

## READINESS FOR CHANGE AS A MECHANISM LINKING MINDFULNESS AND LEADERSHIP STYLE WITH LECTURER'S COMMITMENT TO TEACHING ENTREPRENEURSHIPS: A STUDY OF THAILAND CONTEXT

Chanakan Chavaha<sup>1</sup>, Nutnapha Lekhawichit<sup>2\*</sup>, Krisada Chienwattanasook<sup>3</sup>,  
Kittisak Jernsittiparsert<sup>4,5,6</sup>

**Abstract:** The aim of this research is to explore the impact of mindfulness and transformational leadership (TL) on lecturer's commitment to teaching entrepreneurship (CTE) with a mechanism of readiness for change (RFC) in Thailand polytechnic institutes. The cross-section survey technique is used in this research. 169 lecturers from polytechnics were the respondents in this research. Partial least square-structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) approach was used to analyze the data. The findings have shown that RFC mediates the link between TL and CTE. Mindfulness and TL have no significant effect on CTE. The link between mindfulness and CTE is not mediated by RFC. The role of lecturers RFC should be understood by higher education. The reason for this is that RFC mediates the association between TL and CTE. This research explains the mediation of RFC to affect the association between TL and lecturers CTE in the context of Thailand polytechnics.

**Keywords-** Mindfulness, Commitment to teaching entrepreneurship, Transformational leadership, Readiness for change, Polytechnic, Thailand

---

### 1. Introduction

Growing number of higher education institutions (HEI) worldwide are offering entrepreneurship programs (EP) in order to encourage entrepreneurship as a career between students (Trivedi, 2017). In order to prepare students to engage in entrepreneurship, several EP have started in HEI. Nevertheless, research has exposed the difficulty of teaching entrepreneurship to lecturers from non-commerce faculties (Al-Laham, Souitaris, & Zerbinati, 2007). HEI like polytechnics in Thailand are not excluded. In reality, polytechnics lecturers in Thailand are less committed to TE. In 2017 only 5.7 per cent of self-employed graduates are produced by the polytechnics, as stated by the "Thailand Ministry of Education". Such data have shown that for Thailand Ministry of Education polytechnic graduates, entrepreneurship is not a major alternative to job. Because of lecturers CTE, polytechnic students' low intention to be engaged in entrepreneurship (Othman & Nasrudin,

---

<sup>1</sup> Faculty of Business Administration, Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi, Pathum Thani 12110, Thailand

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Management Science, Yala Rajabhat University, Yala 95000, Thailand

<sup>3</sup> Faculty of Business Administration, Rajamangala University of Technology Thanyaburi, Pathum Thani 12110, Thailand

<sup>4</sup> Institute of Research and Development, Duy Tan University, Da Nang 550000, Vietnam

<sup>5</sup> Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Duy Tan University, Da Nang 550000, Vietnam

<sup>6</sup> MBA School, Henan University of Economics and Law, Henan 450046, China

Corresponding author: E-mail: [nuchnapha.l@yru.ac.th](mailto:nuchnapha.l@yru.ac.th)

2012). In this regard, the study will examine the history of lecturers CTE. Nevertheless, study on lecturers CTE remains limited in research.

Research has persuaded that TL has a significant impact on attitudes and commitment of employees to improve CTE. Enriquez and Jones (2009) have clarified that efforts to the attainment of change should be made when RFC is present in an organization. Hence, mindfulness and RFC of lecturers are vital to improve the CTE. However, differential impacts of mindfulness, TL and RFC on CTE are under investigation in HEI. The aim of the current research is to explore the effect of mindfulness and TL on lecturers CTE with the mediation of RFC in order to resolve the gap in the literature. This research has added beyond the western background to the information base of the HEI. To the researcher's best knowledge, this is the first research to expand the information base of the HEI by examining the direct impact of mindfulness and TL on lecturers CTE with RFC as a mediating factor in polytechnic context in Thailand.

## **2. Theoretical Perspective and Development of Hypothesis**

Blau (1964) social exchange theory (SET) integrated with Bandura (1986) social cognitive theory (SCT) is the theoretical basis of this research. SET describes how to enhance group structure and social interaction as well as how gratitude, trust and personal responsibilities can be improved. SET fundamental principle is that individuals learn to appreciate as well as better understand public relations as well as decides whether to maintain social interactions or not (Ramkissoon & Nunkoo, 2012). The continuous repetitive cycle of advantages as well as encouraging obligations to reciprocate is social exchange among employer and employee. SET explains the behavior of the workplace and highlights social relation among lecturers and HODs. When HODs support and inspire lecturers, lecturers should improve their RFC as they appreciate and recognize the motivation from their HODs. Consequently, they will enhance their CTE.

