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Abstract

In this hyper-competition and turbulence era, many organizations have to change and adjust themselves with the changing external environment. However, not all organizational change has succeeded. One of the reasons why the change process often failed was due to the lack of readiness for change. In this regard, organizations need to create readiness for change (RFC) to enable them implementing the change process effectively and for that purpose leaders and managers need to understand what factors influence change readiness. The aim of this study is to identify the role of psychological capital and psychological empowerment on individual readiness for change (IRFC).

The research used 3 scales as follows: psychological capital developed by Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio (2007), psychological empowerment developed by Spreitzer (2007), and individual readiness for change developed by Hanpachern (1997).

The results from 175 respondents from state own constructions corporations in Indonesia showed that both psychological capital and psychological empowerment have positive and significant influence on individual readiness for change ($R^2 = 0.451$). The result also showed that psychological empowerment ($R^2 = 0.418$) has slightly higher influence on individual readiness for change compare to psychological capital ($R^2 = 0.341$). The findings of this research will enrich the knowledge of organizational change management, as well as provide valuable insights for organizational leaders on how to implement organizational change effectively by creating organizational readiness for change.
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Introduction

Many organizations have to change constantly to adjust themselves with the ever-changing external environment. Thus, organizational change is a major issue affecting all organizations in many industrial sectors. The ability to change, adapt, and evolve—and to do better in competition—is considered to be a sustainable competitive advantage today (Mariotti, 1998). However, not all organizational change process yield successful result. Managing change is not as easy as it looks. Many leading statistics indicate that the change management success rates between a mere 20-50% (Applebaum & Wohl, 2000; Balogun & Hailey, 2004; Beer & Nohria, 2000; Elving, 2005; Porras & Robertson, 1992). Failure to effectively managing change will result in wasted resources, suboptimal organizational performance and deteriorating employee morale (Fachruddin & Mangundjaya, 2012).
As a result, Szamosi and Duxbury (2002) suggested that it has become critical for organizations to understand how to manage better and cope with organizational change.

One of the factors that play an important role in organizational change is the individual within organization. It is understandable since organization consists of individuals that works together to achieve the organizations goals (Robbins, 2013). Managing organizational change, in a very large part, is managing the “people” aspects of that process. Schein (1970) also asserted that in order for organizations to change, people within the organizations have to change and people respond differently to organizational change. (Amernakis & Harris, 2002).

People or the human capital of the organization, are both an essential factor as well as the biggest obstacles to achieve organizational change. They are the one who are expected to embrace the organizational change. As a result, people should be ready in facing changes or in other word should be ready for change (Armenakis et al., 1993; Armenakis, Haris, & Field, 1999). Pelletiere (2006) also supported the argument by saying one of the reasons why the change process often failed was due to lack of readiness for change. In this regard, it is important for leaders and managers to assess individual and organizational readiness for change, and also to understand the factors that influence individual and organizational readiness for change (Madsen, 2005). Moreover, other researchers also suggested in order for an organization to prepare its employees for change, it is essential to understand what creates readiness for change. (Cummings & Worley; 2001; Madsen, 2003; Madsen et al. 2006; Madsen et al. 2005; V.D. Miller et al. 1994)

Numbers of research had been done to investigate factors influencing readiness for change. However, there are limited studies outside the medical field that have focused on the characteristics that can affect readiness for change or commonly referred as readiness factors (D. Miller, et al. 2006). Furthermore, many previous researchers still called for further research to increase the understanding and exploration of the factors that create readiness for change in different organizational setting including public, non-profit organization or other companies, and also in different culture (Haque, 2008; Fakhiruddin & Mangundjaya, 2012). In this regard, this study is aimed at examining the role psychological capital and psychological empowerment on individual readiness for change in two Indonesian state-owned construction companies.

