Jurnal Komunikasi dan Bisnis

THE INFLUENCE OF SOCIAL INTERACTION, KNOWLEDGE SHARING, AND PERCEPTIONS OF WORKLOAD ON TEACHER'S READINESS FOR CHANGE AT SMA XYZ - NORTH JAKARTA

Arief Wibowo[1]
Abdulah Rakhman[2]

[1]Institut Bisnis dan Informatika Kwik Kian Gie, South Jakarta, DKI Jakarta, Indonesia. Email: ariefwibowo76@gmail.com
[2]Institut Bisnis dan Informatika Kwik Kian Gie, South Jakarta, DKI Jakarta, Indonesia. Email: abdullah.rakhman@kwikkiangie.ac.id

Corresponding Author:
Arief Wibowo

Email:
ariefwibowo76@gmail.com

Article History:
Received: 15 Maret 2023
Revised: 10 April 2023
Accepted: 15 Mei 2023
Published: 31 Mei 2023

Publisher:
LPPM Institut Bisnis dan Informatika Kwik Kian Gie

Selection and Peer-review under the responsibility of the Editor Team of Jurnal Komunikasi dan Bisnis.

Abstract

This study aimed to examine the influence of the variables of social interaction, knowledge sharing, and perceived workload on readiness for change among teachers at SMA XYZ in North Jakarta. The research method used is a quantitative research method. The number of respondents in this study were 38 teachers. The sample used is all teachers who are currently working at SMA XYZ in North Jakarta. The sampling technique is based on nonprobability sampling using the questionnaire method, namely by providing a list of questions directly to the respondents. The analysis method uses Structural Equation Modeling - Partial Least Square (SEM-PLS) with the WarpPLS 7.0 program. The conclusion of this study is that Social Interaction has a negative and significant effect on Readiness for change, Knowledge Sharing has a positive and significant effect on Readiness for change, and Workload Perception has a positive and significant effect on Readiness for Change for teachers at SMA XYZ in North Jakarta..

Keywords:

Social Interaction, Knowledge Sharing, Workload Perception, Readiness for Change

INTRODUCTION

School is a place where the learning process occurs. We know that education is an important element for the progress of a nation. The functions and roles of skilled labour, which continue to increase according to the needs of their work, add to the requirements that must be met by companies (educational institutions) (Astakhova et.al, 2016).

Teacher is one of the points in change management in the school. They form the smallest social element in a school. Without their active participation, change in the school is impossible. Change management in relation to individuals means not only adapting skills to new challenges, but also promoting a positive attitude towards the purpose of change and participating in the change. (Lauer, 2021: 7).

The phenomenon of social interaction in the people of Jakarta can be seen from the frequent gathering of local people at rice stalls or modern coffee shops to discuss the changes that have occurred in their city. They discussed the decisions made by the local government and hoped for better knowledge sharing by the local government. In the midst of their conversation, it is often heard that the community is busy at work, so they do not pay attention to the changes that are taking place in their environment.

SMA XYZ also experienced the same phenomenon. Management decisions are often questioned by teachers. The results of interviews with several teachers show that teachers are usually not involved in the decision-making process. The teacher only carries out orders. The most recent case is the relocation of the teacher's room from Building B to Building D. The teacher feels that there are many year-end activities to complete and now a new workload has been added, namely moving all items to the new teacher's room. Teachers seem reluctant and forced to take on new workloads.

Teachers mentioned that sharing information earlier would ease the transition to change. Especially if the reason for the change is also included when information about the change is first provided. Observation of the phenomenon of social interaction between teachers shows that the sharing of knowledge goes well if the teacher is given enough time to interact outside of teaching time in class. Research from various contexts consistently shows that just having one friend who engages in radical action (in this case, making a change) is positively related to the individual's personal involvement in that goal. (van Lange, P. A. M., Higgins, E. T., & Kruglanski, A. W. (Eds.), 2021:577).

