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ABSTRACT
This paper aims to examine mindfulness as a potential mediator of readiness for change to work performance among health workers such as nurses, doctors, and back offices in hospitals in Indonesia. We are using the quantitative method in this research. The partial least square-structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) approach analyzed the data. The population is 206 health workers in Indonesia as a sample of research. A direct and indirect correlation between readiness for change to work performance through mindfulness value is 0.736 with β 15.731. Mindfulness is proven to function as a mediator moderate.
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Introduction
In general, research in organizational industry psychology and organizational behavior emphasizes the positive implications for employee well-being and performance, mainly through the benefits of self-control on the changes taking place within and outside and within the organization's work. The Covid-19 pandemic has brought tremendous disruption to industry and health organizations locally and globally.

In Indonesia, the coronavirus pandemic struck in full force in March 2020 and is still ongoing, affecting daily work. In the Covid-19 pandemic, health workers' work performance becomes very large because dealing directly with patients exposed to Covid-19 is not uncommon for health workers exposed and dying; this should be appreciated. Working as a health worker seems to be getting more and more stressful in critical situations, posing a risk to mental health; causes of anxiety in health workers due to high job demands including long working time, an increasing number of patients. Stewart & Diebold (2017) examines how stressful situations can affect performance and how we can reach our potential regardless.

The work performance of health workers depends on psychological capacity and readiness for change. Performance seems to be a fundamental part of the human experience, according to Davies et al. (2013) in his book on Human Performance, showing that "man was born to do." Health workers' performance exceeds their supposed shifts, and many medical personnel is employed and placed in new specialties even with more significant difficulties than before (Sarre et al., 2020). In addition to serving regular patients and Covid-19, health workers are also faced with changes in service performance, namely services through technology in the field of
health through telemedicine. Covid-19 has optimized technology to empower patients, even in remote areas, to access quality and fast healthcare to deal with rising demands, equality in declining resources, and demand for more public accountability. Health workers must keep up with the rapid advances in technology and knowledge to provide better patient care and enhance their quality of work (Bindon, 2017; Kutzin & Janicke, 2015; Pool et al., 2015).

The problem is how health workers perceive these changes to improve their performance at work. Employee perception of the change efforts in the organization is an essential aspect of change readiness. In addition, the perception of employee readiness of an organization to change has been identified as one of the critical factors in understanding the source of resistance to large-scale Change (Eby et al., 2000). In this case, employees must modify their daily routines and gain up-to-date knowledge to handle heavy workloads in the final period (Tummers et al., 2015).

Readiness for Change health workers become vital to achieving the organization's performance. Wanberg & Banas (2000) state that employees strongly influence the acceptance of the Change. Likewise, as Desplaces (2005) said, employees' Readiness for Change in the face of change will be the driving force that gives positive results. In interpreting the changes that occur, it is essential for health workers who participate in increasing the institutional capacity of the organization in order to be following the conditions of Change; it must be able to see the phenomenon of Change that provides an opportunity to explore what is in the Change, starting with an adequate view of the organization and the surrounding environment so that it will make it easier to deal with changes that provide opportunities to explore what is in the Change, starting with an adequate view of the organization and the surrounding environment, so that it will make it easier to deal with changes that are happening.

Individual differences involve individual and collective attitudes, beliefs, and intentions in seeing Change. In the psychology literature, individual differences factors are often framed in terms. Alternatively, psychological states occur at the individual and organizational levels. (Weiner et al., 2008). Consideration of efforts to integrate certain practices into the work of health workers, namely through an essential element of readiness to make such changes, is through the attitude of each health worker about the Change. Although much research centers around these antecedent variables explaining the adequate performance of workers, studies examining the role of health worker job performance and personal characteristics in terms of Mindfulness traits are not adequately discussed in some literature. However, in a study conducted by Şahin et al. (2020) on mindfulness in Turkey, the results showed that Mindfulness is positively associated with thriving and contextual performance. Furthermore, Mindfulness is indirectly related to contextual performance via thriving.

