

The Role of Resilience and Readiness for Change in Employee Performance at Company X

Previa Sabilla Qolby¹, Kartika Nuradina², Fauzan Daffa³, Prass Rendy⁴

Universitas Indonesia Membangun, Bandung, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: previa.sabilla@student.inaba.ac.id¹, kartika.nuradina@inaba.ac.id²,
fauzan.daffa@imu.ac.id³, prass.rendy@inaba.ac.id⁴

Article Information:

Received: July 06, 2026; Accepted: July 14, 2026; Published: July 16, 2026

Abstract:

Organizational change places employees under continuous pressure to adjust while maintaining effective work behavior. This study examined whether resilience and readiness for change predict individual work performance among employees of Company X, a healthcare service organization operating across 44 branches. A quantitative cross-sectional explanatory design was employed. From a population of 255 employees, 72 respondents were selected through simple random sampling. Data were collected using adapted versions of the Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale, the Readiness for Change Scale, and the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics and multiple linear regression. The results showed that resilience positively and significantly predicted individual work performance ($B = 0.233$), ($t = 2.603$), ($p = 0.011$). In contrast, readiness for change had a positive but statistically nonsignificant contribution ($B = 0.052$), ($t = 0.611$), ($p = 0.543$). The overall regression model was significant ($F = 6.057$), ($p = 0.004$) and explained 14.9% of the variance in individual work performance. These findings indicate that employees' capacity to remain persistent, regulate pressure, and recover from workplace difficulties is more directly related to performance than their general preparedness to accept organizational change. The study highlights the importance of strengthening employee resilience while improving managerial support, communication, and employee involvement during organizational transitions.

Keywords: Individual Work Performance; Organizational Change; Readiness For Change; Resilience

1. Introduction

Organizations operating in volatile business environments must adjust their structures, technologies, policies, and work processes to remain competitive. However, organizational change often creates uncertainty, psychological pressure, and employee resistance, particularly when its purpose, direction, and consequences are not clearly communicated. [Lewin's \(1951\)](#) force-field theory explains change as an interaction between driving and restraining forces, with the stages of unfreezing, moving, and refreezing. This perspective suggests that organizational transformation depends not only on formal policies and managerial decisions but also on employees' psychological capacity to accept, support, and adapt to new working

Published by:

conditions. [Alolabi et al. \(2021\)](#) similarly emphasize that change initiatives are more likely to succeed when both organizations and employees are adequately prepared to implement them.

This issue is particularly relevant in the healthcare service sector, where employees must respond to operational changes while maintaining service quality and work effectiveness. Company X, a healthcare service organization operating through 44 branches, has experienced repeated adjustments in policies, work targets, operating procedures, and incentive arrangements. A preliminary assessment conducted in 2026, based on observations and interviews with 26 employees from branch services, operations, logistics, and employee training, indicated a decline in work motivation and enthusiasm. The respondents associated these conditions with frequently changing policies, unclear work priorities, high job demands, and uncertainty regarding compensation and incentives. Several employees also showed lower discipline in administrative reporting and expressed dissatisfaction through public communication channels, indicating difficulties in maintaining constructive work behavior during organizational change.

One psychological resource that may help employees remain effective under such conditions is resilience. [Connor and Davidson \(2003\)](#) define resilience as the capacity to endure adversity, adjust to stressful circumstances, and recover after experiencing pressure. In organizational settings, resilience enables employees to regulate negative emotions, sustain motivation, and continue performing their responsibilities despite uncertainty and disruption. [Luthans et al. \(2007\)](#) position resilience as a positive psychological capacity that supports recovery from setbacks, conflict, failure, and increasing job demands. [Duchek \(2020\)](#) further explains that resilience involves not only recovery but also the ability to anticipate difficulties, cope with disruption, and learn from adverse experiences. Employees with stronger resilience are therefore expected to maintain more stable work behavior and performance when facing repeated organizational changes.

Readiness for change represents another important psychological factor in organizational transformation. [Holt et al. \(2007\)](#) conceptualize readiness for change as employees' beliefs, attitudes, and intentions regarding the necessity of change, their ability to implement it, management's support, and the personal benefits arising from the change. The construct consists of appropriateness, change efficacy, management support, and personal valence. Employees who believe that change is necessary, feel capable of adapting, perceive adequate managerial support, and recognize personal benefits are more likely to participate constructively in the change process. [Asbari et al. \(2021\)](#) found that readiness for change is closely linked to leadership practices and employee performance, while [Novitasari \(2021\)](#) reported that employees who are more prepared to accept organizational change tend to demonstrate better work outcomes.

