal 3

Tata Cara Pembayaran Dana Hibah PITTA

- (1) Dana Hibah PITTA sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 2 ayat (1) dibayarkan oleh **PIHAK PERTAMA** kepada **PIHAK KEDUA** secara bertahap dengan ketentuan sebagai berikut:
 - a. Pembayaran Tahap Pertama sebesar 70% dari total dana Hibah PITTA yaitu $70\% \times Rp79.000.000,00 = Rp55.300.000,00$ (*Lima puluh lima juta tiga ratus ribu rupiah*), yang akan dibayarkan kepada **PIHAK PERTAMA** kepada **PIHAK KEDUA** setelah **PARA PIHAK** menandatangani Perjanjian ini dan dilengkapi dengan berita acara penilaian kelayakan proposal penelitian dan berita acara pembayaran;
 - b. Pembayaran Tahap Kedua sebesar 30% dari total dana hibah PITTA yaitu $30\% \times Rp79.000.000,00 = Rp23.700.000,00$ (*Dua puluh tiga juta tujuh ratus ribu rupiah*), yang akan dibayarkan oleh **PIHAK PERTAMA** kepada **PIHAK KEDUA** setelah pelaksanaan Monitoring/Pengawasan Hibah PITTA tingkat UI dilengkapi dengan berita acara penilaian luaran penelitian (*status full paper submitted* untuk publikasi) dan berita acara pembayaran.
- (2) Pembayaran dana Hibah PITTA sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) akan dilakukan oleh **PIHAK PERTAMA** kepada **PIHAK KEDUA** ke rekening sebagai berikut:

Nama : WUSTARI L. MANGUNDJAYA
Nomor Rekening : 067201000142504
Nama Bank : BRI Cabang 0672 kcp universitas Indonesia

- (3) **PIHAK PERTAMA** tidak bertanggung jawab atas keterlambatan dan/atau tidak terbayarnya sejumlah dana sebagaimana dimaksud pada ayat (1) yang disebabkan karena kesalahan **PIHAK KEDUA** dalam menyampaikan data terkait rekening milik **PIHAK KEDUA** yang berupa nama bank, nomor rekening, atau nama pemilik rekening.

Pasal 4

Jangka Waktu

Jangka waktu pelaksanaan penugasan sebagaimana dimaksud dalam Pasal 1 sampai selesai 100%, adalah terhitung sejak 20 Maret 2017 dan berakhir pada 30 November 2017.

Pasal 14
Lain-Lain

- (1) **PIHAK KEDUA** menjamin bahwa program dengan judul tersebut di atas belum pernah dibiayai dan/atau diikutsertakan pada Program Pendanaan lainnya, baik yang diselenggarakan oleh instansi, lembaga, perusahaan atau yayasan, baik di dalam maupun di luar negeri.
- (2) Segala sesuatu yang belum cukup diatur dalam Perjanjian ini dan dipandang perlu diatur lebih lanjut dan dilakukan perubahan oleh **PARA PIHAK**, maka perubahan-perubahannya akan diatur dalam perjanjian tambahan atau perubahan (Adendum) yang merupakan satu kesatuan dan bagian yang tidak terpisahkan dari Perjanjian ini.

Perjanjian ini dibuat dan ditandatangani oleh **PARA PIHAK** pada hari dan tanggal tersebut di atas, dibuat dalam rangkap 2 (dua) dan bermeterai cukup sesuai dengan ketentuan yang berlaku, yang masing-masing mempunyai kekuatan hukum yang sama.

PIHAK PERTAMA

PIHAK KEDUA



Prof. Dr. Heri Hermansyah, S.T., M.Eng.
NIP197601181999031002



Dr. Wustari L. Mangundjaya, M.Org Psy, S.E., Psikolog.
NIP195602101986032001

Mengetahui,
Dekan Fakultas Psikologi



Dr. Tjut Rifamentia Umar Ali, M.A
NIP196001131987032002

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323116302>

Transformational Leadership vs Change Self-Efficacy and Its Impact on Affective Commitment to Change

Article in *GATR Journal of Management and Marketing Review* · December 2017

DOI: 10.35609/jmmr.2017.2.4(3)

CITATIONS

9

READS

723

2 authors, including:



[Wustari Mangundjaya](#)

Universitas Bhayangkara Jakarta Raya

161 PUBLICATIONS 766 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)



Transformational Leadership vs Change Self-Efficacy and Its Impact on Affective Commitment to Change

Denvi Giovanita¹, Wustari L. Mangundjaya^{*2}

¹² Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia, Kampus Baru UI, 16424, Depok, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Objective – It is essential for organizations in 21st century to evolve with time. In this regard, both the management and employees of an organization play an essential role in the implementation of change. One way of determining the success of organizational change is by identifying the employees' commitment to change. This research aims to identify the effect of transformational leadership (organizational factors) and employees' change self-efficacy (individual factors) on effective commitment to change, to identify which of those two factors has a more significant effect on affective commitment to change.