Mindfulness is generally described as a relaxed state of mind that allows individuals to engage attentively in the present moment (Langer & Moldoveanu, 2000). According to Brown et al. (2011), Mindfulness can be considered a personality trait (trait Mindfulness). Although psychology and organizational research have studied the nature of Mindfulness extensively, some research gaps remain. Nevertheless, recent research has begun to explore the advantageous effects of trait Mindfulness on Work Performance directly (Hafenbrack & Vohs, 2018; King & Haar, 2017; Lomas et al., 2017). The scope of the work context is limited to research on Mindfulness as a mediator in the Work Performance of health workers is still lacking. Most research tends to focus on its effects on stress and well-being. (Charoensukmongkol & Puyod, 2020; Chen & Murphy, 2019; Koopmann-Holm et al., 2020; Voci et al., 2019), and research by Merdiaty & Aldrin, (2020). But. There is exciting research finding as research conducted by Noetel et al. (2019) that his research found that the influence of mindfulness as a mediator serves very low on athlete performance. Several studies have found a significant effect of attention and acceptance interventions to promote awareness, flow, and current performance and reduce competitive anxiety. So, it is interesting to re-examine whether mindfulness can still serve as a mediator in the post-covid-19.

**Literature Review**

**Theoretical and Conceptual Background**

**Work Performance**

Explaining Work Performance must be appropriate in all strategies and interventions used. In industrial-organizational psychology, all strategies and interventions must be used to improve human performance in the work organization. Work Performance defines the total expected value of the organization of the discrete behavioral episodes that an individual carries out over a standard period (Kell et al., 2014). Also, it describes two conceptual and practical advantages to tying the performance construct to an individual behavior instead of to the results of that behavior. First, it states of people that Change in individual behavior is also affected by other factors, not under the performer's control. Second, to understand how to manage job performance, probably best to construe performance as a behavioral phenomenon.

Following Campbell & Wierink's (2015) review, Work Performance is a construct that comprises behaviors under workers' control that contribute to organizational goals. These authors emphasize that performance is a set of behaviors, not the variables determining these behaviors or their outcomes. The definition is relatively open because it is the only way to describe a phenomenon that varies substantially across jobs (Aguinis et al., 2013) and time (Sackett et al., 2017)

Maresh et al. (2014) define Work Performance as behavior on how a target was achieved; Work Performance is the oriented process of the purpose directed to ensure that every organizational process maximizes the productivity of employees, team, and the organization itself. In another opinion, performance is the employees' things done or not done (Luthans & Sommer, 2005). Good
Work Performance is needed for the organization's goals to be achieved. Work Performance can say well if employees can complete their tasks effectively and efficiently (Ramos-Villagrasa et al., 2019)

According to Ramos-Villagrasa et al. (2019), Work Performance can be operationalized in many ways depending on goals, ranging from broad descriptions of behavior (e.g., showing effort, perseverance, adaptability) to narrow ones (e.g., written and oral communication, attendance, and rules). For example, the meta-analysis of (Salgado et al., 2019) found ten different job-performance measures, each with its specificity. The theoretical review developed by (Koopmans et al., 2013) the researcher uses the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire (Koopmans et al., 2016) to measure task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior.

Mindfulness

Mindful individuals encounter further efficacy, self-regulation, and perceived control changes as Mindfulness prepares them for unwanted excitement and difficulties. Generally, Mindfulness is a psychological state of being attentive and non-judgementally aware of the present moment (Kabat-Zinn, 2015; Malinowski & Lim, 2015; Slutsky et al., 2017). Furthermore, it accepts the inner subjective mental experience such as feelings, thoughts, sensations, perceptions, hopes, dreams, beliefs, and attitudes (Weintraub & Dust, 2020).

The signification of Mindfulness is the quality or conscious or unconscious of something. It becomes simpler if applied to the organization; an employee is a caring person who understands every event before him (Raza et al., 2018).

