

DOES PERCEIVED IMPACT OF CHANGE AFFECT READINESS FOR CHANGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION GOVERNANCE?

Neka Erlyani^{1,2*}, Fendy Suhariadi¹, Rahkman Ardi¹

¹Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, East Java, Indonesia

²Faculty of Medicine, Universitas Lambung Mangkurat, Banjarmasin, South Kalimantan, Indonesia

¹ neka.erlyani-2020@psikologi.unair.ac.id ² n.erlyani@ulm.ac.id

PAPER INFO	ABSTRACT
Received: September 2023 Revised: September 2023 Approved: September 2023	Background: Changes in the financial governance status of more autonomous state universities require readiness for change in the management of state universities. Academic staff is an HR group that carries out administrative tasks in the state university's management. The first factor of readiness for change individuals must have is to know that change will be beneficial for themselves and the organization. Aim: This study aims to determine the role of perceived impact of change on readiness for change in academic staff. Method: This research is a quantitative study with 254 subjects selected using Holt's RFCQ adaptation scale and Vakola's perceived impact of change adaptation scale as research instruments. The data were analyzed using a simple linear regression analysis technique via IBM SPSS. Findings: Perceived impact of change is proven to affect readiness for change in academic staff. If members perceive that change is positive and beneficial for themselves and their organization, they will be more ready to accept change. In addition, demographic factors have no effect on readiness for change.
KEYWORDS	<i>readiness for change, perceived impact of change, academic staff, higher education governance</i>
	© The author(s). This work is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC BY-SA 4.0)

INTRODUCTION

Global competition urges the government to comply with changes in governance and the performance of government apparatus and public services by improving the bureaucracy in all government institutions (Astridina et al., 2018). In the world of education, to follow this rhythm, universities, especially state universities in Indonesia, are trying to change towards more autonomous governance. State universities are competing towards the most autonomous management, namely Legal Entity State Universities (*Perguruan Tinggi Negeri Badan Hukum* abbreviated PTN-BH). Legal entity state universities has abundant sovereign in financial management and human resources within it (Diyanto et al., 2021).

As of 2022, there were 21 state universities in Indonesia with legal entity status (Caesaria, 2022). Meanwhile, state universities that have a prominent opportunity to move up to a legal entity level are state universities with public service agencies (*Badan Layanan Umum* abbreviated BLU). Currently, 47 public service agencies state universities are preparing to become legal entity state universities (eCampuz, 2020; Pindai Kemdikbudristek, 2021). Changing higher education governance status has its challenges because if it is inadequate to meet the achievement requirements in the first couple of years, it might abolish. Whereas for legal entity state universities, those that do not fulfill the performance evaluation

in the form of inappropriate performance reports and financial reports within 5 years may be subject to sanctions in the form of changing the status of legal entity to become public service agencies (downgrade of governance status) as regulated in Article 27 Government Regulations Number 4 of 2014 (Sutini, 2019). Therefore, it is crucial to prepare all human resources in higher education to be able to undergo the change process and maintain the status given. It is because the role and quality of HR greatly influence whether success or failure of an organization in realizing its plans and goals (Inandriciya et al., 2021).

Changes in governance are closely related to the readiness of academic staff in administrative tasks. According to Amon et al. (2021), academic staff should have operational and administrative technical skills in implementing their work. In addition, the academic staff is also the front guard who is required to adapt quickly to changes related to administrative services (Anardani et al., 2021).

Before starting a change in the organization, it requires readiness from members (Mangundjaya, 2016). Readiness for change is one of the drivers for achieving the effectiveness of organizational change (Armenakis et al., 1993). Holt et al. (2007) argue that readiness to change is a comprehensive attitude persuaded by content (something that is changed), process (how changes are carried out), context (changes that are taking place), and a person involved in a change (individual characteristics). There will be feelings of unpreparedness, opposite, rejection, and a lack of commitment to change which will be a challenge and even an obstacle to achieving the success of an organizational change program if the readiness is not prepared (Mangundjaya, 2016).

Rafferty et al. (2013) define readiness to change as a cognitive state in individuals who have positive attitudes, beliefs, and intentions toward change. Bernerth (2004) believes that readiness to change is a success factor in organizational change. The change readiness expressed by Weiner et al. (2008) refers to the commitment to a change to implement the success of the change. Holt et al. (2007) define change readiness as a comprehensive attitude reflected stimulus in the individual's cognitive and emotional aspects. In his research, it was categorized into several dimensions: appropriateness, management support, change efficacy, & personal valence.