Methodology/Technique – The respondents of this study are employees in the finance sector. The data was collected using commitment to change, change self-efficacy and transformational leadership inventories. The data was analyzed using multiple hierarchical regressions.

Findings – The result show that both transformational leadership and change self-efficacy have a positive and significant effect on affective commitment to change. Furthermore, change self-efficacy proved to have a more significant effect on affective commitment to change compared to transformational leadership. Based on these results, organisations may wish to further focus on the development of change self-efficacy of individuals.

Novelty – This study can be used by HR practitioners when dealing with organizational change, as a guide to improving the success of such change.

Type of Paper: Empirical.

Keywords: Affective Commitment to Change; Change Self-Efficacy; Leadership; Organizational Change; Transformational Leadership.

JEL Classification: M10, M19.

1. Introduction

In the era of technology and globalization, organizations are continuously evolving with time, in order to maintain their relevance and operation (Cummings and Worley, 2009). However, organizational change is not always easy to implement.

* Paper Info: Received: August 19, 2017

Accepted: December 2, 2017

* Corresponding author:

E-mail: wustari@ui.ac.id

Affiliation: Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia, Kampus Baru UI, 16424, Depok, Indonesia

In fact, a study conducted by McKinsey&Company found that two out of three organizational changes eventually lead to failure (Aiken and Keller, 2009).

One of the reasons organizational change often fails is due a the lack of commitment by the employees to change; this refers to the employee's willingness to individually perform the actions deemed necessary to effect the change (Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002). Commitment to change is considered very important to the success of organizational change (Mangundjaya, 2016). Commitment to change consists of three dimensions, however, this study focuses only on the affective dimension of commitment to change. Herscovitch and Meyer (2002), defines affective commitment to change as a desire to support organizational change based on a belief in its benefits for the organization. (Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002). According to Herold et al., (2008), affective commitment to change is the most important dimension in predicting an employees' effort in supporting organizational change. This is because the affective dimension describes an individual's commitment to change based on their belief of the benefit of the change (Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002).

There are many variables that may influence employees' affective commitment to change. This can be sourced from the organization or the individual. Previous studies have shown that leaders are one of the important factors in the success of organizational change (Herold, Fedor, and Caldwell, 2007; Anderson and Anderson, 2010). Leaders should guide, motivate, and empower their followers; this is referred to as transformational leadership (Chou, 2013; Herold, etc., 2008; Shin et al., 2015). Transformational leadership refers to a style of leadership where leaders constantly encourage and inspire their subordinates to perform better, and become their mentors to further improve their skill set (Bass and Riggio, 2005). Northouse (2012) explains that transformational leadership is the process by leaders in which they identify their subordinates' motives and goals, satisfy their needs, and treat them as individuals.

However, Herold, Fedor, and Caldwell (2007) are critical of the fact that many studies only this topic only focus on the factors sourced from the organization's neglect of individual elements. This raises the question as to whether individual factors are less critical than organizational factors. Previous studies have also shown that an individual's level of commitment to change is often related to their sense of willingness and ability. For instance, a sense of competence in situations of change may have an impact on affective commitment to change; this is referred to as change self-efficacy (Aini, 2016; Herold, Fedor, and Caldwell, 2007), or psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 2007). Wanberg and Banas (2000) define change self-efficacy as one's perception of their ability to deal with change, and to continue performing their tasks in spite of the demands of the change. Caprara and Steca (2005) state that self-efficacy is a cognitive structure that has the most significant impact on individual behavior. In this case, it is argued that employee's change self-efficacy is a crucial factor in determining whether they will commit to supporting organizational change. This study aims to examine the impact of transformational leadership (organizational/corporate factors) and employees' change self-efficacy (individual factors) on affective commitment to change, and to identify which of those two influencing factors has a more significant effect on affective commitment to change.