Palacios, Gondo, and Patterson (2013) stated that mindfulness enhances RFC by increasing perceived control and self-efficiency. This statement suggests that if lecturers have a high degree of mindfulness, they will definitely increase their RFC that will further improve their CTE. SCT, on the contrary, emphasized that there are three reasons behind human actions: cognitive, behavior as well as other external and personal factors (Subich & Diegelman, 2001). SCT suggests that behavioral changes are caused by external influences, such as environmental factors. In current research, SCT describes that external factor's potential impact, like lecturers RFC and TL, contributes to their commitment to change (CTC).

## **3. Relationship between TL and CTE**

TL represents their potential to achieve organizational commitment as the ultimate model of employee influence. BinBakr and Ahmed (2015) identified the exceptional impact on individuals to the attainment of enhanced commitment as a key feature of the transformational leader. This research is the same as the research conducted by Elias, Sadeghi, and Pihie (2011) which claimed that TL increased the commitment of employees by motivating employees to be creative and innovative in their organization in order to survive. Studies have shown that TL has a direct and indirect impact on teachers' commitment to the

school mission as well as on the professional learning community. Additionally, Bourgeois and Boberg (2016) emphasized that TL leads to positive outcomes, including high level of capability, motivation as well as commitment to the development of innovative educational techniques. The effect of TL and TC on public schools in Malaysia has been examined in a previous research (Ibrahim & Ling, 2013). The findings showed that TL practiced by senior teachers affected TC. The transformational leader strengthens the intrinsic interest of workers in order to increase their commitment to the organization (Minon, 2014). Keeping in view the above discussions, we propose the following hypothesis:

H1: TL has a positive and significant impact on CTE.

#### **4. Relationship between Mindfulness and CTE**

The mechanism in which a person looks at the condition from a particular point of view is mindfulness (Langer, 2014). A mindful teacher is a person who emphasizes the procedure in comparison to the orientation of the response. As Sun (2015) pointed out, teaching commitment is a higher degree of affection of individual for teaching careers. Sternberg (1997) found that students learning would be influenced by mindful teaching. As far as we know, this is the first study to investigate the impact of lecturer's mindfulness on CTE in a polytechnic environment. Individuals in various sectors have discovered that mindfulness is beneficial to their tasks, including medicine (Dobe, 2007), education (McCormick, White, & Kernochan, 2007) and law (McCormick et al., 2007). Mindfulness tends to make the boring teaching activities more enjoyable as well as assist teachers meet their own students' expectations. Moreover, the mindfulness of individuals enhances the well-being of the employees, job performance, job satisfaction and reduces tension related to illness and attrition in the educational sector (Medina, Lomas, Rupprecht, Ivztan, & Eiroa-Orosa, 2017). Keeping in view the above discussions, we propose the following hypothesis:

H2: Mindfulness has a positive and significant impact on CTE.

#### **5. The Relationship between mindfulness and CTE is Mediated by RFC**

Mindful individuals encounter further changes in efficacy, self-regulation and perceived control as mindfulness affects individuals to prepare themselves for undesirable excitement and difficulties. RFC can be enhanced by mindfulness as mindful individuals continue to practice self-efficacy change (Scott, Amel, & Manning, 2009). Organizational changes are always taking place and workers should do their job carefully to ensure that the changes are successful. Through way of mindfulness, the emphasis is on internal and external current incidents. Therefore, individuals are centered and ready to improve. As a result, RFCs can be enhanced by mindfulness as mindful individual encounter experiences in more than one sense, as well as by evaluating impacts if they do not engage in change efforts. Therefore, RFC influences the commitment of employees. Keeping in view the above discussions, we propose the following hypothesis:

H3: The relationship between mindfulness and CTE is positively mediated by RFC.