Research Questions

This study is built on existing research by examining the relationship between the construct of psychological capital, psychological empowerment and individual readiness for change. Guiding this study are two research questions:

1) What is the impact of psychological capital, employee empowerment on individual readiness for change?
2) To what degree do the respondents psychological capital, employee empowerment and individual readiness for change differ based on their age, gender, title, level of employment and level of education?

Literature Review

Individual Readiness for Change
The first use of the readiness for change concept can be attributed to Jacobson (Berne, 2004). Jacobson suggested that Coch and French’1948 study overemphasized resistance to change and proposed the construct of readiness for change (Berne, 2004). Individual readiness for change is different from individual resistance to change. Ellet, Bateman, and Rugut (1996) have explicitly differentiated between individual readiness and resistance as follows; individual readiness for change can be seen as mental attitude of the individual before acting when facing with the change process. On the other hand resistance to change is the behavior or external action to stop, postpone, or destruct the implementation of organization change. (Haque, 2008)

Armenakis et al. (1993) defined readiness as a cognitive state that occurs when organization members have positive attitude, belief and intention toward the change. When the appropriate cognitive state is attained through the development of relevant attitudes, beliefs, and intentions, individuals involve in the process begin to adopt the change and tend to behave in a way that is consistent with the change initiative. At the final stage, the change process is completed and the change is institutionalized.

Moreover, Armenakis & Harris (2002); Berne, (2004) stated that individual readiness for change consists of beliefs and attitudes towards an initiative; a state of unfreezing; and a collection of thoughts toward a change initiative, while Holt (2007) says that individual readiness for change is the comprehensive attitude that simultaneously was influenced by the content (what has been changed), process (how is going to change) context (in what situation that change is done) and characteristic of individual who involved in the change. Much of the subsequent literature seems to support that readiness of individuals to undertake organizational change appears to be an antecedent of successful change (Armenakis & Bedeian, 1999; Armenakis & Harris, 2002; Armenakis et al. 1993; Cunningham et al., 2002; Dirks et al., 1996; Eby et al., 2000; Edwards, Jumper-Thurman, Plested, Oetting, & Swanson, 2000; Holt et al. 2007; Jansen, 2000; Levesque, Proschaska, & Prochaska, 1999; Madsen, 2003; Madsen et al. 2006; Madsen et al 2005; D. Miller et al. 1994; Palmer, 2004; Rafferty & Simons, 2006; Self, 2007; Smith, 2005; Stewart, 1994). Hanpachren (1997) developed the instrument to measure individual readiness for change based on three dimensions as follows; (1) resisting; (2) participating; and (3) promoting. Resisting is the negative attitude of the individual toward change. Participating is the individual participation in the change process. Promoting is about how far a person would like to implement the change process. In this study, the researcher use the concept from Hanpachern (1997).

Factors Influencing Individual Readiness for Change

According to many researchers (Armenakis et al., 1993; Madsen, Miller, & John, 2005; Hanpachern, Morgan & Griego in Madsen, et al., 2005; Weber and Weber in Fachruddin & Mangundjaya, 2012; Leiter and Harvie in Fachruddin & Mangundjaya, 2012; and Holt et al. 2007), there are many factors that can influence individual readiness for change. Those factors can be grouped into individual factors and organizational factors. Moreover, Porras and Patterson (1979), mentioned that, the selection of variables in change studies has been arbitrary. In many cases, manipulative variables have also been used. (Haque, 2008, p.27). Armenakis et al. (1993) had been argued that the change message should address three important factors: a demonstrable need for change, a sense of one’s ability to accomplish change (self-efficacy), and an opportunity to participate in the change process. Furthermore, they suggested that three strategies are conducive to influence individual cognitions appropriate for creating readiness among the change participants as follows: (1) persuasive communication (both oral and written), active participation based on the Social Cognitive Theory by Bandura (1977) and Theory of Reasoned Action by Fishbein & Azjen (1975), and the
management of external sources of information laid a solid foundation for the advancement of research in the area of change readiness. However, they did not offer empirical evidence to verify the impact of the three strategies on individual change readiness. (Haque, 2008)

Eby et al. (2000) in his research proposed that individual attitudes and preferences, work group and job attitude, and contextual variables would have influence on readiness for change. The result showed that at the individual level a preferences for working in team increase change readiness. At the work group level, perceived participation within the team and trust in peers increased change readiness. Finally, individuals who regarded organizational policies as flexible rather than inflexible had higher support for change within a team based organizational structure.