1.1 Transformational leadership, change self-efficacy, and affective commitment to change.

A leader with a transformational leadership style will inspire, motivate, stimulate and care for their followers; this kind of behavior attracts a sense of compliance, particularly when it comes to employee's commitment to change. However, people with a natural sense of confidence and efficacy will likely also be committed to change. Previous studies have shown that transformational leadership has a positive effect on affective commitment to change (Herold et al., 2007). Based on this, the following hypotheses are suggested

:

H1: Transformational leadership has a positive impact on affective commitment to change.

H2: Change self-efficacy has a positive impact on affective commitment to change.

H3: Change self-efficacy has a more significant impact on affective commitment to change compared to transformational leadership.

2. Materials and Methods

The participants in this study were employees from 5 finance sector organisations that have recently undergone some level of organizational change, and who had been working for at least two years. There was a total of 207 participants, and 66.7% of the participants were male. Most of the participants have at least a bachelors degree, and the majority of participants are under 30 years old (35.3%). Most participants have between 2 and 10 years of service (86%). Three types of questionnaires were used to collect data. The first tested Affective Commitment to Change Instruments, based on the questionnaire developed by Herscovitch and Meyer in 2002, and adapted to Bahasa Indonesia by Mangundjaya (2012). This questionnaire uses a 6-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 6 (strongly agree). The second was used to measure transformational leadership, based on the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Form 5 (MLQ 5X), adapted to Bahasa Indonesia. This also uses a 6-point Likert scale. The third was used to measure change self-efficacy, using the Change Related Self-Efficacy instrument as developed by Ashford's Change Self-Efficacy Instrument (1988) and adapted by Aini (2016) to Bahasa Indonesia again using a 6-point Likert scale. Hierarchical multiple regression was used to analyze the magnitude of the independent variables (transformational leadership and change self-efficacy) on the dependent variable (affective commitment to change). ANOVA was also used to determine the description of affective commitment to change on the characteristic of respondents, being gender, age, education, and length of service.

3. Results

3.1 Descriptive Analysis of Affective Commitment to Change

To identify the profiles of the respondents regarding their affective commitment to change, the t-test and ANOVA were conducted.

Table 1. Affective Commitment to Change Profile Based on Demographic Characteristics (N=207)

| Characteristics | N | Percentage | Mean | SD | F | Sign. |
|---------------------|-----|------------|------|------|-------|-------|
| Gender | | | | | 1.175 | 0.311 |
| Male | 138 | 66.7% | 4.26 | 0.73 | | |
| Female | 64 | 30.9% | 4.29 | 0.73 | | |
| Unknown | 5 | 2.4% | - | - | | |
| Age | | | | | 1.277 | 0.283 |
| <30 years old | 109 | 52.7% | 4.24 | 0.71 | | |
| 31-44 years old | 73 | 35.3% | 4.25 | 0.79 | | |
| >45 years old | 9 | 4.3% | 4.63 | 0.46 | | |
| Unknown | 16 | 7.7% | - | - | | |
| Education | | | | | 0.311 | 0.871 |
| High school diploma | 28 | 13.5% | 4.20 | 0.71 | | |
| Associate degree | 28 | 13.5% | 4.38 | 0.59 | | |
| Bachelor degree | 136 | 65.7% | 4.29 | 0.75 | | |
| Master degree | 7 | 3.4% | 4.12 | 0.56 | | |
| Unknown | 8 | 3.9% | - | - | | |
| Length of service | | | | | 0.137 | 0.711 |

| Characteristics | N | Percentage | Mean | SD | F | Sign. |
|-----------------|-----|------------|------|------|---|-------|
| 2-10 years | 178 | 86% | 4.27 | 0.73 | | |
| >10 years | 29 | 14% | 4.32 | 0.74 | | |

The analysis of ANOVA reveals that there is no significant differences in affective commitment to change scores based on the characteristics of gender, age, education, and length of service.