Readiness for change in an individual can be demonstrated through several things, namely individual characteristics (core self-evaluation), contextual (trust in management, communication climate), perceived impact of change, and attitudes at work (job satisfaction) (Vakola, 2014). Perception is how individuals interpret information to gain meaning (Robbins & Judge, 2013). McNabb and Sepic (1995) stated that change is a process of changing actions, reactions, and interactions from individuals to realize the goals of achieving an organization. All changes lead to organizational effectiveness to improve the organization's ability to adapt to environmental changes and the behavior of members (Robbins & Judge, 2013). The perception of an individual becomes a facility and a constraint in implementing readiness for change (Smith, 2005). Individuals in implementing change will make interpretations regarding how the process is, evaluate it, determine its meaning, and develop what they feel (Choi, 2011).

According to Bouckenoghe and Devos (2008), the attitude of readiness for change is divided into three, based on cognitive, emotional, and intentional. An individual's perception becomes both a facility and an obstacle in implementing change readiness (Smith, 2005).

Based on this, the researchers focused on research in the organizational context, especially related to readiness for change and the perceived impact of change on state university academic staff in implementing change. The role of the perceived impact of change on readiness for change is necessary to prove empirically.

Previous research has mentioned the importance of organizations implementing change, informing change processes, and noting predictors of individual readiness to change (Deem et al., 2008; Pincus et al., 2017). Armenakis et al. (1993) believe individual factors are the most influential model for the success of change initiatives in an organization, where the implementation of change will be effective if individuals are dedicated to being ready to change. The change will impact the original situation to the new one, causing feelings of anxiety, uncertainty, and different perspectives (Shah & Shah, 2010). Change requires a way to ensure the success of implementing change by knowing the level of readiness of employees in an organization (Mulà et al., 2017). The researchers thought that further studies need to be conducted to see if the mentioned results also occur in academic field.

This study aims to determine the role of perceived impact of change on readiness for change in academic staff. It aims to test the researchers' hypothesis, which is there is a role for the perceived impact of change on readiness for change in academic staff. Based on this, the researchers focused on research in the organizational context, especially related to readiness for change and the perceived impact of change on state university academic staff in implementing change. The aim of this research is to find out empirically whether there is a role for perceptions of the impact of change on readiness for change. This research can be a reference for universities, especially those who want to change governance so that the implementation of changes can be carried out.

METHOD

The design of this study uses a quantitative method by collecting data in the form of numbers, words, or sentences converted into numerical data, then analyzed to obtain scientific information (Martono, 2019). The research design is cross-sectional, a study with an approach or data collection at once (point time approach) to examine the relationship between risk factors and effects (Siyoto & Sodik, 2015).

The population in this study was 985 academic staff at one state university in South Kalimantan. The recruitment of academic staff as research respondents based on their duties as managers of continuous administrative management with a change plan. The total number of participants was 263 academic staff from 10 faculties (Faculty of Teaching and Education, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Economics and Business, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Faculty of Fisheries and Maritime Affairs, Faculty of Agriculture, Faculty of Engineering, Faculty of Forestry, Faculty Mathematics and Natural Sciences and Postgraduate), it can be said that the minimum sample size is adequate. After going through the residual normality test process, there were nine outliers or subjects with extreme values, the total number of participants to analyze was 254.

Table 1. Population of Academic Staff

Work Unit	Employment Status		Total
	Civil Servant	Non-Civil Servant	
Rectorate	131	194	325
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education	28	67	95
Faculty of Law	16	43	59
Faculty of Economics and Business	15	42	57
Faculty of Social Science and Political Science	8	39	47
Faculty of Fisheries and Maritime Affairs	15	15	30
Faculty of Agriculture	33	24	57
Faculty of Engineering	25	35	60
Faculty of Medicine	47	63	110
Faculty of Dentistry	6	11	17
Faculty of Forestry	27	6	33
Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences	31	30	61
Postgraduate	0	34	34
Total	382	603	985