The teacher's tendency to be difficult to change was also mentioned when discussing readiness for change. They mentioned that many teachers had not changed significantly. The

pandemic has caused learning to be carried out online, making it difficult for some teachers to adapt technology.

Social interaction contributes to disseminating information that shows the capacity of the organization to achieve change (Eby et al., 2000). When people meet strangers in a social interaction, they can choose to always cooperate (i.e., unconditional cooperation), only cooperate in certain situations (i.e., conditional cooperation), or never cooperate (i.e., unconditional defection). Unconditional cooperation is often expensive, because unconditional cooperators can be exploited by free riders. In addition, those who never work together may eventually be kicked out of the group (Wilczynski and Brosnan, 2021).

Authentic interactions reinforce social relationships and influence in spaces where change is most needed (Lee, 2023). Lee also mentioned that through the process of asking questions, change agents can discern the most impactful way they can effect change in a given context and with a specific group of people. According to Kondakci et al. (2017) giving free time and actively offering social and emotional support to teachers contributes to building Readiness for Change.

Knowledge sharing refers to the ability of an organization to reproduce knowledge so that the information can be integrated throughout the organization (Kogut & Zander, 1996). Information sharing refers to various functions within a system, exchanging information with more relevant information or exchanging information in an accurate and more timely manner (Roe et al., 2015).

According to Edmonds and Pusch (2002) in Salloum et al (2018), knowledge sharing is a procedure in which knowledge is transferred to other people in an informative way so that it is easy to use. According to Cummings (2004) in Salloum et al (2018) knowledge sharing is the act of sharing information so that it can help others solve their problems and create new perspectives. Gani et.al (2020:77) concluded that communication means sharing messages with the aim of achieving unity in understanding.

According to Lee (2023), communication that influences people to achieve change together is essential for the successful diffusion of change. The goal of communication is to learn about the potential for collective change through newly established connections. Communicating with this goal assumes that everyone has the agency, or power, to participate in the change movement. According to Borgatti and Cross (2003) in Lee (2023), how knowledge sharing is carried out depends on who is known in the organization but also what can be learned. According to Boyea-Robinson (2016) in Lee (2023), knowledge sharing can help organizations achieve significant collective impact. According to Kondakci et al. (2017) facilitating knowledge sharing contributes to building readiness for change.

Workload is a job demand in the form of a number of assignments that must be completed in a certain time which can sacrifice a person's time for other activities (Samalo & Wulani, 2022). According to Mudarsa (2019), there is a significant effect of work stress on employee readiness for change. According to Kondakci et al. (2017) limiting teacher workload contributes to building readiness for change.

Based on the discussion above, this study aimed at examining the influence of the variables of social interaction, knowledge sharing, and perceived workload on readiness for change among teachers at SMA XYZ in North Jakarta.

RESEARCH METHODS

To address the research aim, data were gathered from secondary teachers currently teaching in academic year of 2022-2023. The total teachers at this school is 60 teachers and 38 teachers voluntarily participated in the study. Of the participants 61% (23) were male and 39% (15) were female. The teachers ranged in age from 28 to 63 with the majority of the participants fell within the age group of 31-40 (47.37%). Most of the teachers (65.79%) were married: of these participants, 72% reported working spouses and 76% reported having children. With regard to their major fields of study, 58% were graduates of teacher education programmes. The experience of the teacher ranged from 1 to 42 years, with 36.84% teachers having 11-15 years of teaching experience.

The instrument test was carried out to test the validity of each questionnaire question and test its reliability against the measured variables. This instrument test was carried out by distributing a pre-questionnaire research to 30 respondents who were working and teaching as teachers at SMA XYZ.