3.2 Regression Analysis

Table 2. Results of Multiple Hierarchical Regression (N=207)

| Variable | r | R2 | Δ R2 | Sig | β | Sign. |
|-----------------------------|--------|-------|-------------|--------|---------|---------|
| Stage 1 | 0.404* | 0.163 | 0.163 | 0.000* | - | - |
| Change Self-efficacy | | | | | 0.404* | 0.000** |
| Stage 2 | 0.445* | 0.198 | 0.035 | 0.003* | - | - |
| Change Self-efficacy | | | | | 0.398* | 0.000** |
| Transformational Leadership | | | | | 0.188* | 0.003** |

**significant at l.o.s $p < 0.01$ (one-tailed)

A two-stage multiple hierarchical regression was conducted to analyze and compare the contribution of each independent variable to affective commitment to change, after controlling the other variable. The hierarchical multiple regression reveals that in stage one, change self-efficacy contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(1,205) = 39.890$, $p < 0.01$. This accounts for 16.3% of the variation in affective commitment to change. The introduction of the transformational leadership variable explained an additional 3.5% of the variation in affective commitment to change. This change in R2 was significant, $F(1,204) = 8.968$, $p < 0.01$. When both independent variables were used in stage two of the regression model, both change self-efficacy, and transformational leadership were significant predictors of affective commitment to change. Together, both independent variables explained 19.8% of the variation in affective commitment to change. The most important predictor of affective commitment to change was changing self-efficacy, which independently explained 16.3% of the variation in affective commitment to change.

4. Discussion

The results show that transformational leadership has a significant effect on affective commitment to change. This finding is consistent with previous studies conducted by Herold et al., (2008); Chou (2013) and Shin et al., (2015). This study also shows that change self-efficacy has a significant effect on affective commitment to change, which which is also consistent with previous studies (Herold, Fedor, and Caldwell, 2007). However, the results of this study are more specific than the results produced by Herold, Fedor, and Caldwell (2007), as this study specifically measures the affective dimension of commitment to change, and in doing so, has demonstrated the role of change self-efficacy as a predictor of affective commitment to change.

This study also reveals that change self-efficacy serves as a more significant predictor of affective commitment to change, when compared to transformational leadership. In this regard, an employees' belief that they are able to effectively manage change actually contributes to their proven ability to manage change. The study concludes that self-efficacy is essential for successful change to occur. This condition is similar to psychological empowerment (Spreitzer, 2007), which consists of a sense of meaning, determination, competence and impact, that has a positive effect on affective commitment to change (Mangundjaya, 2014).

These findings support the criticisms of Herold, Fedor, and Caldwell (2007) which suggests that practices and studies in change management have tended to ignore the role of individual differences. It is

therefore evident that individual differences, particularly change self-efficacy, have a stronger role in building affective commitment to change than leadership factors. Moreover, affective commitment to change is the best to predict the efforts of employees when supporting organizational change (Herold et al., 2008).

However, further study is needed to identify the relationship between demographic characteristics and affective commitment to change. This study is limited as it focused only on financial institutions, and as a result, the study cannot be generalized. In addition, this study was conducted using self-reports, which increases the potential for bias in the results (Podsakoff, 2003).

5. Conclusion

This study concludes that change self-efficacy and transformational leadership are predictors of affective commitment to change. Also, change self-efficacy has a greater impact than transformational leadership on affective commitment to change in employees. Based on these findings, together with the limitations of the study, future research should examine different industries and use additional methods of predicting affective commitment to change, to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon.

