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ABSTRACT

This study seeks to contribute to the existing body of knowledge on individual readiness for change, a topic that has garnered considerable attention from both academia and the broader public over the past few decades. This is because more and more individuals want to feel that their work has value, and because positive organizational change and positive psychology research are both expanding fields. In order for employees to actively adapt themselves in response to the fast-changing environment and produce more meaningful work, this study aims to understand the sources of meaningful work. The target audience consists of software engineers (programmers and developers) employed by Pakistan's Evacuee Trust in its software companies. There is little data on this industry and this level of employees, making it an appealing study target.
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1. Introduction

This chapter's primary goals are to identify the research topic and develop research questions. To accomplish these goals, the chapter begins with an introductory background that includes the study's implications and associations with future variables like behavioral resistance to change and organizational commitment, organizational culture, leadership, and individual readiness for change. Through the moderating effect of behavioral resistance to change, organizational leadership commitment and organizational culture are elements in the current study that influence individuals' preparedness for change. The study objectives, research methodology, and research procedures are all included in this chapter as well.
Previous studies of (Golden, 2002) suggested that the rapid development of technology and its extensive application in business and industry have increased rivalry among organizations around the world, putting 21st-century workers up against greater obstacles than their forebears did.

Because of this, it has been suggested by (Jones, 2005; Holt, 2007; Choi M., 2010; Ruona, 2010) that many authors have begun to emphasize the theory of personal preparation for change.

Many academics, like (Armenakis, 1993; Harris, 1993; Clegg, 2004; Walsh, 2004; Jones, 2005; Holt, 2007) have emphasized some of the most crucial components of psychosomatic or human variables in change-related performance and hard labour. However, winning firms are said to be under a lot of pressure to prepare for and be able to handle these significant changes in order to survive in the hostile global economy. Additional research has been conducted, and according to and (Armenakis, 1993), current literature in the realm of change management acknowledges that an individual’s preparedness for change stands out as a pivotal element for achieving successful change implementation within an organizational context.

Since attitude is what actually presents affective commitment and normative commitment, (Meyer J. P., 2002; Allen, 1990). This concept was further investigated, with the suggestion that organizational commitment represents a form of performance and approach. Conversely, discussions about behavior indicate that behavior dictates the maintenance of continuance commitment.

Hence, commitment serves as a manifestation of trustworthy behavior. Put differently, trust plays a significant role in organizational commitment. Consequently, this notion encompasses three primary influences on business management: it can either diminish or bolster confidence, reduce or heighten awareness of risks, and diminish or enhance transactional relationships. Transactional relationships, however, serve as both a sign of and an explanation for the lack of organizational commitment. They conducted study on the organizational commitment of teachers and found that it was possible to increase this commitment by considering teachers' faith in management and in each other.

The concept of organizational commitment has been thoroughly defined and is open to various interpretations. Further research by scholars has led to the hypothesis that commitments to organizations can be categorized into those related to worthiness, involvement, exchange (balanced choice or execution), as well as affiliation and belongingness. However, some scholars have argued that organizational commitment comprises calculative, attitudinal, and normative aspects.

Many researchers have started to acknowledge that employee commitments have diverse focuses and bases, diverging from the traditionalist perspective that solely or predominantly emphasizes organizational commitment (Thomas & Becker 1995; Reichers, 1985; Reichers, 1986; Becker, 2017; Gary & Becker 1992; Gordon, 1980; Smith, 1993). Extra studies conducted in support of this literature show that the extra conservative vision of commitment, as it was researched by (Thomas E. Becker. D. M., 1995), does not fully account for divergence along with focuses as well as grounds of the commitment.

According to (Reichers, Conflict and organizational commitments., 1986) The theory underlying the various commitments outlined in literature suggests that an employee’s dedication to their workplace or a particular organization cannot be fully explained solely by their commitment to
that specific organization. This is because the coalition perspective of organizations may lead to their commitment being multidimensional.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Leadership

While some perceive leadership as directing others to follow an exacting code of conduct, others view it as motivating your team members to reach their full potential. Although the definitions may offer you a suggestion regarding a contradiction, the underlying attitude remains universal: leaders are individuals who possess the ability to achieve objectives and inspire others to persevere.

(Choi, Kim, & Kang, 2014) Presented a similar, fairly straightforward approach, stating that the purpose of change leadership behaviors at the detailed change is to vision, recruit, empower, monitor, and plateful with personality- reworked copy. Furthermore, (Choi, Kim, & Kang, 2014) noted that there are two components to change leadership, namely: leaders' change implementation behavior, which is action to advance a change and split up the accomplishment from beginning to end, and leaders' change promotion behavior, which aims to encourage the change for the duration of the unfreezing point and make it understandable why the change was necessary.