Cunningham et al., (2002) founded that worker in active jobs, or jobs with higher demands and greater decision latitude, reported greater readiness for change. In addition, employee who had and active approach to solving job problems and higher self-efficacy reported higher readiness for change.

Rafferty and Simmons (2006) conducted a study in which empirically found that trust in peers and senior leaders, logistics and system support and self-efficacy displayed strong positive relationship with readiness for change.

Madsen, Miller, & John (2005) founded that commitment, identification with organization, loyalty and employee involvement has positive correlation with the degree of individual readiness for change. Devos et al., (2008) founded that demographic factors such as education and job position has positive correlation with individual readiness for change. In this regard, employees with higher educational background as well as employees with higher job position have higher level of individual readiness for change. (Fachruddin & Mangundjaya, 2012)

Huy in Fachruddin & Mangundjaya (2012) found several other factors influence individual readiness for change. These factors include belief for support and conducive organizational environment, while Hanpachern, Morgan, and Griego in Madsen et al., (2005) founded employees knowledge and skills, organizational culture, interpersonal relationship at work, as well as the relationship between employee and management or leader also positively influence individual readiness for change.

Weber & Weber in Fachruddin & Mangundjaya (2012) found that trust in management, perception of supervisor support and perception of organizational readiness for change positively correlated with individual readiness for change. Moreover, similar findings from Leiter & Harvie in Fachruddin & Mangundjaya (2008) also showed that acceptance to change is positively correlated with trust in management, effective communication, supportive supervisors, and the value of work.

Holt et al. (2007) stated that content of change, context, and process and individual are also four factors that can influence individual readiness for change. Furthermore, research by Fachruddin & Mangundjaya (2012) also found that psychological capital as part of individual aspect positively influences individual readiness for change.

Psychological Capital

Psychological capital is an individual positive psychological state of development that is characterized by; (1) having confidence to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging task (self-efficacy); (2) making positive attribution about succeeding now and in the future (optimism); (3) preserving toward goals, and necessary redirecting paths to goals in order to
succeed (hope); and (4) when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond to attain success (resilience) (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007).

Based on above definition, psychological capital has the integrative, common thread running the four dimensions (i.e., efficacy, optimism, hope and resilience) of a motivational propensity to accomplish goals or success. Taken as a whole, psychological capital has been demonstrated conceptually (Luthans, Youssef and Avolio, 2007) and empirically (Luthans, Avolio, et al., 2007) to be a higher order core construct. Furthermore, it predicts desired employee outcomes such as performance and job satisfaction better than the individual resources individually (Luthans, Avolio, et al., 2007).

The positive psychological resources that comprise the core construct of psychological capital are fundamentally of a cognitive nature. For example, hope is defined as a “positive motivational state based on an interactively derived sense of successful (a) agency (goal directed agency) and (b) pathways (planning to meet goals)” (Snyder, Irving & Anderson, 1991, p.287). Efficacy beliefs are defined as “one’s conviction (or confidence) about his or her abilities to mobilize the motivation, cognitive resources or courses of action needed to successfully execute a specific task within a given context” (Stajkovic & Luthans, 1998, p.66) and is based on Bandura’s Social Cognitive Theory (1986, 1997). Optimism is defined as the attributions one makes and the explanatory style one uses in response to events (Selingman, 1998). It is oriented toward evaluation of the past or recently occurring events—as opposed to only being oriented toward the future. Specifically, Seligman (1998) describes an optimist as a person who attributes the outcomes of positive events to internal, stable effort, or causes, whereas negative events or outcomes are attributed to, or perhaps explain by specific, unstable, external events that perhaps were also unavoidable. Finally, resilience, the fourth dimension of psychological capital is defined as one’s ability to “bounce back” or rebound when faced with adversity (Block & Kremen, 1996; Masten et al., 1985). Such cognitive resources (e.g., efficacy, hope, optimism and resilience) fall within the boundaries of conservation of resources (COR) theory and are explicitly noted as having relevance and aligning with current trends in COR theory (Hobfoll, 2002). Thus it was proposed that these four components combine into psychological capital to foster cognitive evaluations of the availability of resources as indicators in one global assessment of wellness.