In this study, we will examine 4 variables, each of which consists of dimensions measured through several indicators. The following are variable dimensions and indicators data from this research:

Table 1. Variable, Dimension and Indicator

Variable	Dimension	Indicator
Social Interaction	Unconditional Cooperation	SOS1, SOS2, SOS3, SOS8
	Conditional Cooperation	SOS4, SOS5, SOS6, SOS7
Knowledge Sharing	Communication - Exchanging Information	PTH1, PTH2
	Communication – Information Understanding	PTH3, PTH4, PTH5
Workload Perception	Teacher duties –Lesson readiness	PBK1, PBK2, PBK3
	Teacher duties – Non-teaching activities	PBK4
	Teacher duties – Individual development	PBK5

Readiness for Change	Source of refusal – Selective processing of information	KUB1, KUB2, KUB4, KUB5, KUB7, KUB8,
	Source of refusal - Habits	KUB3, KUB10
	Source of refusal - Security	KUB6, KUB9

The Goodness of Fit test based on the Fit and Indices Model using WarpPLS 7.0 provided 10 fit models and a global quality index, as shown in table below:

Table 2. Model Fit and Indices

Item	Result	Reference	Note
Average path coefficient (APC)	0.234, p=0.030	p<0.05	Valid
Average R-squared (ARS)	0.256, p=0.021	p<0.05	Valid
Average adjusted R-Squared (AARS)	0.191, p=0.052	p<0.05	Valid
Average block VIF (AVIF)	1.141	<=3.3	Valid
Average full collinearity VIF (AFVIF)	1.504	<=3.3	Valid
Tenenhaus GoF (GoF)	0.353	Small >=0.1 Medium >=0.25 Large >=0.36	Valid
Sympson's paradox ratio (SPR)	1.000	1.000	Valid
R-squared contribution ratio (RSCR)	1.000	1.000	Valid
Statistical suppression ratio (SSR)	1.000	>=0.7	Valid
Nonlinear bivariate causality direction ratio (NLBCDR)	0.833	>= 0.7	Valid

Output combined loadings and cross-loadings results for all variables are shown in Table 3 below:

Table 3. Output Combined Loadings and Cross-loadings

No. Item	Loading	p-value	Note
SOS1	0.816	<0.001	Valid
SOS2	0.414	0.002	Keep
SOS3	0.520	<0.001	Keep
SOS4	0.451	<0.001	Keep
SOS5	0.566	<0.001	Keep
SOS6	0.756	<0.001	Valid
SOS7	0.666	<0.001	Keep
SOS8	0.401	0.003	Keep
PTH1	0.880	<0.001	Valid
PTH2	0.817	<0.001	Valid

PTH3	0.759	<0.001	Valid
PTH4	0.595	<0.001	Keep
PTH5	0.790	<0.001	Valid
PBK1	0.683	<0.001	Keep
PBK2	0.744	<0.001	Valid
PBK3	0.856	<0.001	Valid
PBK4	0.634	<0.001	Keep
PBK5	0.523	<0.001	Keep
KUB1	0.762	<0.001	Valid
KUB2	0.831	<0.001	Valid
KUB3	0.777	<0.001	Valid
KUB4	0.641	<0.001	Keep
KUB5	0.785	<0.001	Valid
KUB6	0.771	<0.001	Valid
KUB7	0.734	<0.001	Valid
KUB8	0.728	<0.001	Valid
KUB9	0.583	<0.001	Keep
KUB10	0.487	<0.001	Keep

The loading requirement is above 0.70 because the latent variable should at least be able to explain the variance of each indicator by 50% (the result of 0.702 is close to 50%). However, in some cases, loading requirements above 0.70 are often not met. Therefore, loading between 0.40-0.70 must still be considered to be kept (Sholihin & Ratmono, 2020: 85-86).

Output path coefficient will show how much influence the independent variables have on the dependent variable. The output results will be significant if the p-values <0.05 at alpha 5%.

Table 4. Path coefficients and p-values

Item	SOS	PTH	PBK
Path coefficient against KUB	-0.161	0.272	0.268
p-values against KUB	0.146	0.033	0.035

By looking at the results of the p-value in Table 4, it can be seen that the SOS variable is not significant at alpha 5% but becomes significant at alpha 20%. PTH and PBK variables have p-values below 0.05 so they have a significant influence on KUB.