## 6. The Relationship between TL and CTE is Mediated by RFC

The literature review of organizational change emphasized leadership characteristics. Griffiths, Jimmieson, and Jones (2005) said the quality of leadership and communication skills of leaders are key factors that improve RFC between employees. TL provides support for changing employees' basic values, attitudes and beliefs. The readiness is usually vital for effective change in an organization. Griffiths, Jones, and Jimmieson (2005) stated that the top management would not achieve meaningful results in a timely manner when individuals are engaged with their work and reluctant to acknowledge organizational changes. Acceptance and RFC are therefore key elements of the organization that require immediate attention. Niazi, Bakari, and Hunjra (2017) argued that leadership affects RFC as well as improves employee's commitment. This is in line with Kim, Min, and Park (2016) research which suggested that staff are highly influenced by their CTC as a result of their leadership and their successful communication with all respondents in the implementation of the change. Several studies have shown that TL has a positive effect on workers, which is related to commitment and RFC. The role of the leader in personal qualities and TL behavior in resisting major organizational change between 579 school teachers and 76 school principals has been investigated (Naveed & Saleem, 2017). Findings show that the intention of teachers to resist organizational changes has a negative relationship with the openness of their principles to change TL behaviors and values. Pro-change behavior can be enhanced by TL, which improves staff's commitment to change (Masal & Weiherl, 2016). Keeping in view the above discussions, we propose the following hypothesis:

H4: The relationship between TL and CTE is positively mediated by RFC.

## 7. Methodology

### Sample

A cross sectional quantitative survey research design is used in this study. The survey was conducted in 8 Thailand polytechnics and the participants were lecturers who teach entrepreneurship or subjects related to the factors of entrepreneurship skills. Purposive sampling technique is used in this research. There was a total of 329 lecturers from the 8 polytechnics. After getting the consent of the Center of Research and Innovation, the Human Research Ethics Committee of the University Authority, the directors of the Polytechnics and the lecturers, the questionnaires were handed out to the participants. Respondents were strictly confidential and voluntary. Nevertheless, out of 329 questionnaires only 169 questionnaires have been completed and are useful for our research. 51.6 percent was the response rate. While the sample size 169 deemed to be comparatively small, 64 sample size deemed suitable, and by utilizing statistical software 'G\*Power' we can calculate it with an effect size of 0.10 and a power of 0.80 (Faul et al., 2009). Therefore, in this research to perform analysis sample size of 169 is deemed adequate.

### Measurement Scales

The current research has adopted the TL scale of Thien, Abdullah, and Yeap (2020), that was originally adapted from "Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ) Form 5X-Short" (Avolio & Bass, 1995). As the TL scale is validated in the context of the Thailand polytechnic, we have adopted the measurement scale from Thien et al. (2020). This TL

measurement scale has 4 dimensions: idealized behavior (three items), idealized attributes (three items), individualized consideration (ten items) and inspirational motivation (four items). Responses have been calculated using a 5-point Likert type scale from 1 = not at all to 5 = always. “Spend time coaching subordinates” is the sample item. Similarly, 25 items adopted from the RFC questionnaire by Armenakis, Holt, Harris, and Feild (2007) used to calculate RFC. Armenakis et al. (2007) measure 4 dimensions of RFC: personal valence (three items), management support (six items), appropriateness (ten items) and change self-efficacy (six items). The responses were measured on a 6-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1 to 6 (strongly disagree-strongly agree). “This change makes my teaching job easier” is the sample item.

Likewise, mindfulness can be calculated by the twelve (12) items developed from Thien et al. (2020) which were originally developed from the “Mindful Attention Awareness Scale” (MAAS) developed by Ryan and Brown (2003). Mindfulness has three (3) dimensions: concentration (three items), intentional (two items) and identification of own experience (seven items). Responses were measured using 6-point Likert type scale from 1 to 6 (almost always-almost never). “I could not concentrate sometimes” is the sample item. In addition, CTE has been calculated using twenty four (24) items developed from “Teaching Commitment Scale of Health and Physical Education” (TCS-HPE) by Lin, Pan, and Hsu (2012). Four dimensions of CTE have been calculated by Baeley (2006): tendency towards work continuation (six items), teaching identification (six items), teaching involvement (five items), and teaching objectives (seven items). Responses have been calculated using 6-point Likert type scale, ranging from 1 to 6 (strongly disagree-strongly agree). “I do my best to participate in entrepreneurship program” is the sample item.

### **Analysis of Data**

In order to analyze the data, this research use PLS-SEM with Smart PLS 3.0 (Becker, Wende, & Ringle, 2015). Partial least squares – structural equation modeling is a latent variable modeling method used to enhance the dependent variable explained variance (Hair Jr, Hult, Sarstedt, & Ringle, 2017). PLS-SEM has a dominant role in managing higher order variables in comparison to covariance-based SEM (CB-SEM) (Hair, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2011). In addition, partial least squares – structural equation modeling do not require data to be normally distributed, and its benefit in this analysis is that it has a high statistical power with a low sample size. Moreover, PLS-SEM involves a 2-step methodology, i.e. measurement model assessment and the structural model assessment. The assessment of data begins with the reflective variable of first order, which includes the evaluation of convergent validity (CV), discriminant validity (DV), internal consistency and indicator reliability. The same process has been carried out for the 2nd order formative variable, which includes the evaluation of the importance of the indicator weights, the collinearity of the indicator and the convergent validity.