Psychological Empowerment

Psychological empowerment refers to a set of psychological state that are necessary for individuals to feel a sense of control in relation to their work (Spreitzer, 1995). This perspective refers to empowerment as the personal beliefs that employees have about their role in relation to the organization (Spreitzer, 2007). Spreitzer (2007) stated that psychological empowerment consists of four dimensions as follows; (1) meaning, which define as congruence between the needs of one’s work role and one’s belief, values and behaviors (Hackman & Oldham in Spreitzer, 2007); (2) competence, which refers to self-efficacy specific to one’s work, or belief in one’s capability to perform work activities with skill (Gist, 1987; Bandura, 1989 in Spreitzer , 2007); (3) self-determinant which define as a sense of choice in initiating an regulating one’s action (Deci, Connel & Ryan, 1989). It reflects a sense of autonomy or choice over the initiation and continuation of work behavior and processes (Bell and Staw, 1989 in Spreitzer, 2007); and (3) impact which reflects the degree to which one’s action can influence strategic, administrative, or operating outcomes at work (Ashforth, 1989 in Spreitzer, 2007)

Psychological Capital, Psychological Empowerment and Individual Readiness for Change
Based on the discussion above, it is not organizations as entities that change, it is the people who are part of the organizations who change (Schein, 1970 in Haque, 2008; Bovey & Hede, 2001; Woodman & Dewett, 2004 in Fachruddin & Mangundjaya 2012) In this regards, employee need to have the right knowledge, skills and tools in order to work on the new ways that the organizational change enforces. In addition to this, the role of individual in a change context should be explored in a different way.

In many research, self-efficacy is often studied as a predictor in individual readiness for change (Armenakis et al., 1993 in Haque, 2008, Cunningham, 2002; Rafferty & Simmons, 2006; Lam, Cho & Qu, 2007). It has been argued that self-efficacy is an importance factor for adaptive behavior and performance. Employee will unlikely to change their behavior if they lack of confidence. (Griffin & Hesketh, 2003). Wenberg and Banas (2000) also found that change related to self-efficacy, self-esteem, optimism, and a sense of control predicted openness to change.

As it was mention previously, psychological capital is an individual positive psychological state of development that is characterized by; (1) self-efficacy; (2) optimism; (3) hope; and (4) resilience. (Luthans, Youssef, & Avolio, 2007). All those four positive psychological state of development is importance for individual in the change effort. Furthermore, Fachruddin & Mangundjaya (2012) on their research had been found that psychological capital is an important factor that positively influences individual readiness for change. Base on this discussion, it can be concluded that psychological capital is related to individual readiness for change.

Besides psychological capital, many research also found psychological state that it is necessary for individuals to feel a sense of control in relation to their work and the value of their work also found to be importance in organizational change. (Armenakis et al, 1993; Cunningham et al. 2002; Leitter & Harvie in Fachruddin & Mangundjaya, 2012; Holt et al., 2007). Spreitzer (2007) stated that psychological empowerment as the personal beliefs that employees have about their role in relation to the organization that consist of (1) meaning, (2) competence, (3) self-determinant and (3) impact. In this regards it also can be conclude that psychological empowerment are related to individual readiness for change.