References

- Aiken, C. & Keller, S. (2009). The irrational side of change management. *McKinsey Quarterly*. Retrieved on January 15, 2017, from <http://www.mckinsey.com/business-functions/organization/our-insights/the-irrational-side-of-change-management>.
- Aini, R. N. (2016). Affective commitment to change as a mediator between change communication and change self-efficacy on innovative work behaviour. Universitas Indonesia.
- Anderson, L.A. & Anderson, D. (2010). *The change leader's roadmap: How to navigate your organization's transformation*, (2nd ed.). San Fransisco, CA: Pfeiffer, Wiley Imprint.
- Ashford, S. J. (1988). Individual strategies for coping with stress during organizational transitions. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 24(1), 19-36.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Psychology Press.
- Caprara, G. V., & Steca, P. (2005). Self-efficacy beliefs as determinants of prosocial behavior conducive to life satisfaction across ages. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24(2), 191.
- Chen, G., Gully, S. M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self-efficacy scale. *Organizational Research Methods*, 4, 62–83.
- Chou, P. (2013). The effect of transformational leadership on follower's affective commitment to change. *World*, 3(1).
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. & Morrison, K. (2000). *Research methods in education* (5th ed.). London: Routledge/Falmer.
- Cummings, T. G., & Worley C. G. (2015). *Organization Development and Changes 10th Edition*. USA: South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Gibbs, M. (2005). The right to development and indigenous peoples: Lessons from New Zealand. *World Development*, 33 (8), 1365-1378.
- Herold, D. M., Fedor, D. B., & Caldwell, S. D. (2007). Beyond change management: a multilevel investigation of contextual and personal influences on employees' commitment to change. *Journal of applied psychology*, 92(4), 942.
- Herold, D. M., Fedor, D. B., Caldwell, S., & Liu, Y. (2008). The effects of transformational and change leadership on employees' commitment to a change: a multilevel study. *Journal of applied psychology*, 93(2), 346.
- Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: extension of a three-component model. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(3), 474.
- Mangundjaya, W. (2013). The Predictor of Affective Commitment to Change: Attitude vs Individual Readiness for Change, *Romanian Economic and Business Review*, Special Issue 1, 2013, 198-202. Romanian American University.
- Mangundjaya, W. L. (2014). Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Task Environment in Commitment to Change. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 2(2), 119-126.
- Mangundjaya, W. L. (2016). *Psychology in Organizational Change*. Jakarta: Swasthi Adi Cita.
- Podsakoff, P.M; Mac Kenzie, S.B; Lee, J-Y; Poodsakoff, N.P (2003) Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies, *Journal of Applied Psychology* 3, Vol. 88, No. 5, 879–903

- Shin, J., Seo, M., Shapiro, D. L., & Taylor, M. S. (2015). Maintaining Employees' Commitment to Organizational Change: The Role of Leaders' Informational Justice and Transformational Leadership. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (2007). Taking stock: A review of more than twenty years of research on empowerment at work. *The Handbook of Organizational Behavior*. Cooper and Barling (Eds.). Sage Publications.
- Wanberg, C. R., & Banas, J. T. (2000). Predictors and outcomes of openness to changes in a reorganizing workplace. *Journal of applied psychology*, 85(1), 132.



The Impact of Psychological Capital and Psychological Empowerment on Employee's Affective Commitment to Change

Muthmainah Mufidah¹, Wustari L. Mangundjaya^{2*}

¹² Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia, Kampus Baru UI, 1624, Depok, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Objective – Organizations nowadays have to change and adjust themselves with the changing external environment in order to survive in the globalization era. This change requires a high affective commitment to change from its employees. The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of psychological capital and psychological empowerment on employee's affective commitment to change.

Methodology/Technique – Respondents were 242 employees of Indonesian financial institutions which have undergone organizational changes. Data collection tools were Commitment to Change Inventory, Psychological Empowerment, and Psychological Capital, and was analysed using regression analysis.

Findings – Findings indicated that a positive and significant impact of psychological capital and psychological empowerment on affective commitment to change. This study also found that psychological capital has a more significant influence on affective commitment to change than psychological empowerment.

Research limitations/implications - The implications of the study can be used for managing change better, such as developing confidence in people by developing both psychological empowerment and psychological capital.

Originality/value - Results are essential for managing change better, such as developing confidence in people by promoting both psychological empowerment and psychological capital.

Type of Paper: Empirical

Keywords: Affective Commitment to Change; Psychological Capital; Psychological Empowerment; Organizational Change; Financial Institutions.

JEL Classification: J50, J59.

1. Introduction

Globalization today is inevitable, the implementation of the ASEAN Economic Community or familiarly called MEA had also affected the financial sector in Indonesia (Prasetyo, 2014).

* Paper Info: Revised: December, 19, 2017

Accepted: February, 11, 2018

* Corresponding author:

E-mail: wustari@ui.ac.id; wustari@gmail.com

Affiliation: Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia

Pressures from the external environment described above made the organization needed to do some changes in order to survive and developed better in the globalization (Palmer, Dunford, and Akin, 2009). However, previous studies showed that 70-90% of the change programs were not successful (Fulcher, 2013), and people were said as one of the most important factors (Robbins, 2013). In this regard, people should have the commitment to change (Mangundjaya, 2016). Herscovitch and Meyer (2002) describe affective commitment to change in the organization as a desire within the individual to provide support for change on the basis of a belief that change can be good for the organization. From the three dimensions of commitment to change, affective commitment to change is considered to be the most important among the others (Herscovith & Meyer, 2002; Parish et al., 2008). According to Herscovitch and Meyer (2002), affective commitment to change can become the representative of the commitment to change.