Company X's internal performance records provide additional evidence of the organizational challenge. The company established an annual activity target of 750 points, while actual achievements reached 198 points in 2023, 247 points in 2024, and 416 points in 2025. Although the achievement rate improved from 26.40% to 55.47% during the three-year period, performance remained substantially below the organizational target. This pattern indicates that the company experienced gradual improvement but had not yet achieved the expected level of employee performance. Organizational resilience research suggests that performance during periods of disruption depends on the ability of organizational members to adjust, continue functioning, and respond effectively to changing demands ([Ilseven & Puranam, 2021](#)).

Previous studies have examined employee performance in relation to leadership, compensation, communication, motivation, and organizational culture. However, studies that simultaneously position resilience and readiness for change as predictors of individual work performance remain limited, particularly in healthcare service organizations undergoing repeated policy and operational adjustments. Resilience reflects employees' ability to sustain functioning and recover from pressure, whereas readiness for change reflects their willingness and perceived ability to participate in organizational transformation. [Chrisanty and Gunawan \(2021\)](#) found that readiness and adaptive organizational behavior contribute to employee performance, while [Putra and Nuradina \(2023\)](#) highlighted the role of resilience and coping processes in helping employees manage workplace pressure. Nevertheless, the relative contribution of these two psychological factors to individual work performance has not been sufficiently clarified.

This study addresses that gap by examining resilience and readiness for change within a single regression model of individual work performance among employees of Company X. The study specifically investigates whether resilience significantly predicts individual work performance, whether readiness for change contributes significantly to individual work performance, and whether the regression model comprising both variables is statistically significant in explaining variations in individual work performance. The findings are expected to strengthen the understanding of psychological factors that support employee performance during organizational change and provide practical guidance for developing more effective employee support and change management strategies.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Resilience

Resilience refers to an individual's psychological capacity to remain functional, adjust to demanding circumstances, and recover after experiencing adversity or sustained pressure. [Connor and Davidson \(2003\)](#) emphasize that resilience is not limited to returning to a previous condition after a difficult experience. It also reflects the ability to draw on personal strengths, maintain emotional stability, and develop more adaptive responses to future challenges. In the workplace, this capacity is particularly important because employees are frequently required to manage uncertainty, increased job demands, interpersonal conflict, and changes in organizational policies.

[Luthans et al. \(2007\)](#) define resilience as a positive psychological resource that enables employees to recover from setbacks, failures, conflicts, and organizational disruptions. This perspective positions resilience as an active process rather than a fixed personal characteristic. [Duchek \(2020\)](#) further explains that resilience involves three interrelated capacities: anticipating potential difficulties, coping effectively when disruption occurs, and learning from adverse experiences. Employees with stronger resilience are therefore more likely to regulate negative emotions, preserve motivation, and continue performing their responsibilities when organizational conditions become unstable.

[Connor and Davidson \(2003\)](#) operationalized resilience using the Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC-25). The instrument comprises five dimensions: personal competence and perseverance; trust in one's instincts and tolerance of negative emotions; positive acceptance of change and secure relationships; perceived control; and spiritual influence. Collectively, these dimensions represent an individual's ability to remain persistent, adapt constructively, maintain a sense of control, and draw on internal or spiritual resources when facing difficulties. In the present study, resilience is expected to support individual work performance by helping

employees sustain productive behavior despite repeated organizational changes and workplace pressure.

2.2 Readiness for Change

Readiness for change represents an individual's cognitive and emotional preparedness to accept, support, and participate in organizational transformation. [Holt et al. \(2007\)](#) define the construct as a combination of beliefs, attitudes, and intentions concerning whether a proposed change is necessary, whether the individual is capable of implementing it, whether management is committed to the process, and whether the change will produce meaningful personal benefits. This definition indicates that readiness for change develops from employees' interpretation of both the change itself and the organizational environment in which it is introduced.

[Holt et al. \(2007\)](#) identify four dimensions of readiness for change. Appropriateness reflects the belief that the proposed change is necessary and suitable for the organization. Change efficacy concerns an employee's confidence in their ability to carry out the required adjustments. Management support refers to the extent to which organizational leaders are perceived as committed to and supportive of the change. Personal valence reflects the benefits or disadvantages that employees expect to experience as a consequence of the change. Employees are more likely to support organizational transformation when these four conditions are perceived positively.