Firstly, composite reliability (CR) was used to evaluate the internal consistency of the reflective measurement model. For CR, the appropriate value is 0.70 and higher (Hair Jr et al., 2017). Likewise, to evaluate indicator reliability, the significant outer loading must be 0.70 or above. AVE is the extent of latent construct used to evaluate CV that shows the variance in its variables. The value of average variance extracted must be greater than 0.50



(Fornell & Larcker, 1981). DV refers to the level of the variable that differs exactly by empirical standards from other variables. Fornell–Larcker criterion is used to measure it. The average variance extracted of every variable must be higher than its highest link with other variables.

Redundancy analysis (RA) has been used to investigate the CV of formative variables, for the formative measurement model analysis. RA use formatively measured variables as independent constructs to estimate dependent construct that is operationalized using one or more reflective indicators. At least 0.70 and higher should be the strength of the path coefficient relating two variables. Moreover, collinearity occurs when there are two strongly correlated formative indicators. For each indicator, the variance inflation factor (VIF) value must be less than 5. Absolute significance is measured by the outer loading of the formative item when the outer weights of the item are non significant. The item will remain if the outer weight of the item is non significant but the outer loading is greater than 0.50 (Hult, Hair Jr, Sarstedt, & Ringle, 2016). Secondly, the structural model evaluation includes path relation estimation among variables. Furthermore, the mediation effect was examined by bootstrapping.

## 8. Findings of the Study

### Common Method Variance (CMV)

CMV is referred to as a variance attributable to the method of measurement in relation to the variables of interest (MacKenzie, Podsakoff, Podsakoff, & Lee, 2003). Common method variance occurs when respondent is the single source of getting data for independent as well as dependent constructs within the same measurement context, characteristics and same item context. The Harman's single-factor analysis is performed in this research to analyze the common method variance. The post hoc process is Harman's single-factor analysis that collects data (Eichorn, 2014). Using the eigen value above 1.0, the unrotated principal component factor test is carried out in this research. The total variance was 80.25 percent of the 15 distinctive factors as shown in the results. 37.49 percent of the variance is accounted by the first factor, which is not more than 50 percent of item's total variance. Therefore, the main problem in this analysis was not the common method variance.

### Measurement Model Assessment (Reflective)

As shown in Table 1, the value of all items exceeds the recommended threshold value of 0.7. Five (5) items loading less than 0.70 were deleted. Reflective variables items loading: tendency towards work continuation (TT), teaching objectives (TO), teaching involvement (TN), teaching identification (TI), personal valence (PV), management support (MS), intentional (IN), inspirational motivation (IM), identification of own experiences (IE), individual consideration (IC), idealized behaviors (IB), idealized attributes (IA), change self-efficacy (CS), concentration (CO) and appropriateness (AP), were more than the suggested threshold value of 0.7. As shown in Table 1, it ranged from 0.719 to 0.959. For reflective variables, an average variance extracted was required. It ranges from 0.601 to 0.859. As indicated in Table 1, all average variance extracted values were more than the suggested threshold value of 0.5. The average variance extracted square roots were greater than correlations among the variables and remaining variables in path model. Hence, it indicates

that all variables of the first order construct were the suitable measures of the distinctive concept.