Table 2. Description of Participant

Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Cumulative Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	119	46.9
	Female	135	53.1
Age	18 - 29	52	20.5
	30 - 39	77	30.3
	40 - 49	88	34.6
	50 - 59	37	14.6
	60 - 69	10	4.1
Length of Work	1 - 11 months	5	2
	1 - 9 years	100	39.4
	10 - 19 years	108	42.5
	20 - 29 years	35	13.8
	30 - 39 years	6	2.4

This study used the perceived impact of change scale instruments developed by Vakola (2014) and the Readiness for Change Questionnaire (RFCQ) scale by Holt et al. (2007) in the form of a six-point Likert scale, with the choices Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2, Somewhat Disagree = 3, Somewhat Agree = 4, Agree = 5, Strongly Agree = 6. The scales of the two variables are adapted into Indonesian goes through stages according to the International Test Commission (ITC) Guidelines for Translating and Adapting Tests (Second Edition) (2016). Before being used, the two measuring instruments went through the trial stage. The results show that Cronbach's alpha for the RFCQ scale ($\alpha = 0.906$) and perceived impact of change scale ($\alpha = 0.844$), it could be assumed that both scales are reliable to use.

This research has been declared to have passed the ethical due diligence test from the Health Research Ethics Commission, Faculty of Medicine, Lambung Mangkurat University No.124/KEPK-FK ULM/EC/V/2022 and received approval to conduct trials via Google form on academic staff on April 28th – 20th May, 2022 through one of the contact representatives.

Offline data collection was carried out from June 28th - July 5th, 2022 with a total of 254 for further analysis.

The data analysis technique used is to test assumptions with several tests such as the residual normality test, linearity test, and hypothesis testing with simple linear regression analysis techniques using the help of IBM SPSS Statistics 26.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The description of the research data aims to present general results related to research variable data. The research data were analyzed descriptively based on the scoring results by comparing hypothetical scores with empirical scores on readiness for change and the perceived impact of change.

Table 3. Research Variable Data Categorization

Variables	Range Value	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Readiness for Change	$X < 59$	Low	1	0.4
	$59 \leq X < 95$	Middle	105	41.3
	$95 \leq X$	High	148	58.3
Perceived Impact of Change	$X < 16$	Low	4	1.6
	$16 \leq X < 26$	Middle	104	40.9
	$26 \leq X$	High	146	57.5

The research data collected was then analyzed using the help of IBM SPSS Statistics 26. The analysis used to measure the role of the perceived impact of change on readiness for change in academic staff was preceded by carrying out an assumption test (residual normality test and linearity test). If the assumption test is declared successful, then the data analysis will be continued with hypothesis testing using simple linear regression analysis techniques.

Table 4. Residual Skewness Kurtosis Normality Test Results

Variables	Before eliminating outliers (N = 263)		After eliminating outliers (N = 254)	
	Z Skewness	Z Kurtosis	Z Skewness	Z Kurtosis
Readiness for Change and Perceived Impact of Change	-7,58722	9,716637	-2,01838	-0,14216

Based on the table, before removing outliers the data shows that the residual readiness to change and the residual perceived impact of change does not meet the assumption of normality with a kurtosis z value ($9.71 > 3.29$) and require the elimination of outliers by checking the extreme values (outliers) through the box-pot diagram. Tests after eliminating outliers obtained the data distribution to be normal with skewness z score ($-2.01 < 3.29$) and a kurtosis z score ($-0.14 < 3.29$) (see Table 4). Based on the test results, each variable has fulfilled the assumption of normality.

Table 5. Linearity Test

Linearity	F	Sig.
Readiness for Change	261.822	0.000

Based on the results of the linearity test, the significance value was 0.000 (< 0.05), which means there is a linear relationship between readiness for change and the perceived impact of change ($F = 261.822$, $p < 0.05$), it can be said both variables have met the assumptions of the linearity test.

Table 6. Model Summary Readiness for Change

Model	R	R²	Adjusted R²	RMSE
H ₁	0.760	0.577	0.575	7.458

Table 7. Regression

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p.
H ₁	Regression	19126.924	1	19126.924	343.884	< .001
	Residual	14016.304	252	55.620		
	Total	33143.228	253			

Table 8. Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized	Std. Error	Standardized	t	p.
H ₁	(Constant)	44.463	2.815		15.793	< .001
	Perceived Impact of Change	1.979	0.107	0.760	18.544	< .001

Test the significant role of the perceived impact of change on readiness for change can be seen from the calculated t value. Perceived impact of change positively significant to predicts readiness for change ($R^2 = 0.577$, $F(2, 252) = 343.884$, $p = 0.001$) ($\beta = 1.979$ $t = 18.544$, $p < 0.001$) with a t count is obtained $> t$ table ($18.544 > 1.650$), means the research hypothesis is accepted.