Readiness for change is relevant to employee performance because organizational transformation often requires employees to learn new procedures, modify established routines, and respond to revised performance expectations. Employees who understand the purpose of change and feel capable of meeting its demands may be more willing to invest effort in the transition process. Previous research has linked readiness for change with more constructive employee responses and stronger work outcomes ([Asbari et al., 2021](#); [Novitasari, 2021](#)). Nevertheless, readiness alone may not immediately improve performance when the change process is accompanied by unclear policies, inconsistent managerial support, or limited perceived benefits. Its contribution to performance must therefore be examined empirically within the specific organizational context.

2.3 Individual Work Performance

Individual work performance refers to observable employee behaviors that contribute to achieving organizational objectives. [Koopmans et al. \(2011\)](#) explain that work performance should not be evaluated solely by final outputs, because employees also contribute to organizational effectiveness through how they complete tasks, support the work environment, and avoid behaviors that may harm the organization. This behavioral perspective provides a broader understanding of performance than evaluations based exclusively on sales, production figures, or formal target achievement.

The individual work performance framework consists of three principal dimensions: task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior. Task performance concerns the effectiveness and quality with which employees complete activities directly related to their formal responsibilities. Contextual performance includes voluntary and supportive behaviors that strengthen the organization's social and psychological environment, such as cooperation, initiative, persistence, and assistance to colleagues. Counterproductive work behavior refers to intentional or avoidable actions that may reduce organizational

effectiveness, including neglecting responsibilities, displaying excessive negativity, or engaging in conduct that disrupts workplace functioning.

[Koopmans et al. \(2013\)](#) developed the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire as a generic instrument for assessing these dimensions across different occupations. The instrument emphasizes work behavior rather than isolated performance outcomes, making it suitable for organizations in which employees perform diverse roles. In this study, individual work performance is treated as the dependent variable because resilience and readiness for change may influence employees' capacity to complete their tasks, maintain constructive workplace behavior, and avoid actions that interfere with organizational effectiveness during periods of change.

3. Research Method

3.1 Research Design

This study employed a quantitative, cross-sectional, explanatory design to examine the contributions of resilience and readiness for change to individual work performance among employees of Company X. Data were collected at a single point in time and analyzed using multiple linear regression. This design was appropriate because the study focused on testing predictive relationships among variables through standardized measurement and statistical analysis ([Creswell & Creswell, 2018](#)).

3.2 Population and Sample

The study population comprised 255 active employees working across 44 branches of Company X. Participants were required to be permanent employees, to have worked for the company for at least one year, and to voluntarily complete the questionnaire. The minimum sample size was determined using the Slovin formula with a 10% margin of error, yielding 71.83 respondents, rounded to 72. The respondents were selected through simple random sampling from the available employee list.

Demographic information included age and length of employment. Age data were available for 71 respondents, as one participant did not complete the age field, whereas analyses of resilience, readiness for change, and individual work performance were based on all 72 respondents.

3.3 Measurement Instruments

Resilience was measured using the Indonesian adaptation of the Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale developed by [Connor and Davidson \(2003\)](#). The final scale consisted of 19 items covering personal competence, perseverance, tolerance of negative emotions, positive adaptation, perceived control, and spiritual influence. Higher scores indicated stronger resilience.

Readiness for change was assessed using the scale developed by [Holt et al. \(2007\)](#). The final instrument contained 17 items measuring appropriateness, change efficacy, management support, and personal valence. Higher scores reflected a stronger willingness and perceived ability to participate in organizational change.

Individual work performance was measured using the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire developed by [Koopmans et al. \(2013\)](#). The final 12-item scale assessed task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior. Negatively worded items were reverse-scored so that higher total scores represented better individual work performance.

Published by:

All instruments used a four-point Likert-type response format. Before the main survey, the instruments were piloted with 34 employees. Items with corrected item–total correlations below 0.30 were excluded. The final scales demonstrated acceptable internal consistency, with Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of 0.845 for resilience, 0.898 for readiness for change, and 0.732 for individual work performance ([DeVellis & Thorpe, 2021](#)).