Table 2 also gives an Average R-squared (ARS) result of 0.256 with a p value of 0.021 which is smaller than the reference value of 0.05. The R^2 result above is 0.26 which is a low predictive power value (Sholihin & Ratmono, 2020:55). The value of R Square is 0.26, which means that 26% of the Readiness for Change variation can be explained by the variables Social Interaction, Knowledge Sharing, and Perceived Workload. Meanwhile the rest or 74% is influenced by other variables outside of this research model.

Table 5. Latent variable coefficients

	SOS	PTH	PBK	KUB
Composite reliability	0.802	0.881	0.821	0.912
Cronbach Alpha	0.718	0.828	0.726	0.891
Full Collin. VIF	1.553	1.918	1.465	1.081

Composite reliability for all variables are more than 0.70 which indicates that the reliability of the instruments have been met. Cronbach Alpha for all variables are more than 0.70 which indicates that the reliability of the instruments have been met.

Full Collinearity Test VIF is the result of full collinearity testing which includes vertical and lateral multicollinearity. The output shown in Table 5 above shows the full collinearity values VIF of SOS (1.553<3.3), PTH (1.918<3.3), PBK (1.465<3.3), and KUB (1.081<3.3) so that the model is free from vertical, lateral collinearity problems, and common method bias.

Table 6. Indirect and Total Effects

	SOS	PTH	PBK
Total Effects KUB	-0.161	0.272	0.268
P values for total effects	0.146	0.033	0.035

Based on the output of WarpPLS 7.0 in Table 6 above, the regression equation is obtained as follows: **KUB = -0.161SOS + 0.272PTH + 0.268PBK + Error.**

Based on the regression equation above, it can be seen that the social interaction regression coefficient is -0.161 with a p-value of 0.146 at alpha 5% to be invalid. But the p-value will be valid at alpha 20%. This can be interpreted that every increase in the Social Interaction variable by one unit will result in a decrease in Readiness for Change by 0.161. The regression coefficient is negative. This can be interpreted that there is a negative influence between Social Interaction on Readiness for Change.

It can be seen that the value of the Knowledge Sharing regression coefficient is 0.272 with a p-value of 0.033 (valid at alpha 5%). This can be interpreted that each increase in the Knowledge

Sharing variable by one unit will result in an increase in Readiness for Change by 0.272. The regression coefficient is positive. This can be interpreted that there is a positive influence between Knowledge Sharing on Readiness for Change.

As for the regression coefficient value of Perceived Workload of 0.268 with a p value of 0.035 (valid at alpha 5%). This can be interpreted that each increase in the Perception of Workload variable by one unit will result in an increase in Readiness for Change by 0.268. The regression coefficient is positive. This can be interpreted that there is a positive influence between Perceived Workload on Readiness for Change.

This research is using Likert scale. Respondents are asked to agree or disagree each statement. Respondents can choose the order of values as follows: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) neutral, (4) agree, and (5) strongly agree. Each indicator statement is adapted from Kondakci et al (2013).

Table 7. Average Score for Social Interaction Variable (SOS)

Indicator	Statement	Average Score	
SOS1	1. There is extensive social interaction at my school.	3.61	Agree
SOS2	2. Many formal and informal meetings are held at my school.	3.84	Agree
SOS3	3. Ideas are shared at formal and informal meetings at my school.	4.03	Agree
SOS4	4. Social interaction at my school is instrumental in solving the problems I encounter.	3.84	Agree
SOS5	5. There is an environment in my school where I can express my troubles and concerns.	3.71	Agree
SOS6	6. I have experience colleagues at my school whom I can consult on professional and social issues.	3.76	Agree
SOS7	7. Social interaction at my school is a collaboration mechanism for employees.	3.61	Agree
SOS8	8. My school is based on mutual respect.	3.76	Agree

Table 8. Average Score for Knowledge Sharing Variable (PTH)