Individual's commitment to change is inseparable from their characteristics (Mangundjaya, 2014). Luthans, Youssef, and Avolio (2007) described a concept of the positive characteristics that individuals have in achieving target and facing the changing situation, as psychological capital. Luthans, Youssef, and Avolio (2007) define psychological capital as an individual's positive psychological state of development and characterized by people having confidence to take necessary effort to succeed in performing tasks, to make a definite attribution about succeeding now and in the future, and has adversity attitude to bounce back to attain success. There are four dimensions of psychological capital, namely a) self-efficacy, self-confidence in individual's ability to drive motivations, cognitive sources, and actions to successfully perform a task in a particular context (Stajkovic and Luthans, 1998), b) optimism, a condition in which individuals attribute events positively (Seligman, 2011) c) hope, individuals favourable motivational condition and determination to start and keep effort in reaching a goal (Snyder, 2000), and d) resilience, a capability to recover from misery, conflict, failure, that a person experiences (Luthans, 2002).

The similar characteristics of psychological capital have developed by Spreitzer (2007) which was called psychological empowerment. Both are the positive characteristics of the individual and considered mutually supportive of each other as to their influence on organizational change. Psychological empowerment emphasizes on controlling the environment and competence (Spreitzer, 2007). Spreitzer (2007) defines psychological empowerment as a set of psychological states which are necessary for people to feel a sense of control of their work. Psychological empowerment is explained Spreitzer (2007) as a motivational construct manifested from four dimensions, namely a) meaning, as the value owned by employees in the goals or targets to be achieved, b) competence, as a trust owned by the individuals about their ability to perform correctly and competently, c) self-determination, is an individual's view of themselves about the choice to initiate, and d) impact as the degree to which the individual feels that one is capable of influencing the work.

Meanwhile, psychological capital is not about control, but about the four characteristics (self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience) that can be used in managing change. The objective of this study was to test the impact of psychological capital and psychological empowerment on affective commitment to change and to identify which one of the two had a stronger impact on affective commitment to change.

People who have high psychological capital which consisted of hope, self-efficacy, resilience, and optimism, are assumed to be having more positive attitude and behavior toward organizational change (Luthans, 2002) as they are confident in facing the organizational change. Meanwhile, people who have high psychological empowerment, which have a high feeling of competence, meaning, determination and impact will also be ready to face the changes (Spreitzer, 2007). Based on these, the following hypotheses were developed:

Hypothesis 1: Psychological capital had a positive impact on affective commitment to change.

Hypothesis 2: Psychological empowerment had a positive impact on affective commitment to change.

Individual readiness for change is related with the commitment to change (Mangundjaya, 2013) and based on Lizar, Mangundjaya, and Rachmawan (2014) findings, showed that psychological empowerment had a more significant impact on individual readiness for a change compared with psychological capital. Based on these, the following hypothesis as follows:

Hypothesis 3: Psychological empowerment had greater positive impact on affective commitment to change compared with psychological capital.

Methods

Participants

The respondents of the study were employees who worked at banking and non-banking financial institutions in Jakarta and surrounding areas, which have been conducted organizational changes. Respondents consisted of 242 permanent employees who have worked for at least two years and had the educational background at least graduated from Senior high school. The profiles of the participants are as follows: The majority of male (N 176, or 72,7%), within the range of age 25-44 years old (32.2%), had a bachelor degree (68.6%) and had been working in the company between 2-10 years (86.7%). The complete profile of the respondents can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Demographic of Respondents

| Respondent Characteristic | | Frequency (N= 242) | Percentage (%) |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Gender | Women | 66 | 27.3% |
| | Men | 176 | 72.7% |
| Age | <25 years old | 78 | 32.2% |
| | 25-44 years old | 150 | 62% |
| | >44 years old | 14 | 5.8% |
| Education | High School | 30 | 12.4% |
| | D3/D4 (Diploma) | 31 | 12.8% |
| | S1 (Bachelor) | 166 | 68.6% |
| | S2 and S3 (Master & PhD) | 15 | 6.1% |
| Lengths of Work | Years | 210 | 86.7% |
| | >10 years | 32 | 13.3% |

Data Collection

Data was collected using three instruments as follows: a) Affective Commitment to Change adopted from Herscovith and Meyer (2002) which had been translated into Bahasa Indonesia by Mangundjaya (2013), b) Psychological Empowerment adopted from Spreitzer (1995) which had been translated into Bahasa Indonesia by Mangundjaya (2014), and c) Psychological Capital from Luthans, Youssef, and Avolio (2007) which translated by Mangundjaya (Lizar, Mangundjaya, & Rachmawan, 2015).