Table 1 Result of Measurement Model

| Lower Order Components                  | Indicators | Loadings | AVE   | CR    |
|---|------------|----------|-------|-------|
| Tendency towards work continuation (TT) | TT_1       | 0.819    | 0.749 | 0.950 |
|   | TT_2       | 0.910    |       |       |
|   | TT_3       | 0.859    |       |       |
|   | TT_4       | 0.819    |       |       |
|   | TT_5       | 0.879    |       |       |
|   | TT_6       | 0.910    |       |       |
| Teaching objectives (TO)                | TO_7       | 0.935    | 0.828 | 0.969 |
|   | TO_8       | 0.948    |       |       |
|   | TO_9       | 0.959    |       |       |
|   | TO_10      | 0.909    |       |       |
|   | TO_11      | 0.928    |       |       |
|   | TO_12      | 0.920    |       |       |
|   | TO_13      | 0.781    |       |       |
| Teaching involvement (TN)               | TN_14      | 0.829    | 0.739 | 0.948 |
|   | TN_15      | 0.818    |       |       |
|   | TN_16      | 0.890    |       |       |
|   | TN_17      | 0.888    |       |       |
|   | TN_18      | 0.859    |       |       |
| Teaching identification (TI)            | TI_19      | 0.870    | 0.820 | 0.968 |
|   | TI_20      | 0.895    |       |       |
|   | TI_21      | 0.920    |       |       |
|   | TI_22      | 0.930    |       |       |
|   | TI_23      | 0.918    |       |       |
|   | TI_24      | 0.889    |       |       |
| Personal valence (PV)                   | PV_1       | 0.889    | 0.849 | 0.960 |
|   | PV_2       | 0.948    |       |       |
|   | PV_3       | 0.950    |       |       |
| Management support (MS)                 | MS_4       | 0.850    | 0.709 | 0.950 |

|  |       |       |       |       |
|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|  | MS_5  | 0.840 |       |       |
|  | MS_6  | 0.890 |       |       |
|  | MS_7  | 0.889 |       |       |
|  | MS_8  | 0.838 |       |       |
|  | MS_9  | 0.817 |       |       |
| Appropriateness (AP)                   | AP_10 | 0.791 | 0.710 | 0.959 |
|  | AP_11 | 0.879 |       |       |
|  | AP_12 | 0.818 |       |       |
|  | AP_13 | 0.860 |       |       |
|  | AP_14 | 0.849 |       |       |
|  | AP_15 | 0.788 |       |       |
|  | AP_16 | 0.860 |       |       |
|  | AP_17 | 0.790 |       |       |
|  | AP_18 | 0.880 |       |       |
|  | AP_19 | 0.882 |       |       |
| Change self-efficacy (CS)              | CS_20 | 0.830 | 0.789 | 0.967 |
|  | CS_21 | 0.895 |       |       |
|  | CS_22 | 0.920 |       |       |
|  | CS_23 | 0.888 |       |       |
|  | CS_24 | 0.889 |       |       |
|  | CS_25 | 0.890 |       |       |
| Intentional (IN)                       | IN_1  | 0.930 | 0.819 | 0.910 |
|  | IN_2  | 0.890 |       |       |
| Identification of own experiences (IE) | IE_4  | 0.750 | 0.601 | 0.920 |
|  | IE_5  | 0.740 |       |       |
|  | IE_7  | 0.820 |       |       |
|  | IE_9  | 0.759 |       |       |
| Concentration (CO)                     | CO_10 | 0.940 | 0.859 | 0.949 |
|  | CO_11 | 0.950 |       |       |
|  | CO_12 | 0.910 |       |       |
| Individual consideration (IC)          | IC_1  | 0.780 | 0.629 | 0.947 |



---

|                               |       |       |       |       |
|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|                               | IC_2  | 0.729 |       |       |
|                               | IC_3  | 0.750 |       |       |
|                               | IC_4  | 0.790 |       |       |
|                               | IC_5  | 0.871 |       |       |
|                               | IC_6  | 0.819 |       |       |
|                               | IC_7  | 0.778 |       |       |
|                               | IC_9  | 0.789 |       |       |
|                               | IC_10 | 0.830 |       |       |
| Inspirational motivation (IM) | IM_11 | 0.889 | 0.789 | 0.940 |
|                               | IM_12 | 0.878 |       |       |
|                               | IM_13 | 0.891 |       |       |
|                               | IM_14 | 0.879 |       |       |
| Idealized behaviors (IB)      | IB_15 | 0.719 | 0.710 | 0.880 |
|                               | IB_16 | 0.915 |       |       |
|                               | IB_17 | 0.869 |       |       |
| Idealized attributes (IA)     | IA_18 | 0.869 | 0.718 | 0.890 |
|                               | IA_19 | 0.850 |       |       |