Additionally, as suggested by e.g. (DM Herold, 2008) self-leadership traits and abilities that are developed have generated and caused considerable study pains throughout the previous decade. Similarly, leadership is an impudence-related development that helps individuals and working groups find their own path, encourage or improve it, and demonstrate how to go toward reaching the most desired and desired behaviors and results. Furthermore, it was proposed that several phenomena on self-influence, which emphasized concepts of self-identification, can be linked to its heritage. Therefore, to disparate individuals, the term "leadership" denotes opposite or distinct attributes.

Although a definitive definition of leadership has not yet been established, the majority of definitions of leadership, according to (Gary Yukl, 2009). Along with group influence, aim, and target, the majority of leadership theories demonstrate and reflect several fundamental principles, as described by (Choi M., 2011).

2.2 Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment refers to a person's perspective on how much of their value and objectives align with the organization, how to resolve disagreements, and how they can support the business. Thus, (Meyer J. P., 1997) included three aspects of organizational commitment. These three ratios are additional and fit to be referred to as organizational commitment dimensions. Because the associations between the organization and its components show how the three dimensions differ from one another.

Thus, (Meyer J. P., 1997) included three aspects of organizational commitment. These three ratios are additional and fit to be referred to as organizational commitment dimensions. Because the associations between the organization and its components show how the three dimensions differ from one another.
(Meyer J. P., 1997) Went on to say that an affectively unwavering employee will firmly identify the organization's aims, vision and goals and fervently wish for remaining in background. Because they need to hang out in the organization, this employee is committed to the association.

Hence, (Strasser, 2017) defined continuous commitment as an employee's dedication to a company due to their perception as this one significantly more difficult and costly to maintain organizational relationship than to build new. Because they are required to remain with the company, the employee continues to be a part of it.

The three organizational commitment dimensions that are higher will affect each person's capacity for change. Consequently, it can be inferred that employees who exhibit higher levels of commitment to the organization are likely to demonstrate greater adaptability to change. In summary, (Meyer J. P., 1993) identified cognitive and affective foundations of cooperation as part of organizational commitment.

Therefore, by combining all of these behavioral principles, the fundamental structure of an item measuring organizational commitment should resemble this: (A) It would replicate a clear category, i.e., continuing commitment, normative, or affective: (b) the commitment's objective, in this instance the employing association (c) the expected behavioral actions, such as sticking around the company and becoming a valuable member of the hiring association; and (d) experiencing an energizing conflict while feeling under the control of behavioral requirements and commitment types.

**Affective commitment** refers to a worker's connection, involvement, and passion for their work for their employer because of their special relationship with that particular company.

**Continuance commitment** Employees that exhibit continuous commitment are almost universally predicted to exhibit certain thought patterns, such as timidity, anxiety, and trepidation about potential organizational trouble costs (Meyer J. P., 1997).

**Normative commitment** pertains to a worker's hopeful intention to remain attached and duty-bound to the company (Meyer J. P., 1997).

Organizational commitment is a mindset or behavior that emphasizes the significance of the relationship between an employee and the organization, along with its inherent narrative.

### 2.3 Organizational Culture

According to (Wielkiewicz, 2005) Corporate culture can be defined as a framework of shared values, norms, and traditions embraced by members of a particular group, delineating how activities are conducted within an organization, including internal decision-making processes as well as interactions with customers, suppliers, and the broader environment. With this explanation already set up, we can observe, for example, that a company is rarely prepared for action due to groundbreaking development if it lacks a strong, shared culture that is obviously innovation-oriented. To suggest innovation does not guarantee that everyone involved would find such a notion conventional.
As a result, the text appears to be somewhat in agreement with (Judge, 1999) regarding which type of corporate culture will value creativity and uniqueness. Who made the suggestion that an organization's culture has the power to inspire confidence in its staff members?

To preserve its uniqueness and modernism, an organization's culture should be innovative and responsive to global cultural shifts. However, innovative and resourceful behavior, as suggested by (Wielkiewicz, 2005) can also be problematic.

Different cultural types exist. Group, adhocracy, and market cultures are only a few examples of the various organizational cultures that exist. Studies and written works have demonstrated that companies with a group culture tend to do better than those with an adhocracy or market culture. The group culture is the study's main focus.