Base on the above discussions, this study tried to examine the impact of psychological capital and psychological empowerment on individual readiness for change.

Methods and Measures

Data Collection

Data in this research was collected through 3 types of questionnaires as follows:a) Individual Readiness for Change adapted from Hanpachern (1997) which consists of 3 dimensions: (1) resisting; (2) participating; and (3) promoting (α : 0.796). Resisting is the negative attitude of the individual toward change. Participating is the individual participation in the change process. Promoting is about how far a person would like to implement the change processes; b) Psychological Capital adapted from Luthans, Youssef and Avolio (2007) which consists of 4 dimensions: (1) having confidence to take on and put in the necessary effort to succeed at challenging task (self-efficacy); (2) making positive attribution about succeeding now and in the future (optimism); (3) preserving toward goals, and necessary redirecting paths to goals in order to succeed (hope); and (4) when beset by problems and adversity, sustaining and bouncing back and even beyond to attain success (resilience); and c) Psychological Empowerment adapted from Sprietzer (1996) which consists of 4 dimensions: (1)
meaning, which define as congruence between the needs of one’s work role and one’s belief, values and behaviors; (2) competence, which refers to self-efficacy specific to one’s work, or belief in one’s capability to perform work activities with skill; (3) self-determinant which define as a sense of choice in initiating an regulating one’s action. It reflects a sense of autonomy or choice over the initiation and continuation of work behavior and processes; and (3) impact which reflects the degree to which one’s action can influence strategic, administrative, or operating outcomes at work. All of the three questionnaires were already tested in its reliability and validity.

Sampling & Sample

The sample of this research was collected from two state-owned construction companies that had undergone some organizational changed, such as business development, organizational right-sizing, and changes on general system and procedures. Samples were chosen by convenience sampling. The numbers of participants were 175, with the characteristic as follows: permanent employees, minimum working in the company is 1 year, minimum education is senior high school, and the age is between 21–64 years old. The profile of the participants can be summarized as follows; male (73%), range of age between (25-44) years old (74%), bachelor’s degree (91%), staff position (69%), length of works 1-10 (88%).

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using Descriptive Statistics, and Multiple Regression.

Results

The results will be discussed in descriptive statistics and multiple regression analysis.

Table 1: Descriptive Analysis of Psychological Capital, Psychological Empowerment & Individual Readiness for Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics Variable</th>
<th>Psychological Capital</th>
<th>Psychological Empowerment</th>
<th>Individual Readiness for Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Sign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.5727</td>
<td>0.6221</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex/Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.5521</td>
<td>0.6071</td>
<td>0.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.6271</td>
<td>0.6637</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;25 y.o.</td>
<td>4.441</td>
<td>0.4914</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44 y.o.</td>
<td>4.542</td>
<td>0.6026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;45-64 y.o.</td>
<td>4.8081</td>
<td>0.7487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>4.1931</td>
<td>0.9803</td>
<td>0.010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>4.6109</td>
<td>0.5648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>4.4657</td>
<td>0.6195</td>
<td>0.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior Mgt</td>
<td>4.7183</td>
<td>0.5436</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the Table 1 above, the results of the study shows as follows:

1. In terms of individual readiness for change, the results show that there is no difference between group’s base on gender, age, education, position, and length of works.

2. In terms of psychological empowerment, the results show that there is significant mean difference between individuals with diploma degree and bachelor male. Individuals with bachelor degree have higher mean of psychological empowerment compare to individuals with diploma degree. There are also significant differences based on position and lengths of works. Individuals in middle management position have the highest mean of psychological empowerment. Individuals who works for 6-10 years have the highest mean of psychological empowerment.

3. In term of psychological capital, the results show that there are significant mean differences between individuals from different educational background and position. Individuals with bachelor degree have higher mean compare to diploma degree. Individual who are in middle management position have the highest mean of psychological capital and individual from staff position have the lowest mean of psychological capital.