Indicator	Statement	Average Score	
PTH1	1. There is a wide range of information sharing in my school.	3.79	Agree
PTH2	2. I can quickly access the information I need in my school.	3.47	Agree
PTH3	3. I know very well where and what information to get in my school.	3.71	Agree
PTH4	4. I try to get the information I need directly in my school.	3.76	Agree
PTH5	5. There are formal mechanisms in my school to ensure knowledge sharing.	3.71	Agree

Table 9. Average Score for Workload Perception Variable (PBK)

Indicator	Statement	Average Score	
PBK1	1. I think my workload is too much (Reversed)	3.39	Neutral
PBK2	2. The workload expected from me is at a level that I can cope with.	3.63	Agree
PBK3	3. I don't have enough time to prepare my lessons. (Reversed)	3.47	Agree
PBK4	4. I think I spend most of my time on non-teaching work. (Reversed)	3.63	Agree
PBK5	5. I have time to discuss teaching or non-teaching matters with my colleagues	3.68	Agree

Table 10. Average Score for Readiness for Change Variable (KUB)

Indicator	Statement	Average Score	
KUB1	1. I find change refreshing	3.68	Agree
KUB2	2. Change helps me do my job better	3.63	Agree
KUB3	3. I usually don't like change . (Reversed)	3.50	Agree
KUB4	4. Suggested changes are often for the better in the organization.	3.71	Agree
KUB5	5. I would like to dedicate myself to the change process.	3.55	Agree
KUB6	6. Change breaks my enthusiasm for work. (Reversed)	3.58	Agree
KUB7	7. Change encourages me to try harder in my job	3.61	Agree
KUB8	8. I would like to do my best for the success of the change process.	3.82	Agree
KUB9	9 Change often makes me uneasy. (Reversed)	3.71	Agree
KUB10	10. I try to apply the changes made.	3.92	Agree

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Social Interaction variable in this study shows an average answer value of 3.77 which is included in the agree category for all the indicators given. This shows that respondents agree that social interaction at SMA XYZ provides space for extensive social interaction, many formal and informal meetings are held at school, ideas are shared at formal and informal meetings, social interaction considered instrumental in solving the problems teachers encounter, the availability of an environment in schools where teachers can express their problems and concerns, social interaction becomes a collaboration mechanism for teachers, schools are based on mutual respect, and there are experienced colleagues whom teachers can consult on professional and social issues; all these are to help the teacher's readiness for change.

The highest average score of respondents' answers is on the SOS3 indicator with a value of 4,026 (agree). The regular meeting every Monday is a formal meeting that informs the teacher about the activities for the week ahead. Informal meetings in the teacher's room or conversations in the WhatsApp group are also a means of social interaction. The lowest average score of

respondents' answers is in the SOS1 and SOS7 indicators.. Even though it is the lowest, the average score still shows the agree category.

The results of the path coefficient calculation show a value of -0.161 which indicates that the Social Interaction variable has a negative influence on Readiness for Change at alpha 20% at SMA XYZ. In fact, SMA XYZ has quite a wide range of social interactions, but it is possible that new teachers have not adapted to the atmosphere, environment and new friends so they feel awkward interacting. The same thing can also be seen from the mechanism of collaboration between teachers. New teachers feel awkward in collaborating in their social interactions with other teachers.

On the other hand, older teachers gave the impression that they only interacted with their own group. Teachers from certain countries tend to interact with fellow nations. This factor seems to give a strong negative impression. The results of this study provide different results from those carried out by Astuti and Khoirunnisa (2018) which show that the Social Interaction variable has no significant effect on the Readiness for Change variable.

The Knowledge Sharing variable in this study is showing an average answer value of 3.69 which is included in the agree category for all the indicators given. This shows that respondents agree that Knowledge Sharing at SMA XYZ has a wide range of information sharing activities, teachers can quickly access the information needed, teachers know very well what information will be obtained from which sources, teachers can get the information they need. needed immediately, and the existence of formal mechanisms to ensure knowledge sharing activities so as to help Readiness for change teachers.