2.4 Individual Readiness for Change

Adaptation is indeed crucial for organizations to not only survive but also to thrive amidst intense global competition. And the key to achieving this transformation is the employee, specifically their dedication and promise to make the necessary changes. Therefore, it is crucial that we consider the implications and make an effort to comprehend how to fulfill the organization's mission and fulfill its commitment to change.

(Meyer B., 2001) Conducted additional research on this idea and clarified that commitment to change is the ability to stay bound and dedicated to the specific actions required of a person in order for them to carry out the organization must undertake specific tasks for the betterment of the organization to implement the change initiative effectively.

As a result, a lot of researchers believe that if a certain organization is unable to effect change in its workforce, it may become difficult for that organization to move forward because the task would require a significant amount of time and energy, as noted by (Smith I., 2005). As a result, it was simple to see and accept that, as (Shaun Powell, 2009) noted, management is able to determine if a given behavior will support or oppose a change only when they are prepared for it. Therefore, as per the research and analysis conducted by (Daniel T. Holt, 2007), field & the management should align the interests of the organization's employees and bring the organization's concerns into line if it wishes to resolve all conflicts and achieve improved and good results.

Additionally, for a company to thrive in the harsh and quickly evolving global environment, change is essential. Researchers have found that organizations that successfully innovate and strive to bring about positivity are also successful in bringing about change or have managed to persuade staff members to be open to the change by dismantling existing structures and erecting new ones that have been suggested by (William A. Weeks, 2004).

2.5 Behavioral Resistance to Change

Many scholars have investigated and analyzed the topic of resistance to change, finding that it rarely occurs suddenly. Many researchers have concluded, with the aid of earlier study, that resistance is one of the primary causes of a change process' disappointment. As (Oreg, 2007) suggested, resistance will typically result in delays to the change and increase its cost.
Moreover, resistance represents a significant aspect, often referred to as the "unfreezing stage" of the change process; if resistance proves overwhelming, the organization may not be adequately prepared for change implementation. However, additional research suggests that confrontation isn't inherently negative. In fact, almost always, the situation may be different because there is usually a valid reason for confrontation, which occasionally inspires management to deal with particular aspects of the change (Dianne Waddell, 1998).

Compared to resistance to change, individual preparedness for change is a somewhat distinct construct. Additionally, there is a difference between resistance to the status quo and personal preparedness for change. The act of performing or achieving something peripheral in order to obstruct, resist, or destroy organizational change is known as resistance. Yet, upon closer scrutiny of this notion, it became apparent that an individual's cognitive readiness for change can be perceived as predating their response to the onset of change, with suggestions indicating their inclination to either embrace or adapt to organizational change.

3. Conceptual framework:
In the present study, individual readiness for change is treated as the dependent variable, and its relationship with leadership, organizational commitment, and organizational culture is explored, taking into account the moderating effect of behavioral resistance to change. Hypotheses are formulated based on the combination of these variables proposed in the study. With the developed hypotheses and supportive evidence from the study, the following conceptual framework is established:

4. Research Methodology
The study utilized the questionnaire method as its primary data collection instrument. The questionnaire was designed to assess various factors including Leadership, Organizational Commitment, Organizational Culture, Behavioral Resistance to Change, and Individual Resistance to Change within software houses located in Islamabad, Punjab, Pakistan. The structured questionnaires were personally administered, with software engineers being visited and asked to complete the questionnaire. Assurance was provided that the collected data would be used solely for educational purposes and that all information would be kept confidential.
4.1 Data Collection

The targeted respondents for this study were software engineers employed at Evacuee Trust Software Houses. The data collection strategy employed a convenience sampling method to gather primary data. To determine the sample size, the rule proposed by (CHOU, 1986) was followed, which involves multiplying the total number of items in the study by 5 (115 * 5 = 575). To ensure greater accuracy and reliability of the results, the sample size was expanded to 650. There are approximately 300 to 350 software houses in Evacuee Trust Islamabad, categorized into three sizes based on the number of employees:

1. Large size (with more than 200 employees)
2. Medium size (with more than 100 employees)
3. Small size (with fewer than 100 employees)

Given the convenience sampling technique used in this study, medium-sized software houses were selected to collect data. There are around 150 medium-sized software houses in Evacuee Trust Islamabad, each employing approximately 150 to 200 employees. As such, 650 questionnaires were distributed among these medium-sized software houses.