Mindfulness has recently begun attracting industry attention and is widely referred to in the industrial and organizational psychology literature (IO) (Aldrin & Merdiaty, 2019). Two theoretical articles about the potential role of Mindfulness in the workplace have suggested that Mindfulness has a relevant role in work-related outcomes such as task performance, physical health, and psychology (Dane, 2011; Glomb et al., 2011). Prior research has suggested that employee Mindfulness is related to Work Performance (Shao & Skarlicki, 2009).

Mindfulness has a positive linkage to the processes essential to creativity (Colzato et al., 2012). This process, often referred to as creative process engagement indicates employee involvement in creativity-relevant methods or processes, including first problem identification, second information searching and encoding, and third idea and alternative generation (Zhang & Bartol, 2010).

A leading mindfulness theory concerning task performance is Dane's (2011) contingency theory, based on the assumption that Mindfulness widens attentional breadth (e.g., seeing more peripheral stimuli and being less focused on a specific target). The measuring Mindfulness in positive psychology is the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale, developed by Brown et al. (2011).

Readiness for Change

Employees' Readiness for Change reflects how employees tend to approve, accept, and adopt specific plans, aiming to change current circumstances. Readiness for Change is defined as "the cognitive precursor to the behaviors of either resistance to or support for change efforts (Armenakis et al., 1993). Readiness for Change employees defined as a comprehensive attitude simultaneously influenced by the content (what changes), processes (how changes are implemented), contexts (the environment in which changes occur), and employees (the characteristics of employees who are asked to change) involved in a change that the organization will do (Holt et al., 2007).

Suppose a health worker perceives that their organization fosters an environment that supports change efforts. In that case, one might expect health workers to be more willing to take risks and embrace change strategies that might increase performance. Positive behavior is a basis for health workers to deal with Readiness for Change positively or negatively by avoiding Change.

Empirical Review and Hypothesis Development

Relation between Readiness for Change to work performance

Readiness for Change can be identified from employees' positive attitudes toward Change, the perception of the overall citizens of the organization to deal with Change, and the trusted individual in the face of Change (Desplaces, 2005). Also, (Bernherth, 2004) mentioned that "Readiness is more than understanding the change, readiness is more than believing in the change, readiness is a collection of thoughts and intentions toward the specific change effort. The evidence found in the previous research that readiness for change significantly and positively affects performance (Banjongprasert, 2017; Katsaros et al., 2020).

"Based on the above exposure, it can be compilation hypothesis research as follows

H1: There is a direct influence on Readiness for Change on Work Performance

Relation between Readiness for Change to mindfulness

According to Liu et al. (2020), readiness for change is a complex multidimensional construct including individual and structural factors at differing levels. Moreover, Readiness for Change requires willingness, capability, and Mindfulness to change. An organization filled with energized individuals about an impending innovation but ill-equipped to accomplish it is no more ready than an apathetic but well-equipped one, then Work Performance will be achieved.
The research Weiner (2009) argues that readiness for change is not a homologous concept and therefore has to be explored differently on the organizational level. That is, it depicts shared attitudes and evaluations of determinants.

Gondo et al. (2013) argue that because much behavior in organizations occurs in a relatively automatic and non-conscious manner, the focus on how change recipients develop positive change beliefs regarding an explicitly formulated change is likely to be an incomplete understanding of how readiness for change develops. A complete understanding requires consideration of how change recipients develop an awareness of their automatically replicated behaviors. The article theorizes that mindfulness facilitates this awareness and suggests that there may be trade-offs in developing positive change beliefs and uncovering automatically replicated behaviors. The article concludes with suggestions regarding how these two aspects of readiness may be balanced.

Based on the above exposure, it can be compilation hypothesis research as follows.

**H2: There is a direct influence of Readiness for Change on Mindfulness**

**Relation Mindfulness to Work performance**

Trait Mindfulness is associated with job performance among restaurant servers (Dane & Brummel, 2014) and supervisors (Reb et al., 2014). A link between academic performance (overall GPA among MBA students) and trait Mindfulness was found, but only for women (Shao & Skarlicki, 2009). Middle managers receiving Mindfulness training exhibited considerable improvements in supervisor-rated work performance compared to their initial performance and a control group (Shonin et al., 2014). Similar results have been found among health care workers.