The average score of respondents' answers that are the highest or agree is on the PTH1 indicator of 3.79. The PTH1 indicator is that there are various kinds of information sharing activities in schools. WhatsApp, e-mail, bulletin boards, meetings and conversations between teachers are the media used to share various information.

The lowest average score of respondents' answers is on the PTH2 indicator with a value of 3.47. The PTH2 indicator is that teachers can quickly access the information they need. Even though it is the lowest, the average score still shows the agree category. With so many communication media used, it often makes it difficult for teachers to get the information they need quickly. The teacher must try to access several communication media before finding the information needed.

The results of this study gave the same results as those conducted by Kondacki et al (2017) which showed that the Knowledge Sharing variable had a positive and significant effect on the Readiness for Change variable.

The Perceived Workload variable in this study is showing an average answer value of 3.56 which is included in the agree category for all indicators given. This shows that the respondents agreed that the workload perceptions at SMA XYZ that the workload expected of the teacher is at a level that can be overcome and the teacher has time to discuss work or non-work issues with his co-workers. Respondents gave Disagree answers to the teacher's workload being too much, teachers not having enough time to prepare lessons, and teachers spending most of their time on non-teaching work.

The average score of respondents' answers that are the highest or agree is on the PBK5 indicator with a value of 3.68. The PBK5 indicator is that teachers have time to discuss work or non-work issues with their colleagues. There are quite a lot of discussion activities to find solutions to work problems at SMA XYZ. Teachers consult each other about how to help certain students. Teachers also consult each other on the pedagogy used.

The lowest average score of respondents' answers is on the PBK1 indicator with a value of 2.61 (where the PBK1-Reversed value is 3.39). The PBK1 indicator is that the teacher thinks the workload is too much. The results of answers that are in the neutral category indicate that the teacher feels the workload is not too much or too little.

The results of this study provide the same results as those carried out by Mudarsa (2018) which shows that the Perceived Workload variable has no positive and significant effect on the Readiness to Change variable.

CONCLUSIONS

This study documented the negative influence of Social Interaction on Readiness for Change. This should alerts the management of the school on the amount and quality of the social interactions amongst the teachers. All the indicators suggested that the teachers were on agree category. Further research can be suggested to find out whether to increase or reduce the amount of social interaction amongst teachers to prepare them to have a better readiness for change.

The Knowledge Sharing and Workload Perception played the main roles in preparing readiness for change in teachers. The study suggested that the management keeps the information flowing and circulating. The information should easily be found. The workload that the teachers have right now were perceived at the right amount. This study suggested that the management keeps the amount of workload as this gives a good indication for readiness for change.

REFERENCES

Armenakis, A. A., Harris, S. G., & Mossholder, K. W. (1993). Creating Readiness for Organizational Change. Human Relations, 46(6).

Astakhova, K. v, Korobeev, A. I., Prokhorova, V. v, Kolupaev, A. A., Vorotnoy, M. v, & Kucheryavaya, E. R. (2016). International Review of Management and Marketing The Role of Education in Economic and Social Development of the Country. International Review of Management and Marketing |, 6(S1), 53–58. http:www.econjournals.com

Astuti, E., & Khoirunnisa, R. M. (2018). Pengaruh Employee Engagement, Komitmen Organisasi, Dan Kepemimpinan Transformasional Terhadap Kesiapan Untukberubah (Readiness For Change) Pada Karyawan Universitas Ahmad Dahlan.

Bubb, S., & Earley, P. (2004). Managing Teacher Workload: Work-Life Balance and Wellbeing. Paul Chapman Publishing.

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), 419–442. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726700533006

Fullan, M., & Hargreaves, A. (Eds.). (1992). Teacher Development and Educational Change. Routledge.