Table 1: Operationalization of Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Information Collected from Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>In the current study, leadership is operationalized as the ability to guide others in completing specific tasks and inspiring group members to reach their full potential. In essence, leaders are individuals who possess the skills to achieve objectives and motivate others throughout the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational culture</td>
<td>In this study, organizational culture is operationalized as the collective organizational culture that serves as a constant source of inspiration for employees and motivates individuals to be prepared for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational commitment</td>
<td>Based on the description provided, this study aims to investigate whether organizational commitment produces similar outcomes for software engineers as it does for individuals in other occupations, or if it varies among different groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRTC:</td>
<td>In this study, behavioral resistance to change is operationalized as the behaviors exhibited by employees during the change process, which impact their organizational commitment, organizational culture, and leadership style. Consequently, these behaviors may lead employees to resist the implementation of change initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual readiness for change</td>
<td>In this study, change is operationalized as the way individuals comprehend and perceive personal changes, and subsequently, how they align their attitudes toward personal changes with those occurring within an organizational context.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Results and Discussion

5.1 Regression Model and findings:

The statistical analysis reveals that Leadership demonstrates a significant positive association with the dependent variable (individual readiness for change) \( p < .05, \beta = .590 \). Similarly, Organizational Commitment exhibits a significant positive relationship with the dependent variable (individual readiness for change) \( p < .05, \beta = .331 \). Furthermore, organizational culture shows a
significant and positive association with the dependent variable (individual readiness for change) \( (p < .05, \beta = .104) \). On the other hand, Leadership demonstrates a significant negative relationship with behavioral resistance to change \( (p > .05, \beta = -.302) \), as does Organizational Commitment \( (p > .05, \beta = -.120) \) and Organizational Culture \( (p > .05, \beta = -.389) \). Additionally, Behavioral Resistance to Change displays a significant negative relationship with individual readiness for change \( (p < .05, \beta = -.006) \). These findings indicate the significance of the variables in predicting the dependent variable and the strength of their relationships.

### Table 2 Regression Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>1.802</td>
<td>.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEADERSHIPCOMP</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCC_IMPT</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ORC_IMPT</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRTC_IMPT</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRTC_LEADERSHIP</td>
<td>1.985</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>-.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRTC_OCC</td>
<td>-.831</td>
<td>.533</td>
<td>-.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BRTC_ORC</td>
<td>-2.358</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>-.389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: IRFC_IMPT

### 5.2 Estimation of the Regression Model

(Erik Mooi., 2011) Suggests that statisticians often construct a linear regression model, which is commonly used as the standard method for evaluating predictors and determining variables that are suitable for metric scale analysis. When estimating the regression model, the coefficient of determination, or R2, is often employed to ensure that the model is fit for purpose and to verify that it is a suitable expressive model for the study under investigation.

The coefficient of regression, or R2, is incredibly helpful because it is the most dependable metric for assessing the predictability of a model and can be quickly and easily interpreted in empirical research. This improvement comes with a warning, as previous studies have demonstrated that certain factors must be considered because of this. These factors are thought to be required to be considered when interpreting the coefficients of determination, particularly during the model selection process. The results of the analysis as they were examined and subsequently interpreted by (Mayer, 1975) may be of little consequence.
### 5.3 Overall Measurement Model:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IRFC</th>
<th>OC</th>
<th>BRTC</th>
<th>ORC</th>
<th>L</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRFC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVE</td>
<td>(.554, .554)</td>
<td>(.744, .744)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.892 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OC</td>
<td>(.789 **)</td>
<td>(.772 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.826 **)</td>
<td>(.829 **)</td>
<td>(.880 **)</td>
<td>(.793 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRTC</td>
<td>(.703 **)</td>
<td>(.618 **)</td>
<td>(.619 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.703 **)</td>
<td>(.618 **)</td>
<td>(.619 **)</td>
<td>(.793 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.703 **)</td>
<td>(.618 **)</td>
<td>(.619 **)</td>
<td>(.793 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.703 **)</td>
<td>(.618 **)</td>
<td>(.619 **)</td>
<td>(.793 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORC</td>
<td>(.826 **)</td>
<td>(.829 **)</td>
<td>(.880 **)</td>
<td>(.793 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.826 **)</td>
<td>(.829 **)</td>
<td>(.880 **)</td>
<td>(.793 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.826 **)</td>
<td>(.829 **)</td>
<td>(.880 **)</td>
<td>(.793 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.826 **)</td>
<td>(.829 **)</td>
<td>(.880 **)</td>
<td>(.793 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>(.826 **)</td>
<td>(.829 **)</td>
<td>(.880 **)</td>
<td>(.793 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.826 **)</td>
<td>(.829 **)</td>
<td>(.880 **)</td>
<td>(.793 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.826 **)</td>
<td>(.829 **)</td>
<td>(.880 **)</td>
<td>(.793 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.826 **)</td>
<td>(.829 **)</td>
<td>(.880 **)</td>
<td>(.793 **)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
By merging all of the CFAs and EFAs that were previously covered in the parts above, this section looks at the overall measurement model in order to measure and validate the dimensions. The conversation has so far focused on how dependent and independent variables are measured in models. Five items were removed from the model during the model measurement procedure in order to improve fit, as determined by the outcomes of the first order CFA and EFA analyses. Few items were eliminated from the real model due to poor standardized loading and the cross-loading of one item on many parameters.

