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Abstract

The Indonesian Army (TNI AD) is improving its main capabilities to meet the demand of the changing form of armed conflict. As for human capabilities, leadership is still counted as the main capabilities. To develop its capabilities as an organization, TNI AD must focus on its soldiers' readiness to change. Based on the previous research findings and the need to change in TNI AD, research must be conducted to demonstrate the effect of leadership style on TNI AD soldiers' readiness to change. This study aims to determine the effect of battalion commander’s leadership style on soldiers’ readiness to change in Xth Infantry Battalion. Data collection using questionnaires has been completed for both variables, the commander's leadership style and soldiers’ readiness to change. The analytical tool used in this study is simple linear regression analysis, correlation test, and t-test using SPSS for windows 23.0. The result showed that the transformational leadership of the Xth Infantry Battalion Commander has positive effects on readiness to change of soldiers from Xth Infantry Battalion. The coefficient determinant demonstrated from this study is 50.2%, meaning that the Xth battalion commander's transformational leadership effect on soldiers' readiness to change is 50.2%. This study is preliminary and has its limitations. However, this study can be developed in many ways for the benefit of the Indonesian Army to change to meet the ever-changing dynamics of armed conflict.
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INTRODUCTION
Currently, the Indonesian Army (TNI AD) is working hard to improve its capabilities, to adapt to the changing form of armed conflict. Armies around the world, especially armies from developed countries, are fighting as the 5th warfare generation. Four approaches become the highlights of the 5th warfare generation, which are: networks, combat cloud, multi-domain battle, and fusion warfare (Layton, 2017). The United States (U.S.), China, and Australia are countries that have already developed their armed forces with space and cyber technologies (Poirier & Lotspeich Maj, 2013). Aware of the fast-changing dynamics of armed conflict, the Indonesian Armed Forces is attempting to modernize itself, adhering to Indonesia's Defense White Paper (Kementerian Pertahanan RI, 2015). In terms of human capabilities, the Indonesian Army (TNI AD) is developing leadership as the foundation of change. Even though many forms of changes are currently taking place in the Indonesian Army, leadership is still identified as the primary driving force for the Indonesian Army’s reform (Kementerian Pertahanan RI, 2015). Furthermore, to be the dominant participant in the future battle, the TNI AD is obliged not to only develop tangible factors such as future technology and equipment, but also to focus on intangible factors such as the TNI AD soldiers' agility and adaptiveness. Therefore, to develop its capabilities as an organization, TNI AD must focus on its soldiers' readiness to change. This is due to the reason that there are many occasions where organizations failed to change (Probst & Raisch, 2005). Development or change in an organization must begin with readiness to change from all its employees (Holt et al., 2007). In the context of TNI AD, change must begin for all soldiers of TNI AD. Research from the U.S. army demonstrated the importance of a few leadership behaviors on U.S. army soldiers’ readiness to change (Lyons et al., 2009). Other research in the Canadian army and British armies indicated that transformational leadership is considered a more effective leadership style and gave more satisfaction to soldiers compared to transactional leadership (B. M. Bass, 1990). Based on the previous research findings and the need to change in TNI AD, research must be conducted to demonstrate the effect of leadership style on TNI AD soldiers' readiness to change.

As stated by the Department of the Army, Army Leadership (Department of the Army, 2012), there are three levels of war that clearly define leadership differently. Consequently, there are three levels of Army leadership: direct, operational, and strategic. Identical with the U.S. Army doctrine, the Indonesian Army also levels its leadership into three categories. Regarding the ongoing change of doctrine in the TNI AD, which occurred mostly at the operational level, thus, this preliminary study focuses on the operational level. Operational context in TNI AD comprises of brigade and battalion level. Nevertheless, the changing doctrine has a more immediate impact on battalion commanders compared to brigade commanders. For that reason, this study focuses to seek the effect of battalion commander's leadership styles on the soldiers' readiness to change at the battalion level.

The Full Range Leadership (FLR) Model comprises three styles of leadership: transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire (B. Bass & Riggio, 2006). Transactional leaders are those who lead their subordinate through the social exchange, mostly done through reward after soldiers’ positive actions is completed. Whereas transformational leaderships are leaders who lead their followers by stimulating and inspiring them to attain exceptional results while developing their leadership ability. Behaviors demonstrated by transformational leaders are setting examples, two-way communication, active listening, inspire motivation, solving problems, and openness in achieving
targets. Meanwhile, laissez-faire is a very passive form of leadership, which is a contradiction to transformational leadership (B. Bass & Riggio, 2006). Behaviors demonstrated by laissez-faire are to escape upon finding problems, apathy, and unable to take responsibilities. There are seven components of The FLR Model, which are idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, management-by-exception, and passive-avoidant (B. Bass & Riggio, 2006). These first four components made up the transformational leadership, the next two components made up the transactional leadership, and leaving the last component was the only component for laissez-faire. Currently, the transformational leadership dimension of idealized influence is divided into two, which are idealized influence behavior and idealized influence attributed (B. Bass & Riggio, 2006). Idealized influence behavior is influence behavior demonstrated by transformational leaders. Whereas idealized influence attributed is influence behavior of transformational leaders which are attributed by followers.