The unstandardized coefficients in the constant column (a value) are 44.463, the unstandardized coefficients in the perceived impact of change column (b value) are 1.979 using a simple linear regression equation $\hat{Y} = a + bX$, then $\hat{Y} = 44.463 + 1.979X$. If the perceived impact of change increases by one point, the readiness for change will increase by 1.979. The coefficient value is positive means there is a positive role between the perceived impact of change and readiness for change, the higher the perceived impact of change, the higher the readiness for change in academic staff and vice versa.

The coefficient of determination (R^2) value is 0.577. It shows the role of the perceived impact of change on readiness for change by 57.7% and 42.3% is affected by other factors not included in this study (e.g. individual characteristics, contextual, and attitudes at work) (Vakola, 2014).

Table 9. Hierarchical Regression

	Model 1	Model 2
	β	β
Step 1: Predictor Variable		
Perceived Impact of Change	0.760***	0.764***
Step 2: Demography		
Gender		0.027
Age		0.055
Length of Work		0.006
R^2	0.577	0.581
F for change in R^2	343.884***	86.441***

Notes: *** $p < 0.001$

The researcher tried to perform a hierarchical regression analysis to discover whether demographic factors (gender, age, and length of work) could influence the research model. In Table 9, the results of the R^2 value strengthen ($R^2 = 0.581$, $F(4, 249) = 86.441$, $p = < 0.001$), but the β value from the demographic data is not significant. It can be concluded that gender, age, and length of work do not affect readiness for change.

Based on the results, there is a role for the perceived impact of change on readiness for change. This finding is align with previous research conducted by Vakola (2014), someone who is positively oriented to the perceived impact of change will be more ready to face these changes. Other findings to strengthen the results of this study investigated by Armenakis et al. (1993), if they dedicated to implementing change through their perspective are the models that most play a role in the success of change. These findings are also supported by Choi's research (2011) which shows that individuals will make interpretations regarding the systematic process of implementing change.

The operational system in an organization must focus on individual perception abilities in dealing with change to achieve readiness for change (Walinga, 2008). Worrall et al. (2000) explained that an individual's perception has an impact on change which can affect negatively or positively, one of several factors that have the potential to influence readiness for change. A positive attitude toward change is motivated by its perception of change and becomes the most meaningful thing to target a certain goal in the organization (Eby et al., 2000). Vakola (2014) also believes that the perceived impact of change is a context that tends to be strong in dealing with readiness for change effectively.

The individual value of the change plan is influenced by cognitive and emotional (Purwaningrum et al., 2022). In implementing the changes, Judge et al. (1999) stated that one individual will see change as an opportunity while the other might be neutral or respond negatively. However, Eby and colleagues (2000) mention that each individual has their view of the organization, individual perceptions will continue to evolve as time goes by, and the results from the change itself will impact an individual's performance, attitude, and willingness to survive from the organization. Creating perceptions about the impact of change through the impressions and expectations given by the company will guide attitudes and behavior to be ready to accept change (Choi & Ruona, 2013; Tran et al., 2020).

Based on the data analysis, the coefficient value is positive, which means that the higher the perceived impact of change, the higher the readiness for change in academic staff. The existence of a positive role between these variables involves the effectiveness of academic staff in implementing changes, especially in the context of financial management by general state financial management to public service agencies. In line with previous findings by Bowman and Stern (1995), a positive individual interpretation of change can lead to successful change. Walinga (2008) also added that the operational system in an organization focuses on the ability of individual perceptions in dealing with change to achieve readiness for change. Research by Eby et al. (2000) which is also the supporting findings stated that individual perceptions play a significant role in readiness for change. This perception of receiving support from the internal context can help organizations manage uncertainty and anxiety during organizational change (Cullen et al., 2014).