To evaluate the appropriateness of the measurement model, an overall model was evaluated in this section. This was done by looking at the covariance structures of the independent and dependent variables with moderating variables. The entire measuring model improves with the removal of the five elements and better statistics. Consequently, the final 21 items representing the various constructs demonstrated a good fit between the measurement model and the data. This refinement aimed to provide model fit statistics and eliminate the five items.

According to the descriptive statistics in Table 4.1, the mean values of the variables lie between 2 and 3, indicating a range from agreement to neutrality. This suggests that the software engineers under study are making progress in changing themselves to reduce behavioral resistance to change, albeit at a slow pace. Leadership and organizational commitment emerge as crucial factors for enhancing individual readiness for change. Therefore, there is a significant need for improvement in leadership, organizational commitment, and organizational culture within software houses.

Managers should focus on developing relationship-oriented leadership styles to reduce employee resistance to change and enhance their skills to achieve company goals effectively. This will facilitate software engineers in transitioning to learning organizations more swiftly. The standard deviations in Table 4.1 indicate variation among the variables, highlighting the potential for improvement in leadership, organizational commitment, and organizational culture to foster long-term customer relationships while reducing intentions of behavioral resistance to change.

Furthermore, the regression coefficients in Table 4.15 reveal that leadership, organizational commitment, and organizational culture are positively and significantly related to individual readiness for change (p < .05, β = .596 for leadership; p < .05, β = .331 for organizational culture).
commitment; \( p < .05, \beta = .104 \) for organizational culture). These findings confirm the direct and significant impact of these variables on individual readiness for change among software engineers in Evacuee Trust software houses.

In summary, this study was motivated by the need to examine the predictive role of leadership, organizational commitment, and organizational culture on individual readiness for change among software engineers. The results support the significant influence of these variables on individual readiness for change, highlighting the importance of addressing them to facilitate successful organizational change initiatives.

### 6. Limitations

This study investigates the influence of organizational commitment, leadership, and organizational culture on an individual's readiness for change, with behavioral resistance to change acting as a moderating factor. However, research is an intricate process, constantly evolving with new concepts and theories emerging. It's essential to recognize that factors beyond leadership, organizational commitment, and organizational culture can significantly impact an individual's readiness for change. Future studies could explore the effects of related variables in this area.

The study's sampling frame was limited to Evacuee Trust software houses in Islamabad, Punjab. Expanding the coverage to other areas might yield slightly different results. The results are based on a cross-sectional approach rather than a longitudinal one, potentially overlooking changes in the data over time. Despite conducting the research diligently with necessary precautions, research remains an ongoing process. As circumstances change, we must continually gather and analyze new information to draw accurate conclusions.

In our dynamic world, change is constant. With advancements in science, technology, and socio-economic models, organizations must continually learn from past experiences to maintain a competitive edge and survive in the ever-changing environment.

### 7. Future Research:

These studies explore new dimensions by introducing variables such as leadership, organizational commitment, and organizational culture, which influence an individual's readiness for change. While there is existing literature on leadership and its impact on individual readiness for change, these variables offer novel insights into guiding individuals towards readiness for change.

This study aims to underscore the distinctive contributions of proactive organizational commitment, organizational culture, and leadership, with a focus on the moderating role of behavioral resistance in individual readiness for change. While past research has discussed leadership primarily as a predictor of turnover intention, this study sheds light on the role of counter-behavior in fostering individual readiness for change.

Various statistical techniques have been employed to illustrate the importance of leadership, organizational commitment, and organizational culture in moderating behavioral resistance to change, which significantly influences individual resistance to change.

In modern organizations, leaders are expected to cultivate a culture of trust among employees, embody participative leadership, and serve as motivators to enhance employee satisfaction and retention. Thus, managers should prioritize interpersonal interactions as a key
factor positively influencing an individual's readiness for change, with leadership playing a crucial role. Moreover, managerial factors and organizational commitment are closely intertwined, requiring managers to embrace openness and accommodate creative ideas from staff members, thereby fostering inclusivity in the decision-making process.
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