According to Liem et al. (2020), employee creativity significantly affects job performance. The mediating effect of creative process engagement and employee creativity on the linkage between mindfulness and job performance was significant.

Some findings provided empirical evidence supporting the positive relationship between Mindfulness and creativity. Nonetheless, the mediating effect of Mindfulness on the positive relationship between Readiness for Change and Work Performance has not yet been tested.

Given the several goals to achieve performance, it is tempting to research; attention will be focused on the global positive effect on performance. However, most research on performance has looked at the effects without carefully exploring the mechanisms of what exactly drives performance, most of them very psychological aspects.

According to Liddy (2021), in his research results, the mediated relationship between surface acting and five dimensions of employee performance via self-control depletion is moderated by mindfulness at the first stage. This mediated relationship is stronger for more mindful individuals.

Based on the above exposure, it can be compilation hypothesis research as follows.

**H3: There is a direct Mindfulness influence on Work Performance**

**H4: There is an indirect influence on Readiness for Change to the Work Performance through Mindfulness as a mediator.**

**Research and Methodology**

**Method**

This research used the accidental sampling technique to reach the aim and tested four hypotheses using quantitative approaches and data collection equipment using psychological scales. Research respondents were Health workers in the Hospital in Indonesia. Data analysis techniques using SEM-PLS. To obtain direct and indirect impact values using regression analysis involving the intervening variable. The employee level studied starts from the regular workers, nurses to doctors. We ensured that respondents were the health workers through the control questions on the questionnaire. This process obtained a convenience sample of responses. The partial least square structural equation model (PLS-SEM) requires a minimum sample size. G*Power was used to calculate the sample size based on statistical power. The statistical power value for this sample was 0.95, higher than the minimum requirement of 0.8 (Carranza et al., 2020; Hair et al., 2019). Therefore, the sample size in this study is considered acceptable.

**Figure 1: Research Model:** Note: RFC (readiness for change); MN (mindfulness); WP (work performance)
The respondent characteristic shows a different ratio between women 43% and men, 57% of the total respondents, 31% Diploma level, 66% Bachelor level, and 3% Master's level, representing an educated group of participants. Regarding age, 48.5% are between 25 and 35 years old, 43% are between 36 and 45 years old, and 8.5% are 46 and 56, representing the samples. 7% are regular office, 90% Nurses, and 3% doctors. The young-aged and bachelor's degrees dominated the respondents could be why mindfulness is moderately significant as a mediator. After Covid-19 had passed and the changes employees have been experiencing, almost 90% of respondents reported that they were mentally and spiritually prepared to face the Covid-19 attack for two years.

**Measuring Instruments**

In collecting the research data, the author adopts an original adapted to the local culture and develops a research instrument using a psychological scale with a Likert scale of 1 to 5. There are three scales developed and tested. To measure Work Performance researcher uses the Individual Work Performance Questionnaire from Koopmans (2015), task performance, contextual performance, and counterproductive work behavior. Mindfulness and Scale Awareness (Brown, West, Loverich, & Biegel, 2011), a size explicitly designed for and often used to measure attention to a standard population. Including participants who do not through attention training to any type who does not have a formal meditation experience (Aldrin & Merdiaty, 2019). Holt et al. (2007) explained that an employee declares themselves as Readiness for Change when they show the behavior of acceptance, embracement, and adopt plans of change done. Before an employee is ready, they should reflect on content, context, process, and individual attributes to perceive and believe the Change. All devices demonstrate satisfactory reliability with *Alpha of Cronbach* starting from 0.938 to 0.952.