Febriandono, M. H., Harry, F., Mulia, N., Iswara, N. H., Management, B., School, B. B., Lekir, J. H., No, I., & Selatan, J. (2019). Pengaruh Kompetensi Personal Terhadap Kesiapan Perubahan Dalam Industri 4.0. Technology Acceptance Model, 9(2).

Gani, N. A., Utama, R. E., Jaharuddin, & Priharta, A. (2020). Perilaku Organisasi. Penerbit Mirqat.

Ghauri, P., Grønhaug, K., & Strange, R. (2020). Research Methods In Business Studies (5th ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Guamaradewi, N. G., & Mangundjaya, W. L. (2018). Dampak Kesiapan Individu dan Kesiapan Organisasi untuk Berubah bagi Komitmen Afektif untuk Berubah The Impact of Individual and Organizational Readiness to Change on Affective Commitment to Change. In Jurnal Manajemen Aset Infrastruktur & Fasilitas (Vol. 2, Issue 2).

Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(3), 474–487. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.3.474

Knowledge Management in Organizations: 13th International Conference, KMO 2018 Žilina, Slovakia, August 6–10, 2018 Proceedings. (2018). In L. Uden, B. Hadzima, & I.-H. Ting (Eds.), Communications in Computer and Information Science (Vol. 877). http://www.springer.com/series/7899

Kogut, B., & Zander, U. (1996). What Firms Do? Coordination, Identity, and Learning. In Source: Organization Science (Vol. 7, Issue 5). http://www.jstor.orgURL:http://www.jstor.org/stable/2635287

Kondakçı, Y. Zayim, M. ve Çalışkan, Ö. (2013). Development and Validation of Readiness for Change Scale. Elementary Education Online, EEO, 12 (1), 23-35.

Kondakci, Y., Beycioglu, K., Sincar, M., & Ugurlu, C. T. (2017). Readiness of teachers for change in schools. International Journal of Leadership in Education, 20(2), 176–197. https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2015.1023361

Lauer, T. (2021). Change Management: Fundamentals and Success Factors. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-62187-5

Lee, Y. (2023). Leading Change While Loving People. Routledge.

Mudarsa, H. (2019). Pengaruh Stres Kerja Dan Budaya Organisasi Terhadap Kesiapan Berubah Pada Karyawan Pt Budi Perkasa Alam.

Roe, M., Xu, W., & Song, D. (2015). Optimising Supply Chain Performance: Information Sharing and Coordinated Management. Palgrave Macmillan.

Salloum, S. A., Al-Emran, M., & Shaalan, K. (2018). The Impact of Knowledge Sharing on Information Systems: A Review. In L. Uden, B. Hadzima, & I.-H. Ting (Eds.), Knowledge Management in Organizations (Vol. 877, pp. 94–106). Springer.

Samallo, M., & Wulani, F. (2022). Model Hubungan Kompleksitas Pekerjaan, Beban Kerja, Stres Kerja, Dan Kepuasan Kerja Guru Sma Pada Yayasan Pendidikan Xyz Di Surabaya. E-Jurnal

Manajemen Universitas Udayana, 11(3), 614. https://doi.org/10.24843/ejmunud.2022.v11.i03.p10

Schindler, P. S. (2019). Business Research Methods (13th ed.). McGraw-Hill.

Sholihin, M., & Ratmono, D. (2020). Analisis SEM-PLS dengan WarpPLS 7.0 (1st ed.). Penerbit ANDI.

Tampubolon, M. P. (2020). Change Management: Manajemen Perubahan: Individu, Tim Kerja, Organisasi (First). www.mitrawacanamedia.com

van Lange, P. A. M., Higgins, E. T., & Kruglanski, A. W. (Eds.). (2021). Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles (3rd ed.). The Guilford Press.

Wahjono, S. I. (2022). Stress & Perubahan. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/359999660

Wilczynski, W., & Brosnan, S. F. (2021). Cooperation and Conflict: The Interaction of Opposites in Shaping Social Behavior. In Cooperation and Conflict. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108671187