3.4 Data Collection and Analysis

The questionnaires were distributed to eligible employees after they received information about the study's purpose, the voluntary nature of participation, and the confidentiality of their responses.

The analysis included descriptive statistics, score categorization, and multiple linear regression. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize respondent characteristics and the distribution of each variable. Before conducting regression analysis, the model was examined for residual normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity. Normality was assessed using the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test with Monte Carlo significance estimation, multicollinearity was evaluated through tolerance and variance inflation factor values, and heteroscedasticity was tested using the Glejser procedure.

The partial contribution of resilience and readiness for change was evaluated using the (t)-test, while the significance of the overall regression model was assessed using the (F)-test. The coefficient of determination was used to estimate the proportion of variance in individual work performance explained by the two predictors. All statistical tests applied a significance level of 0.05.

4. Findings and Discussions

4.1 Findings

4.1.1 Respondent Characteristics

The study involved 72 employees of Company X. Information on length of employment was available for all respondents, whereas age data were available for 71 respondents because one participant did not complete the age field. Therefore, age percentages were calculated from 71 valid responses.

Table 1. Respondent Characteristics by Length of Employment

Length of Employment	Frequency	Percentage
1–3 years	37	51.4%
More than 5 years	35	48.6%
Total	72	100.0%

Slightly more than half of the respondents had worked for Company X for one to three years, while 48.6% had more than five years of employment experience. This distribution indicates that the sample included both relatively recent employees and those with longer organizational experience.

Table 2. Respondent Characteristics by Age

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage
≤ 25 years	30	42.3%
26–35 years	24	33.8%
36–45 years	15	21.1%
> 45 years	2	2.8%
Total valid responses	71	100.0%

Most respondents were 35 years old or younger. Employees aged 25 years or below represented the largest group, followed by those aged 26–35 years. Only a small proportion of respondents were older than 45 years.

4.1.2 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics were calculated to summarize the distribution of resilience, readiness for change, and individual work performance scores.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics

Variable	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Resilience	72	46	76	60.18	5.84
Readiness for change	72	32	66	50.21	6.19
Individual work performance	72	29	48	36.71	4.07

The mean resilience score was 60.18, with a range of 46 to 76. Readiness for change had a mean score of 50.21, whereas individual work performance had a mean of 36.71. The standard deviations indicate moderate variation around the mean scores. These values describe the spread of responses but do not, by themselves, demonstrate whether differences among respondents are statistically significant.

To provide a clearer descriptive profile, the scores were classified into low, moderate, and high categories.

Table 4. Distribution of Variable Categories

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage
Resilience	Low	0	0.00%
	Moderate	33	45.83%
	High	39	54.17%
Readiness for change	Low	2	2.78%
	Moderate	54	75.00%
	High	16	22.22%
Individual work performance	Low	0	0.00%
	Moderate	42	58.33%
	High	30	41.67%

More than half of the respondents were classified as having high resilience, and none were included in the low category. In contrast, readiness for change was predominantly moderate, with three-quarters of the respondents falling within this category. Individual work

performance was also generally moderate, although a substantial proportion of employees were classified in the high category.

4.1.3 Regression Assumption Tests

Before estimating the regression model, the residuals and predictor variables were examined for normality, multicollinearity, and heteroscedasticity.

Table 5. Residual Normality Test

Test	Significance Value	Decision
Kolmogorov–Smirnov	0.200	Normal
Monte Carlo significance	0.917	Normal

Both significance values exceeded 0.05, indicating that the residuals did not significantly deviate from a normal distribution. Therefore, the normality assumption for multiple linear regression was considered satisfied.

Table 6. Multicollinearity Test

Predictor	Tolerance	VIF	Decision
Resilience	0.727	1.375	No multicollinearity
Readiness for change	0.727	1.375	No multicollinearity

The tolerance values were greater than 0.10, and the variance inflation factor values were well below 10. These results indicate that resilience and readiness for change were not excessively correlated and could be included simultaneously in the regression model.

Table 7. Glejser Heteroscedasticity Test

Predictor	Significance Value	Decision
Resilience	0.213	No heteroscedasticity
Readiness for change	0.759	No heteroscedasticity

The significance values for both predictors exceeded 0.05. Accordingly, there was no evidence that the residual variance changed systematically across predictor values, indicating that the homoscedasticity assumption was satisfied.