**Result and Discussion**

**Result**

The research aims to test the direct and indirect influence of Readiness for Change on Work Performance through Mindfulness. In evaluating the measurement model using the SEM-PLS, firstly, we must analyze the reliability of the measurement scale. The loading indicator with their respective construct has been tested to test each item. The loading factor value should be greater than 0.708 (Joe F Hair et al., 2019). In our study, the total loadings were more significant than 0.708. Therefore, it is necessary to verify the results of other measurement indexes for the constructs of these items (Joseph F Hair et al., 2019). To assess the individual reliability of each construct, composite reliability (CR) and Dijkstra–Henseler's rho ($\rho_{A}$) were calculated. The CR value is more significant than 0.7 for all composites (Nunnally, 1994). Meanwhile, Dijkstra–Henseler rho ($\rho_{A}$) exceeds 0.7 in all cases, indicating its reliability (Joe F Hair et al., 2019). Table 1 shows the high level of internal consistency in each construct.

The next step after testing reliability is to test convergent validity utilizing average variance extracted (AVE), which must be greater than 0.5 (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). To test the significance of each loading, the bootstrap resampling procedure (5,000 subsamples of the original sample size) was determined to obtain the $t$ statistical value (Hair Jr et al., 2017). The results of loading showed significance with a confidence of 95%.

The next is to analyze the validity of the discriminant using the Fornel Larker criteria. The square root of each AVE construct value must be higher than the construct correlation with other latent variables (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). The result shows that the AVE construct value is high. There is discriminant validity when the value is below 0.90 (Henseler et al., 2015). Other criteria set the value below 0.85 (Joseph F Hair et al., 2019). The value obtained remains under the cut-off value in this study, which shows good reliability and validity (see table 1).

**Structural Model**

Collinearity should be performed before performing structural relationship analysis to ensure no bias in regression results. Ideally, the Variance inflation factor (VIF) value should be lower than 3 (Joe F Hair et al., 2019). in this study, there is no multicollinearity (see table 3).

The next step is to do structural model testing. A bootstrap procedure using 5,000 iterations evaluated the significance of indicators and path coefficients (Chin et al., 2008). Before testing the hypotheses, an assessment of the model quality was carried out. The criteria used were the coefficient of determination ($R^2$), effect size ($f^2$), cross-validated redundancy ($Q^2$), and path coefficient (Joe F Hair et al., 2019). $R^2$ measures 0.75, 0.50, and 0.25 for all endogenous structures, considered substantial, moderate, and weak. The results show that $R^2$ is 0.652. Shows that exogenous variables with moderate criteria influence of variable.

Finally, to conclude the evaluation of the structural model, the current study examines the predictive relevance of the model using Stone–Geisser's Q2 (Joseph F Hair et al., 2019). The result shows that one $Q^2$ values are above zero (see Table 3), indicating that the model has adequate predictive power. The results of the hypotheses testing using two-tailed testing. Two-tailed testing is recommended if the coefficient is assumed it is not clear in the direction (positive or negative).
Table 1: Loading Factor and level of internal consistency in each construct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construct item</th>
<th>loading</th>
<th>Cronbach’ Alpha</th>
<th>Dijkstra–Henseler’s rho (ρA)</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>AVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness1</td>
<td>0.836</td>
<td>0.951</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>0.956</td>
<td>0.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness 2</td>
<td>0.823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness 3</td>
<td>0.834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness 4</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness 5</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness 6</td>
<td>0.867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness 7</td>
<td>0.866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness 8</td>
<td>0.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness 9</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness 10</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness 12</td>
<td>0.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change3</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>0.938</td>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change4</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change5</td>
<td>0.734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change6</td>
<td>0.797</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change7</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change8</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change9</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change10</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change11</td>
<td>0.700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change14</td>
<td>0.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change15</td>
<td>0.795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change16</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance1</td>
<td>0.800</td>
<td>0.952</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.958</td>
<td>0.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance2</td>
<td>0.848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance3</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance4</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance5</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance6</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance7</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance8</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance9</td>
<td>0.847</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance10</td>
<td>0.826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance11</td>
<td>0.723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance12</td>
<td>0.813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance13</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Readiness for Change directly affects Work Performance with a value of β = 0.736; T-value 15.731***