Readiness to change determines the condition where an individual or individuals are inclined cognitively and emotionally to accept and acquire a distinct plan of action to change the current condition. There are five dimensions from readiness to change, which are change self-efficacy, personal valence, senior leadership support, organizational valence, and discrepancy (Holt et al., 2007). Change self-efficacy is a condition where an individual feels that he or she possesses the skills and ability to finalize the tasks that in the end will bring perspective change. Meanwhile, personal valence is a condition where an individual feels that there is no foreseeable benefit for himself or herself, regarding the finalization of the prospective change. Additionally, senior leadership support is the extent where one feels that the organization’s leadership and management are fully dedicated and support the execution of the prospective change. Furthermore, organizational valence is the circumstances where an individual feels that the organization will benefit from a successful change. Lastly, discrepancy refers to the condition where an individual feels that there are acceptable reasons and needs for the change with the prospect.

This study has the purpose to seek the effect of battalion commander's leadership styles on the soldiers' readiness to change. The result will also determine the scale of the effect of the battalion commander's leadership style on the soldier's readiness to change. Hence, the senior leaders of TNI AD could generalize the result of this study as a foundation of the organization's development and change, where soldiers are the backbone for the success of TNI AD's development and change.

METHODS
Subject
The subjects in this study were soldiers (n=303) from the Xth Infantry Battalion. Xth infantry battalion was chosen due to its main capability as a raider infantry battalion, where most of the infantry battalion in Indonesia is a raider infantry battalion. The other main reason would be that the Xth infantry battalion function as the primary infantry battalion in its military command. The sample comprised of officers, non-commissioned officers, and soldiers, randomly taken from every unit, but complying with the percentage set for each unit and ranks. The data were collected from various units of the Xth Infantry Battalion. They were given informed consent and sign the agreement as voluntary participants in the research. The criteria for participating were active soldiers, has joined the army for at least one year, and signed the informed consent. All the subjects in this study are male.

Instruments
The instrument used in this study was The Multilevel Leadership Inventory Short
Form 5X (MLI-5X), invented by Bass & Riggio, which consisted of 45 items that measure 7 components of the three styles of FLR leadership. It has a fairly good level of reliability (> 0.7). The MLI-5X has been adapted into Indonesian through the method of back translation and expert assessment. Furthermore, the MLI-5X was purchased through Mindgarden.com. Meanwhile, the instrument used for readiness to change was an instrument developed by Holt. Permissions were received to use and develop the readiness to change scale. The questionnaire consists of 25 items that represented five dimensions of readiness to change. This readiness to change scale has a fairly high level of reliability. The same process was applied to this questionnaire as with the MLI-5X, which are back translation and expert assessment.

**Research Method**

Both instruments were tested for their validity using Pearson Product Moment and tested for their reliability using Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficient. The leadership style of the Xth infantry battalion commander will be determined by comparing the survey result means of the three styles of FLR model leadership. Furthermore, a classical assumption test, which consists of a normality test, heteroscedasticity test, and linearity test will be conducted before seeking the effect of the two variables. The normality tests applied are the normality probability plot test and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Furthermore, a heteroscedasticity test using scatter plot test and Glejser test will be conducted. Lastly, for the classical assumption test, the linearity test will be executed by using the linearity test and analysis of variance (Anova) table. And only after completing those classical assumption tests, t-test seeking for the effect and coefficient of determinant analysis seeking the scale of the effect will be conducted.