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Science) software and analyzed using regression analysis.

Results

Regression Analysis

The following table 1 showed the Results of Regression Analysis (Psychological Capital and Psychological Empowerment on Affective Commitment to Change).

Table 1: The results of regression analysis

| | Standardized Coefficient β | r | R2 | Sig (p) |
|---|----------------------------------|--------|--------------------|---------|
| Psychological Capital | .360 | .360** | .130 | .000** |
| Self-efficacy | .305 | .305** | .09 | .000** |
| Optimism | .330 | .330** | .10 | .000** |
| Hope | .345 | .345** | .11 | .000** |
| Resilience | .368 | .368** | .13 | .000** |
| Psychological Empowerment | .332 | .332** | .11 | .000** |
| Meaning | .348 | .348** | .12 | .000** |
| Competence | .332 | .332** | .11 | .000** |
| Self-determination | .220 | .220** | .04 | .000** |
| Impact | .242 | .242** | .05 | .000** |
| Psychological Empowerment + Psychological Capital | | .376** | .141 | .000** |
| Psychological Empowerment | .152 | | $\Delta R2 = .011$ | .079 |
| Psychological Capital | .252 | | $\Delta R2 = .031$ | .004* |

F=19.631

*significant at LOS .05 (one-tailed)
 **significant at LOS .01 (one-tailed)

Findings showed that there was a positive and significant correlation between psychological capital and affective commitment to change, $r = 0.36$, $p < 0.01$ (one-tailed). Psychological capital had a significant impact on the affective commitment to change ($\beta = 0.36$, $p = 0.00$, $p < .01$). Each of the four dimensions of psychological capital had also a positive and significant impact on affective commitment to change. Resilience dimension had the greatest impact ($\beta = 0.368$, $p = 0.00$, $p < .01$), while self-efficacy had the least impact on affective commitment to change ($\beta = 0.305$, $p = 0.00$, $p < .01$).

There was a positive and significant correlation between psychological empowerment and affective commitment to change, $r = 0.332$, $p < 0.01$ (one-tailed), psychological empowerment had a significant influence on the affective commitment to change ($\beta = 0.332$, $p = 0.000$, $p < .01$). Each of the dimensions of psychological empowerment had a positive and significant impact on affective commitment to change. Meaning had greatest effect ($\beta = 0.348$, $p = 0.00$, $p < .01$), while self-determination has the least impact on affective commitment to change ($\beta = 0.220$, $p = 0.00$, $p < .01$).

The result also showed that psychological capital and psychological empowerment both had significant impact on the affective commitment to change ($R^2 = 0.141$, $F = 19.631$, $p = 0.00$). The amount of change in affective commitment to change variance due to the influence of psychological capital is 0.031, with the coefficient beta of psychological capital 0.252 and the significance 0.004 ($\Delta R^2 = 0.031$, $\beta = 0.252$, $p = 0.004$, $p < .01$). Meanwhile, the amount of change due to the influence of psychological empowerment is 0.011 with the psychological empowerment beta coefficient 0.152 and the significance 0.079 ($\Delta R^2 = 0.011$, $\beta = 0.152$, $p = 0.079$, $p > .01$). Based on this calculations, it can be said that psychological capital had a greater value of influence than the psychological empowerment on affective commitment to change.

Discussion

The result showed a positive and significant impact of psychological capital on affective commitment to change. This result supported the previous study by Naotunna (2015), who found that psychological capital had a positive correlation with affective commitment to change. This finding was also in line with Avey, Wernsing and Luthans (2008) that showed psychological capital positively correlated with positive emotions and behaviors in the organization, which are considered relevant and necessary for individuals in the change process. Findings also showed that psychological empowerment had a positive impact on affective commitment to change. These findings supported Mangundjaya (2014) which suggested that psychological empowerment plays a vital role in developing employee's commitment to change. Results also showed that psychological capital had a more significant influence on affective commitment to change compared with psychological empowerment. This finding was not in line with the research by Lizar, Mangundjaya, and Rachmawan (2014) where psychological empowerment had more influence than psychological capital to individual readiness for change. The impact of individual readiness for change cannot be generalized in the level of commitment to change. Commitment to change is the most important in managing organizational change successfully (Mangundjaya, 2013). It is more than just ready to face changes, but consistently being bound by it. In the globalization era, it is needed more than just focus on the ability of work, but also the positive personal characteristics of individuals who emphasize self-development and definite attribution as there is described well in psychological capital (Luthans, Youssef, and Avolio, 2007). From this findings, future study should be conducted.