Table 2: Discriminant Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foretell-Larcker Criterion</th>
<th>Readiness for Change</th>
<th>Mindfulness</th>
<th>Work Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>0.816</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>0.797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTMT</td>
<td>Readiness for Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness</td>
<td>0.278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Performance</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note(s): The square root of AVE are shown diagonally in italic; Readiness for Change (readiness for Change); Mindfulness (mindfulness); Work Performance (work performance)
Table 3: Structural model evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T value</th>
<th>Confidence interval (95%)</th>
<th>Supported</th>
<th>Variance (R²)</th>
<th>R² Adjusted</th>
<th>Q²</th>
<th>F²</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change - Mindfulness</td>
<td>0.292</td>
<td>4.686 ***</td>
<td>0.180-0.416</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>(0.033-0.210)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mindfulness - Work Performance</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>3.757 ***</td>
<td>0.089-0.278</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.23-0.198)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change - Work Performance</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>15.731 ***</td>
<td>0.635-0.818</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0.652</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td>1.423</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>(0.827-2.389)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note(s): n = 5,000 sub-sample; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001.

VIF: variance inflation factor; Readiness for Change (readiness for Change); Mindfulness (mindfulness); Work Performance (work performance), less than 3.

Discussion

The study was to verify four planned hypotheses. All hypotheses are accepted from the results of research that the impact of mediation functions moderately. To help the health workforce work well, they feel calm with mindfulness. The initial suggestion that mindfulness would function optimally at work performance was proven, as the results were moderate. The work performance of health workers was quite good with the readiness to change from the employee himself directly. It can happen because health workers have been tested mentally and psychologically for two years during the Covid-19 period from early 2020 to 2022. This opinion is in line with previous research (Jha, 2021); (Shahbaz & Parker, 2021); (Lyddy et al., 2021). In addition, the well-being and resilience of health workers are high because of the role of the government in providing a sense of security to workers by providing vaccines simultaneously.

According to data as of April 30, 2021, from the Ministry of Health, 100% of health workers are vaccinated. In addition, the rewards of the government further strengthen the willingness to change come from itself. When the organization's readiness, in this case, the government and the organization for Change, is high, the organization members are more likely to initiate Change, exert tremendous effort, show more remarkable persistence, and display more cooperative behavior. The result is effective implementation. The ability to work is not just about how to get a job but about how to develop attributes, techniques, or experiences to live. According to Merdiaty & Aldrin (2020), the psychological connection of employees to their work has become very important in 21st-century information or economy services. In the contemporary world of work, companies recruit the best-honored employees to compete effectively. They must also be able to inspire and enable employees to apply their full abilities to their work.

Conclusion

The results of this publication were verified to be four planned hypotheses; all hypotheses were accepted. The study results found that mindfulness as a mediation impact plays a moderate role in assisting work performance. In post-Covid-19, the role of mindfulness is reduced in effect because employees have been tested and mentally and psychologically. It makes employees better understand
how to behave and realize favorable resolutions to face challenging changes in themselves and the organization. The analysis of mindfulness used as a mediator or moderator has very much attracted attention from various parties to be done.

This research has broadened our understanding of the readiness for Change to work performance through mindfulness. However, some limitations must be acknowledged. First, the R square value for Readiness for Change to Mindfulness is unsatisfactory. Many other factors affect Work Performance during and after the Covid-19 pandemic. Likewise, many indicators dropped, although the loading factor was high less than 0.7, as the role of thumbs of SEM-PLS must be equal to or high than 0.70. The other reason is that the statement instruments in the questionnaire were adopted directly, impacting the decision-making to choose because of cultural differences in the concept of thinking in Indonesia from the questionnaire instrument derived. For future research, instruments will be more suitable to be made by themselves to fit cultural conditions and research purposes. Future research is expected to distinguish employee characteristics in analyzing the effects of their work performance in post-Covid-19.
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