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

The results show that the highest mean is transformational leadership, compared to transactional leadership and laissez-faire (Table 1). The lowest mean is laissez-faire with a mean of 0.58. Based on the mean result comparison of the three leadership styles, it reveals that the Xth infantry battalion commander’s leadership style is transformational leadership. Even though the category of Xth infantry battalion commander leadership style falls into transformational leadership, Xth infantry battalion commander still demonstrated transactional and laissez-faire leadership style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Mean of leadership style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: SPSS 23 Data Processed by Author, 2021*

**Validity test**

The validity test used in this study was Pearson Correlation (Pearson Product Moment) using SPSS Statistics 23 software. If the coefficient between the item and the total items is equal to or above the r-table then the item is declared valid. However, if the correlation value of the item is below the r-table then the item is declared invalid. Moreover, the r-table is obtained by a degree of freedom calculation (df) = n-2.0, where n is the number of research samples of 303 respondents. The magnitude of the degree of freedom (df) = 303-2 = 301. With df = 301 and alpha = 0.05, thus r-table value is 0.113. The result for each question item r-count value is above the r-table value, thus concluded that every question item on the transformational leadership variable declared valid. Whereas for readiness to change items, each question item r-count value is above the r-table value. Thus concluded that every question item on readiness to change variable declared valid.
Therefore, both transformational leadership and the readiness to change scale are valid.

Reliability Test
In this study, the reliability test used was Cronbach's alpha coefficient method with the help of SPSS 23 software. Cronbach's alpha coefficient method is the most commonly used method to evaluate internal consistency. The instrument is reliable if the Cronbach's Alpha has a value of > 0.6 and the higher the alpha coefficient, the better the instrument's ability to measure the object. All variables have a Cronbach's Alpha value greater than 0.6. Therefore, all research variables, which are transformational leadership and readiness to change, have met the criteria for being reliable.

Assumption Test
Before analyzing the obtained data through a simple linear regression test, the data must pass the classical assumption test, which consists of the normality test, heteroscedasticity test, and linearity test. There are two tests applied for the normality test, which are the probability plot and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The results from both tests indicated that the data has a normal distribution. Whereas for the heteroscedasticity test, the scatter plot and Glejser test was conducted, with both of the result showing that the regression model does not experience heteroscedasticity symptoms. Lastly, the results of the linearity test concluded that the regression model has met the linearity assumption requirement.

T-test Hypothesis Testing
The t-test is applied to discover the partial effect of the transformational leadership variable on the readiness to change the variable. The research hypothesis of the Impact of transformational leadership variable on readiness to change variable is as follows:

\[ H_0 : \beta_1 = 0 : \text{Transformational leadership variable has no impact on readiness to change.} \]
\[ H_1 : \beta_1 \neq 0 : \text{Transformational leadership variable has an impact on readiness to change.} \]

The test criteria use is if the value of t-count > t-table and sig. < \( \alpha = 0.05 \) then \( H_0 \) is rejected. With a significance of 5% and df = n-k = 303-2 = 301 (n= number of respondents and k= number of variables), value of t-table attained is 1.968. Results of the research can be seen in Table 2.

Simple Linear Regression Analysis
Simple linear regression analysis is applied to determine the impact of transformational leadership on readiness to change. Moreover, this simple linear regression analysis also predicts the value of transformational leadership that increases or decreases the value of readiness to change. The result of simple linear regression analysis is shown as a simple linear regression equation as follows:

\[ Y = 44,535 + 0,728 X_1 \]

Source: SPSS 23 Data Processed by Author, 2021

Coefficient of Determination Analysis
Coefficient determination analysis is applied to determine the degree of impact of transformational leadership on readiness to change. The coefficient of determination is used by squaring the coefficient. By using SPSS 23 software, the following outputs are obtained and shown in Table 3. Based on the calculations in Table 3, it can be seen that the impact of the transformational leadership variable on the readiness to change variable is 0.502 or 50.2%. Meanwhile, the remaining 49.8% given by other factors’ impact, which is not explained in this study.
Table 2. T-test Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>tt</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>44.535</td>
<td>2.502</td>
<td>17.800</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trans. Leadership</td>
<td>.728</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>17.403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Readiness to Change

Source: SPSS 23 Data Processed by Authors, 2021

Table 3. Coefficient Of Determination Test Model Summaryb

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.708a</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>7.82280</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Transformational_Leadership
b. Dependent Variable: Readiness_To_Change

Source: SPSS 23 Data Processed by Authors, 2021

Discussion
Based on the mean result comparison of the three leadership styles, it reveals that the X\textsuperscript{th} infantry battalion commander’s leadership style is transformational leadership. This is because the result of the transformational leadership of 2.67 is higher than transactional leadership (2.02) and laissez-faire (0.58).

According to the processing result, it can be seen that the t-count generated by the transformational leadership variable is 17.403 and the significance is 0.000. Then, these results indicate that t-count > t-table, namely 17.403 > 1.968 with significance level of 0.000 < 0.05, it is believed that $H_0$ is rejected. Therefore, it is concluded that there is an impact of the transformational leadership variable of the X\textsuperscript{th} infantry battalion commander on the readiness to change of his soldiers.