The results also showed differences between banking and non-banking financial institutions. In banking institution, psychological empowerment had the more significant influence; meanwhile, in a non-banking institution, psychological capital had the greater impact on employee's affective commitment to change. These findings were interesting and might be due to the types of jobs and organizational culture of each organization.

There were some limitations in this research. First, it cannot be generalized to all company sectors, as this research only applies to financial institutions. Second, data collection based on self-report, which might have common method biases (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003), as a result, further studies should be conducted using different types of data collection tools. New research is also expected to explore each dimension of psychological capital and psychological empowerment which in this study only discussed a little. Results also showed that both the influence of each of psychological capital and psychological empowerment on affective commitment to change is still smaller than the percentage variance of other factors, indicating that various other factors that might contribute on the affective commitment to change. Thus, it is necessary to continue the research, explore more about the impact of other factors on affective commitment to change.

Conclusion

From this study, it can be concluded that there is a positive and significant impact of each psychological capital and psychological empowerment on affective commitment to change. The higher the psychological

capital, the higher will be employee's affective commitment to change. The same can be summed up in the psychological empowerment, the higher it is, the higher the affective commitment to change the person has. When compared both, psychological capital showed a greater impact on affective commitment to change than psychological empowerment.

References

- Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T. S., & Luthans, F. (2008). Can positive employees help positive organizational change? Impact of psychological capital and emotions on relevant attitudes and behaviors. *The journal of applied behavioral science*, 44(1), 48-70.
- Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(3), 474.
- Fulcher, J. D. (2013). *An Analysis of the Common Reasons for Organizational Change Failures; an Exploration of the Contributing Roles of the Individual, the Leader, and the Environment* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland University College).
- Lizar, A. A., Mangundjaya, W. L., & 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.
- Luthans, F. (2002). The need for and meaning of positive organizational behavior. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 23(6), 695-706.
- Luthans, F., Youssef, C. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2007). *Psychological capital: Developing the human competitive edge* (p. 3). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mangundjaya, W. L. (2013). The Predictor Of Affective Commitment To Change: Attitude Vs Individual Readiness For Change. *Romanian Economic and Business Review*, 198.
- Mangundjaya, W. (2014). Psychological empowerment and organizational task environment in commitment to change. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 2(2), 119.
- Mangundjaya, W. L. H. (2016). *Psychology in Organizational Change*. Jakarta: Swasthi Adi Cita.
- Bakari, H., & Khoso, I. (2017). Psychological Determinants of Graduate Employability: A Comparative Study of Business and Agriculture Students Across Pakistan. *Business & Economic Review*, 9(4), 111-138.
- Palmer, I., Dunford, R., Akin, G., & Buchanan, D. A. (2009). *Managing organizational change: A multiple perspectives approach*. New York: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Turner Parish, J., Cadwallader, S., & Busch, P. (2008). Want to, need to, ought to: employee commitment to organizational change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 21(1), 32-52.
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(5), 879.
- Prasetyo, B. (2014). Considering Indonesia's Employment World Readiness in Facing MEA. *RechtsVinding Online* (Media Pembinaan Hukum Nasional).
- Robbins, S. (2013). *Organizational behavior*. USA: McGraw-Hill
- Seligman, M. E. (2011). *Learned optimism: How to change your mind and your life*: Vintage. New York.
- Snyder, C. R. (Ed.). (2000). *Handbook of hope: Theory, measures, and applications*. Academic press.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of management Journal*, 38(5), 1442-1465.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (2008). Taking stock: A review of more than twenty years of research on empowerment at work. *Handbook of organizational behavior*, 1, 54-72.
- Stajkovic, A. D., & Luthans, F. (1998). Social cognitive theory and self-efficacy: Go beyond traditional motivational and behavioral approaches. *Organizational dynamics*, 26(4), 62-74.