4.1.4 Multiple Linear Regression

Multiple linear regression was conducted to examine the contribution of resilience and readiness for change to individual work performance.

Table 8. Multiple Linear Regression Coefficients

Variable	Unstandardized Coefficient, B	t	p
Constant	20.038	—	—
Resilience	0.233	2.603	0.011
Readiness for change	0.052	0.611	0.543

The regression equation was:

$$[Y = 20.038 + 0.233X_1 + 0.052X_2]$$

where (Y) represents individual work performance, (X₁) represents resilience, and (X₂) represents readiness for change.

The coefficient for resilience was positive and statistically significant. Holding readiness for change constant, a one-point increase in resilience was associated with an estimated increase of 0.233 points in individual work performance. In contrast, readiness for change had a small positive coefficient, but its contribution was not statistically significant.

4.1.5 Hypothesis Testing

The partial test showed that resilience significantly predicted individual work performance, with ($t = 2.603$) and ($p = 0.011$). Because the probability value was below 0.05, the first hypothesis was supported. This result indicates that employees with higher resilience tended to report stronger individual work performance after controlling for readiness for change.

Readiness for change did not make a significant unique contribution to individual work performance, with ($t = 0.611$) and ($p = 0.543$). Although the direction of the coefficient was positive, the evidence was insufficient to support the second hypothesis.

Table 9. Overall Regression Model

F	p	Decision
6.057	0.004	Statistically significant

The overall regression model was statistically significant, ($F = 6.057$), ($p = 0.004$). This finding indicates that resilience and readiness for change, when entered together, improved the prediction of individual work performance compared with a model containing no predictors. However, the significant overall model should not be interpreted as evidence that both predictors were individually significant because only resilience showed a significant unique contribution.

4.1.6 Coefficient of Determination

Table 10. Model Summary

R	R²	Adjusted R²	Standard Error of the Estimate
0.386	0.149	0.125	3.806

The coefficient of determination showed that resilience and readiness for change explained 14.9% of the variance in individual work performance. The adjusted (R^2) value of 0.125 indicates that the explanatory power of the model remained modest after adjustment for the number of predictors and sample size. The remaining 85.1% of the variance was associated with factors not included in the present model, such as leadership, motivation, job satisfaction, compensation, workload, organizational support, or other individual and organizational conditions.

4.2 Discussion

4.2.1 Resilience and Individual Work Performance

The findings show that resilience positively and significantly predicted individual work performance, as indicated by ($B = 0.233$), ($t = 2.603$), and ($p = 0.011$). This result suggests that employees who are better able to regulate pressure, adjust to difficult circumstances, and recover from setbacks tend to maintain stronger work performance. In the context of Company

X, this capacity is particularly relevant because employees are required to respond to recurring policy changes, shifting work priorities, and demanding service expectations.

This finding is consistent with the resilience framework proposed by [Connor and Davidson \(2003\)](#), which emphasizes perseverance, emotional tolerance, adaptability, perceived control, and the use of personal resources when confronting adversity. These psychological capacities may help employees remain focused on their responsibilities even when organizational conditions are uncertain. Rather than eliminating work pressure, resilience appears to reduce the extent to which such pressure disrupts productive behavior.

The result also supports the view of [Luthans et al. \(2007\)](#), who describe resilience as a positive psychological resource that enables employees to recover from conflict, failure, and increasing job demands. [Duchek \(2020\)](#) extends this perspective by explaining that resilience includes the ability to anticipate disruption, respond effectively, and learn from adverse experiences. Employees who possess these capacities may be more capable of preserving task completion, contextual performance, and behavioral consistency during periods of organizational change.

The empirical pattern at Company X reinforces this interpretation. Although the organization's activity-point achievement increased between 2023 and 2025, performance remained below the established target. This gap suggests that employees were still operating under conditions that required sustained adaptation and psychological endurance. Under such circumstances, resilience may function as an immediate personal resource that helps employees remain productive despite unresolved organizational pressures. The finding is also in line with [Putra and Nuradina \(2023\)](#), who reported that resilience and coping processes support employees in managing work-related stress and maintaining adaptive workplace behavior.

4.2.2 Readiness for Change and Individual Work Performance

Readiness for change did not significantly predict individual work performance, with ($B = 0.052$), ($t = 0.611$), and ($p = 0.543$). Although the coefficient was positive, the relationship was too small to provide sufficient statistical evidence that greater readiness was associated with better performance in the present sample. This result indicates that psychological preparedness to accept organizational change does not necessarily translate directly into improved work behavior.