Comparison of readiness for change based on demographic data (gender, age, and length of work) showed no difference. This finding aligned with Wittenstein research (2008) which investigated the role of demographics, individual dispositions towards change, empowerment, and emotional climate with employee readiness for change and found no significant differences between demographic characteristics (age, gender, length of work) and employee readiness for change. O'Neil (2007) also investigated the role of demographic information such as gender, age, years of service, and position. He found no significant difference between demographic information in employees' readiness for change.

This research has limitations such as measuring tools in the form of self-reports because humans sometimes do not tell what is true about themselves, which creates a risk of bias. Second, this research only examines one of the human resources that is most related to changes in higher education governance, namely academic staff. Other human resources (lecturers, leaders, students) can consider being used as material for further research. Third, this study only included gender, age, and length of work as additional demographic data. Other researchers can add other demographic factors to enrich the research results.

CONCLUSION

The results show that the perceived impact of change affected the readiness for change in academic staff. State universities, especially leaders, are expected to ensure the participation of employees, especially academic staff, in undertaking planning and implementing governance changes for these changes to run successfully. In addition, this research can be used as material for consideration for state universities to ensure that the message of change has been conveyed in order that its members are ready to face change.

REFERENCES

- Amon, L., Ping, T., & Poernomo, S. A. (2021). Tugas dan Fungsi Manajemen Pendidik dan Tenaga Kependidikan. *Gaudium Vestrum: Jurnal Kateketik Pastoral*, 5(1).
- Anardani, S., Riyanto, S., & Setiawan, D. (2021). Perancangan Knowledge Management System Berbasis Web pada Tenaga Kependidikan Fakultas Teknik Universitas PGRI Madiun. *Jurnal Teknologi Informasi Dan Ilmu Komputer*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.25126/jtiik.0813252>

- Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating Readiness for Organizational Change. *Human Relations*, 46(6). <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872679304600601>
- Astridina, A., Maarif, M. S., & Wijayanto, H. (2018). Komparasi Sistem Remunerasi Pada Tiga Perguruan Tinggi Negeri Badan Hukum (PTNbh). *Jurnal Manajemen Dan Organisasi*, 8(3). <https://doi.org/10.29244/jmo.v8i3.22448>
- Bernerth, J. (2004). Expanding Our Understanding of the Change Message. *Human Resource Development Review*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484303261230>
- Bouckennooghe, D., & Devos, G. (2008). *Ready or not...? What's the relevance of a meso level approach to the study of readiness for change* (2008/20; Vlerick Leuven Gent Working Paper Series 2008/20).
- Bowman, G. D., & Stern, M. (1995). Adjustment to Occupational Stress: The Relationship of Perceived Control to Effectiveness of Coping Strategies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 42(3). <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.42.3.294>
- Caesaria, S. D. (2022, October 27). *Daftar 21 PTN-BH di Indonesia, Apa Itu PTN-BH?* Kompas.
- Choi, M. (2011). Employees' attitudes toward organizational change: A literature review. *Human Resource Management*, 50(4). <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.20434>
- Choi, M., & Ruona, W. E. A. (2013). Individual Readiness for Organizational Change. In H. S. Leonard, R. Lewis, A. M. Freedman, & J. Passmore (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Leadership, Change, and Organizational Development*. Wiley-Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118326404.ch16>
- Cullen, K. L., Edwards, B. D., Casper, W. C., & Gue, K. R. (2014). Employees' Adaptability and Perceptions of Change-Related Uncertainty: Implications for Perceived Organizational Support, Job Satisfaction, and Performance. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-013-9312-y>
- Deem, R., Mok, K. H., & Lucas, L. (2008). Transforming higher education in whose image? Exploring the concept of the "world-class" university in Europe and Asia. *Higher Education Policy*, 21(1). <https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.hep.8300179>
- Diyanto, C., Putranti, I. R., Yuwono, T., & Yuniningsih, T. (2021). Kebijakan Otonomi Perguruan Tinggi Indonesia: Antara Privatisasi dan Komersialisasi. *Ijtimaiyya: Jurnal Pengembangan Masyarakat Islam*, 14(1). <https://doi.org/10.24042/ijpmi.v14i1.7574>
- 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). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700533006>
- eCampuz. (2020, October 23). *Perguruan Tinggi sebagai Badan Layanan Umum (BLU)*. ECampuz.
- 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). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886306295295>
- Inandriciya, R. A., Suswati, E., & Joesoef, J. R. (2021). Kepuasan Kerja Memediasi Pengaruh Kompensasi dan Motivasi Terhadap Kinerja Pegawai: Studi Pada Pegawai Non PNS Tenaga Kependidikan Bagian Pelayanan Administrasi Subbag Rumah Tangga di