Moreover, the simple linear regression analysis showed that the transformational leadership of the infantry battalion commander has a positive effect on the readiness to change of its members. The constant value ($\alpha$) is 44.535, which means that if there is no transformational leadership value, the value of the readiness to change variable is 44.535. It can also be interpreted that if it is assumed that the transformational leadership variable is 0, then the value of the readiness to change variable remains at 44.535. Besides, the transformational leadership regression coefficient showed a positive value of 0.728, which means that if the transformational leadership of the X\textsuperscript{th} infantry battalion commander increases, it will increase the readiness to change of the infantry battalion members with a value of 72.8%. The rate of readiness to change improvement of the X\textsuperscript{th} infantry battalion soldiers is equal to the value of the increase multiplied by the regression coefficient value (0.728) of the transformational leadership of the X\textsuperscript{th} infantry battalion commander.

As seen on the analysis conducted for the coefficient of determination, the magnitude of the transformational leadership of the X\textsuperscript{th} infantry battalion
commander impact on the readiness to change of the Xth infantry battalion soldiers is only 0.502 or 50.2%. Meanwhile, the remaining 49.8% is the influence given by other factors that need further examination. From these data, it is clear that the transformational leadership of the Xth infantry battalion commander is a major factor in soldiers’ readiness to change. Hence, transformational leadership is a variable that must be considered, to increase soldiers’ readiness to change.

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The leadership style demonstrated by the Xth infantry battalion commander was transformational leadership. Furthermore, a positive effect from the Xth infantry battalion commander’s transformational leadership on soldiers’ readiness to change was concluded. This positive effect comes with a transformational leadership regression coefficient of 0.728. Moreover, the Xth infantry battalion commander’s transformational leadership is a major factor in the soldiers’ readiness to change by 50.2%. Xth infantry battalion commander’s behavior, such as setting examples, active communication, setting clear goals, and intellectual stimulation, has driven his soldiers' readiness to change. Findings of this study could be applied as the foundation to enhance TNI AD soldiers' readiness to change, to develop and change TNI AD to meet the ever-changing dynamics of armed conflict.

This is a preliminary study to seek the effect of battalion commander’s leadership style on soldiers’ readiness to change in one battalion, ceteris paribus. This study has only covered transformational leadership, leaving out the other two leadership styles. Lastly, this study has only determined the positive effect of transformational leadership of Xth battalion commander on soldiers’ readiness to change, and not yet elaborate on how to enhance both transformational leadership and readiness to change.

To make a further generalization, future studies on other battalions should be carried out. Furthermore, similar studies of other combat arms should be conducted to attain a broader understanding of this issue in the context of TNI AD. For future studies, seeking the effect of transformational leadership’s dimensions on readiness to change’s dimensions could be conducted. This will be a big step in determining intervention to enhance TNI AD soldiers’ readiness to change through the transformational leadership of their leaders. Because in the end, soldiers’ readiness to change must be increased to boost the development and adaptability for TNI AD. Lastly, future studies could be carried out at the strategic level of leadership, since a higher level of leadership should have a greater impact on the soldiers.
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Appendix

Readiness to change questionnaire

1. I think that our battalion will benefit from this change.
2. It doesn’t make much sense for us to initiate this change.
3. There are legitimate reasons for us to make this change.
4. This change will improve our battalion’s overall efficiency.
5. There are some rational reasons for this change to be made.
6. In the long run, I feel it will be worthwhile for me if our battalion adopts this change.
7. This change makes my job easier.
8. When this change is implemented, I don’t believe there is anything for me to gain.
9. The time we are spending on this change should be spent on something else.
10. This change matches the priorities of our battalion.
11. Our battalion commander has encouraged all of us to embrace this change.
12. Our battalion commander has put all his support behind this change effort.
13. Our battalion commander has stressed the importance of this change.
14. Our battalion commander is committed to this change.
15. I think we are spending a lot of time on this change when our battalion commander doesn’t even want it implemented.
16. Battalion commander has sent a clear signal this organization is going to change.
17. I do not anticipate any problems adjusting to the work I will have when this change is adopted.
18. Some tasks will be required when we change that I don’t think I can do well.
19. When we implement this change, I feel I can handle it with ease.
20. I have the skills that are needed to make this change work.
21. When I set my mind to it, I can learn everything that will be required when this change is adopted.
22. My past experiences make me confident that I will be able to perform successfully after this change is made.
23. I am worried I will lose some of my statuses in my battalion when this change is implemented.
24. This change will disrupt many of the personal relationships I have developed.
25. My future in this position will be limited because of this change.