[Holt et al. \(2007\)](#) explain that readiness for change depends on four perceptions: the appropriateness of the change, personal capability to implement it, managerial support, and expected personal benefits. Employees may understand that change is necessary and may even be willing to participate, yet their performance may remain unchanged when policies are unclear, managerial support is inconsistent, or the personal consequences of change are uncertain. In such situations, readiness exists at the attitudinal level but may not be strong enough to produce measurable improvements in work outcomes.

This explanation is relevant to the conditions identified at Company X. The preliminary assessment indicated that employees experienced repeated policy changes, shifting work priorities, and uncertainty concerning compensation and incentives. These conditions may weaken employees' perceptions of appropriateness, management support, and personal valence. As a result, employees may be psychologically aware of the need to adapt without being fully able to convert that readiness into stronger performance.

The finding differs from [Novitasari \(2021\)](#), who reported a positive relationship between readiness for change and employee performance, and from [Asbari et al. \(2021\)](#), who linked

readiness for change with constructive employee outcomes. The difference may be explained by organizational context. Readiness for change may contribute more strongly to performance when change is clearly communicated, adequately supported, and perceived as beneficial. In contrast, frequent or ambiguous change may create uncertainty that weakens the practical value of readiness. The present result therefore suggests that readiness for change may require supportive organizational conditions before it can influence individual performance.

4.2.3 The Combined Contribution of Resilience and Readiness for Change

The overall regression model was statistically significant, with ($F = 6.057$) and ($p = 0.004$). This indicates that resilience and readiness for change, when considered together, improved the prediction of individual work performance compared with a model without these variables. However, the significance of the overall model should not be interpreted as evidence that both predictors contributed equally. The partial results show that resilience was the only variable with a significant unique contribution.

This pattern suggests that the capacity to remain functional under pressure may be more immediately relevant to work performance than a general willingness to accept organizational change. Readiness for change may shape employees' attitudes toward transformation, whereas resilience may more directly influence their ability to sustain effort, manage emotional strain, and complete work responsibilities. In other words, employees may be willing to adapt, but their performance depends more strongly on whether they can remain psychologically stable and behaviorally effective throughout the process.

The model explained 14.9% of the variance in individual work performance, with an adjusted (R^2) of 0.125. This represents modest explanatory power and indicates that most variation in performance was associated with factors outside the model. Employee performance may also depend on leadership quality, work motivation, job satisfaction, compensation, workload, organizational support, competence, and access to adequate resources. The relatively small (R^2) therefore does not diminish the importance of resilience, but it shows that individual work performance is a multidimensional outcome that cannot be explained by psychological readiness and resilience alone.

From a practical perspective, Company X should not rely only on encouraging employees to become more accepting of change. The organization should also strengthen resilience through stress-management support, adaptive coping development, supervisory assistance, and clearer communication during policy transitions. At the same time, readiness for change may be improved by explaining the purpose of change, involving employees in implementation, demonstrating managerial commitment, and clarifying the benefits and consequences of new policies. These measures may create the organizational conditions needed for psychological readiness to develop into stronger work performance.

This study has several limitations. First, the research was conducted within a single healthcare service organization, which limits the extent to which the findings can be generalized to other industries or organizational settings. Second, the cross-sectional design captured the variables at one point in time and therefore does not permit firm conclusions regarding causality or changes in employee responses over time.

Third, all variables were measured using self-report questionnaires. This approach may increase the risk of social desirability and common method bias, particularly because individual work performance was evaluated by the employees themselves rather than through supervisor

ratings or objective performance records. Future research should combine self-reported data with managerial evaluations, attendance records, productivity measures, or other objective indicators.

Fourth, the sample was drawn from employees across 44 branches, but the analysis did not account for possible differences between branches, job levels, or functional units. Stratified or multistage sampling would allow future studies to examine whether the observed relationships differ across organizational groups. Finally, the model explained only 14.9% of the variance in individual work performance. Future studies should therefore include additional predictors such as leadership, compensation, workload, job satisfaction, organizational support, and employee engagement.