The following table will show the results of multiple regression analysis between psychological capital, psychological empowerment and individual readiness for change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>AdjustedR^2</th>
<th>Sign.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap PE &amp; IRFC</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>0.451</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PsyCap &amp; IRFC</td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>0.341</td>
<td>0.310</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE &amp; IRFC</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td>0.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Significant at p<0.01

From the Table 2 above, the results of the study shows as follows:
1. Psychological Capital and Psychological Empowerment both positively influence Individual Readiness for Change

2. The impact of Psychological Empowerment (41.8%) on Individual Readiness for Change is higher compare to Psychological Capital (34.1%)

**Discussion**

The results of the study showed that individual aspects such as psychological capital that consist of self-efficacy, optimism, hope and resilience, and psychological empowerment which consists of meaning, competence, self-determinant, and impact both have positive influence on employee readiness for change. Moreover, the result also shows that the influence of psychological empowerment has higher influence on individual readiness to change compare to psychological capital.

Despite of cultural and organizational differences, this finding supports several researches that had been done previously which found that several individual factors specifically psychological capital and employee empowerment support individual readiness for change. (Armenakis et al., 1993 in Haque, 2008, Cunningham, 2002; Rafferty & Simmons, 2006; Lam, Cho & Qu, 2007). The finding from this research also support Wenberg and Banas (2000) who found that individual readiness to change related to self-efficacy, self-esteem, optimism, and a sense of control predicted openness to change. The finding of this study also supports Fachruddin & Mangundjaya (2012) who found that psychological capital as part of individual aspect positively influences individual readiness for change. Furthermore, this study also supports Leitter & Harvie in Fachruddin & Mangundjaya (2012) which found that acceptance to change is positively correlated with trust in management, effective communication, supportive supervisors, and the value of work.

**Conclusions and Implications**

Psychological capital as one of positive psychological resources and psychological empowerment play an important role in organizational change. Both variables have positive impact on creating employee readiness for change. In this study individual with high self-efficacy, optimism, hope and resilience, are more ready to change. Individual with high psychological empowerment which consists of meaning, competence, self-determinant, and impact also proven to be more ready both have positive influence on employee readiness for change. In this regard, organizations undergo any change process need to pay attention on this matter. Change initiatives should comprise several level, not only organizational level, but also individual level and group level. Many organizations put most of its effort in changing organization strategy, structure and systems and procedures and neglected individual level issues.

Based on this research to create readiness for change, organizations should create initiatives that can develop employees’ self-efficacy, optimism, hope and resilience as well as meaning of work, competence, self-determinant and impact. Organizational and managerial supports such as employee development (training, development, coaching and counseling) are also can be considered as initiatives that can increase employee readiness for change. Employee involvement the process of managing change can also increase meaning, self-determinant and thus increase employees’ readiness for change. Lastly in the context of continuously changing environment in which change ready organization become competitive advantage, attracting, developing and retaining employees with high psychological capital as and developing psychological empowerment in the work place can give positive advantages for organizations.
However, there are some limitations in this research that should be taken into consideration. Firstly, among various numbers of variables that can influence individual readiness for change, this research only include two variables as the predictors of individual readiness for change. Base on that, for further research regarding individual readiness for change several other variables such as leadership, managerial support, positive work relationship, organizational culture, and others could be included to create a more robust model. Secondly, this research conducted with total respondents N=175 and use convenience sampling methods, for further research, it is suggested that the research should be conducted in a larger sample and used other sampling methods such as random sampling to increase the generalized ability of the research results. Thirdly, further research in different organizational setting public, non-profit and other companies in many different cultures are also important to be conducted to explore and expand the understanding and exploration of the factors that create readiness for change. Lastly, for further research, longitudinal study that examine individual readiness for change in relations with other variables also important to be conducted.
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