- Universitas Negeri Malang. *Artikel Ilmiah, Jurnal Pendidikan & Budaya WARTA PENDIDIKAN*, Edisi 56, (Mei 2021).
- Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., Pucik, V., & Welbourne, T. M. (1999). Managerial coping with organizational change: A dispositional perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(1). <https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-9010.84.1.107>
- Mangundjaya, W. L. H. (2016). *Psikologi dalam Perubahan Organisasi*. Swasthi Adi Cita.
- Martono, N. (2019). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif: Analisis isi dan analisis data sekunder*. PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- McNabb, D., & Sepic, F. (1995). Culture, climate, and total quality management: Measuring readiness for change. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 18(4).
- Mulà, I., Tilbury, D., Ryan, A., Mader, M., Dlouhá, J., Mader, C., Benayas, J., Dlouhý, J., & Alba, D. (2017). Catalysing Change in Higher Education for Sustainable Development: A review of professional development initiatives for university educators. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 18(5). <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSHE-03-2017-0043>
- O'Neil, D. V. (2007). *Predicting public managers' readiness for contracting of professional services in a changing state government agency* [Doctoral Dissertation]. Georgia Institute of Technology.
- Pincus, K. V., Stout, D. E., Sorensen, J. E., Stocks, K. D., & Lawson, R. A. (2017). Forces for change in higher education and implications for the accounting academy. *Journal of Accounting Education*, 40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaccedu.2017.06.001>
- Pindai Kemdikbudristek. (2021). *Pencapaian IKU 2021*. Pindai Kemdikbudristek.
- Purwaningrum, E. K., Suhariadi, F., & Fajrianti. (2022). Participation and Commitment to Change on Middle Managers in Indonesia: The Role of Perceived Organizational Support as Mediator. *Global Business Review*, 23(5). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150919892371>
- Rafferty, A. E., Jimmieson, N. L., & Armenakis, A. A. (2013). Change Readiness: A Multilevel Review. *Journal of Management*, 39(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312457417>
- Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2013). *Perilaku organisasi: Organizational behaviour*. Salemba Empat.
- Shah, N., & Shah, S. G. S. (2010). Relationships between employee readiness for organisational change, supervisor and peer relations and demography. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 23(5). <https://doi.org/10.1108/17410391011083074>
- Siyoto, S., & Sodik, M. A. (2015). *Dasar metodologi penelitian*. Literasi Media Publishing.
- Smith, I. (2005). Achieving readiness for organisational change. *Library Management*, 26(6–7). <https://doi.org/10.1108/01435120510623764>
- Sutini, L. (2019). Akibat Hukum PTN BH yang Tidak Memenuhi Evaluasi Kinerja. *Jurist-Diction*, 2(5). <https://doi.org/10.20473/jd.v2i5.15242>
- Tran, D. T., Pham, H. T., & Bui, V. T. (2020). The Effect of Contextual Factors on Resistance to Change in Lean Transformation. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 7(11). <https://doi.org/10.13106/jafeb.2020.vol7.no11.479>

- Vakola, M. (2014). What's in there for me? Individual readiness to change and the perceived impact of organizational change. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 35(3). <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-05-2012-0064>
- Walinga, J. (2008). Toward a theory of change readiness: The roles of appraisal, focus, and perceived control. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 44(3). <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886308318967>
- Weiner, B. J., Amick, H., & Lee, S. Y. D. (2008). Review: Conceptualization and measurement of organizational readiness for change. A review of the literature in health services research and other fields. *Medical Care Research and Review*, 65(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077558708317802>
- Wittenstein, R. D. (2008). Factors Influencing Individual Readiness for Change In a Health Care Environment By [Doctoral Dissertation]. In *The George Washington University*. The George Washington University.
- Worrall, L., Cooper, C. L., & Campbell-Jamison, F. (2000). The impact of organizational change on the work experiences and perceptions of public sector managers. *Personnel Review*, 29(5). <https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480010296429>