5. Conclusion

This study examined the contribution of resilience and readiness for change to individual work performance among employees of Company X. The findings demonstrate that resilience is a meaningful predictor of work performance. Employees who are better able to manage pressure, remain persistent, adapt to disruption, and recover from setbacks tend to maintain stronger work behavior under changing organizational conditions. In contrast, readiness for change showed a positive but statistically nonsignificant contribution. This result indicates that employees' willingness and perceived capacity to accept organizational change do not automatically lead to improved performance when the change process is accompanied by unclear priorities, limited managerial support, or uncertain personal consequences.

The overall regression model was statistically significant, although its explanatory power remained modest. Resilience and readiness for change accounted for 14.9% of the variance in individual work performance, indicating that employee performance is shaped by a broader combination of psychological and organizational factors. Leadership quality, workload, compensation, motivation, job satisfaction, organizational support, competence, and access to adequate work resources may provide additional explanations for differences in performance.

These findings highlight the importance of strengthening employees' adaptive psychological resources while improving the conditions under which organizational change is implemented. Company X should support resilience through stress-management initiatives, adaptive coping development, constructive supervision, and accessible employee assistance. At the same time, change initiatives should be communicated clearly, supported consistently by management, and implemented with meaningful employee involvement. Clarifying the purpose, expected consequences, and potential benefits of change may help transform readiness from a favorable attitude into effective work behavior.

The results should be interpreted within the boundaries of a cross-sectional, self-report study conducted in one healthcare service organization. Future research should apply longitudinal or mixed-method designs, involve broader organizational samples, compare employees across branches and job levels, and combine self-reported performance with supervisor evaluations or objective organizational records. Examining additional predictors and possible mediating variables may also provide a more comprehensive explanation of how employees sustain performance during organizational transformation.

References

- Alolabi, Y. A., Ayupp, K., & Al Dwaikat, M. A. (2021). Issues and implications of readiness to change. *Administrative Sciences*, 11(4), Article 140. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci11040140>
- Asbari, M., Hidayat, D., & Purwanto, A. (2021). Managing employee performance: From leadership to readiness for change. *International Journal of Social and Management Studies*, 2(1), 74–85. <https://doi.org/10.5555/ijosmas.v2i1.12>
- Chrisanty, F. N., Gunawan, M. S., Wijayanti, R. W., & Soetjipto, B. W. (2021). The role of transformational entrepreneurship, readiness to change and counterproductive work behavior in enhancing employee performance. *Organizacija*, 54(1), 63–81. <https://doi.org/10.2478/orga-2021-0005>
- Connor, K. M., & Davidson, J. R. T. (2003). Development of a new resilience scale: The Connor–Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC). *Depression and Anxiety*, 18(2), 76–82. <https://doi.org/10.1002/da.10113>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- DeVellis, R. F., & Thorpe, C. T. (2021). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Duchek, S. (2020). Organizational resilience: A capability-based conceptualization. *Business Research*, 13(1), 215–246. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-019-0085-7>
- Holt, D. T., Armenakis, A. A., Feild, H. S., & Harris, S. G. (2007). Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of a scale. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(2), 232–255. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886306295295>
- Ilseven, E., & Puranam, P. (2021). Measuring organizational resilience as a performance outcome. *Journal of Organization Design*, 10(3–4), 127–137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41469-021-00107-1>
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., Schaufeli, W. B., de Vet, H. C. W., & van der Beek, A. J. (2011). Conceptual frameworks of individual work performance: A systematic review. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 53(8), 856–866. <https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0b013e318226a763>
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., van Buuren, S., van der Beek, A. J., & de Vet, H. C. W. (2013). Development of an individual work performance questionnaire. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 62(1), 6–28. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17410401311285273>
- Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science: Selected theoretical papers* (D. Cartwright, Ed.). Harper & Brothers.
- Luthans, F., Avolio, B. J., Avey, J. B., & Norman, S. M. (2007). Positive psychological capital: Measurement and relationship with performance and satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 60(3), 541–572. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2007.00083.x>

- Novitasari, D. (2021). Readiness for change: The secret to managing employee performance. *International Journal of Social and Management Studies*, 2(2), 122–134. <https://doi.org/10.5555/ijosmas.v2i2.23>
- Putra, D. A., & Nuradina, K. (2023). Strategi coping dan upaya resiliensi karyawan di masa pandemi COVID-19. *Inaba Journal of Psychology*, 1(1), 33–40. <https://doi.org/10.56956/ijop.v1i01.189>

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