---

Table 2 Discriminant Validity (Fornel Larcker Criterion)

| Constructs | AP           | CO           | CS           | IA           | IB           | IC           | IE           | IM           | IN           | MS           | PV           | TI           | TN           | TO           | TT           |
|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| AP         | <b>0.839</b> |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| CO         | 0.218        | <b>0.930</b> |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| CS         | 0.750        | 0.189        | <b>0.890</b> |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| IA         | 0.390        | 0.131        | 0.440        | <b>0.849</b> |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| IB         | 0.489        | 0.119        | 0.429        | 0.710        | <b>0.838</b> |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| IC         | 0.519        | 0.189        | 0.518        | 0.720        | 0.660        | <b>0.799</b> |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| IE         | 0.270        | 0.670        | 0.260        | 0.180        | 0.188        | 0.259        | <b>0.780</b> |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| IM         | 0.539        | 0.118        | 0.471        | 0.629        | 0.740        | 0.790        | 0.219        | <b>0.891</b> |              |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| IN         | 0.189        | 0.359        | 0.178        | 0.209        | 0.210        | 0.350        | 0.410        | 0.260        | <b>0.910</b> |              |              |              |              |              |              |
| MS         | 0.788        | 0.160        | 0.750        | 0.470        | 0.540        | 0.569        | 0.239        | 0.642        | 0.189        | <b>0.845</b> |              |              |              |              |              |
| PV         | 0.720        | 0.219        | 0.870        | 0.378        | 0.428        | 0.482        | 0.239        | 0.429        | 0.158        | 0.688        | <b>0.918</b> |              |              |              |              |
| TI         | 0.679        | 0.169        | 0.562        | 0.330        | 0.409        | 0.449        | 0.219        | 0.430        | 0.159        | 0.559        | 0.580        | <b>0.910</b> |              |              |              |
| TN         | 0.578        | 0.265        | 0.580        | 0.390        | 0.455        | 0.490        | 0.268        | 0.419        | 0.135        | 0.582        | 0.569        | 0.709        | <b>0.859</b> |              |              |
| TO         | 0.610        | 0.220        | 0.541        | 0.269        | 0.359        | 0.389        | 0.240        | 0.370        | 0.089        | 0.590        | 0.568        | 0.777        | 0.829        | <b>0.909</b> |              |
| TT         | 0.519        | 0.221        | 0.588        | 0.358        | 0.390        | 0.370        | 0.281        | 0.272        | 0.270        | 0.511        | 0.650        | 0.580        | 0.690        | 0.659        | <b>0.870</b> |

### Assessment of formative second-order constructs

TL, RFC and CTE have corresponding path coefficients values of 0.940, 0.967 and 0.958. It can be stated that the variables formative indicators should contribute adequately to the intended content. The VIF values below than 5 are shown in Table 3. Therefore, collinearity among formative indicators is not an issue. Except for the variables TN, TO, CS, IA and IM, all the outer weights of the variables were significant. The outer loadings of each variable were higher than 0.50.

Table 3 Results of Formative Higher Order Components

| Constructs | Indicators | Weights | t-values of outer weights | Outer loading | t-values of outer loading | VIF   |
|------------|------------|---------|---------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|-------|
| TL         | IC         | 0.559   | 2.920                     | 0.929         | 17.601                    | 3.389 |
|            | IA         | -0.078  | 0.425                     | 0.740         | 7.959                     | 2.579 |
|            | IM         | 0.190   | 0.878                     | 0.895         | 15.269                    | 3.458 |
|            | IB         | 0.417   | 1.989                     | 0.869         | 12.492                    | 2.760 |
| RFC        | AP         | 0.390   | 2.492                     | 0.930         | 23.060                    | 3.269 |
|            | CS         | 0.050   | 0.271                     | 0.875         | 19.560                    | 4.889 |
|            | MS         | 0.348   | 2.310                     | 0.909         | 24.410                    | 3.160 |
|            | PV         | 0.320   | 2.059                     | 0.880         | 18.311                    | 4.158 |
| CTE        | TI         | 0.470   | 3.071                     | 0.910         | 17.470                    | 2.530 |
|            | TN         | 0.230   | 1.170                     | 0.879         | 19.725                    | 3.769 |
|            | TO         | 0.100   | 0.429                     | 0.880         | 14.339                    | 4.150 |
|            | TT         | 0.339   | 2.549                     | 0.840         | 14.320                    | 2.020 |

### Structural Model Assessment

For dependent latent constructs, the  $R^2$  values are weak, moderate and substantial at 0.25, 0.50 and 0.75 correspondingly (Sarstedt, Hair, & Ringle, 2013). For CTE, the  $R^2$  value of 0.550 indicates that 55.0 percent of the variance in CTE is explained by TL and mindfulness. Generally,  $R^2$  value of CTE 0.550 is regarded as moderate.

### Hypotheses

The direct effect among TL and CTE is not significant ( $\beta = 0.085$ ,  $t = 0.939$ ) as shown in Table 4. Therefore, hypothesis H1 is rejected. However, the path coefficient results indicate that the relationship between mindfulness and CTE is not significant ( $\beta = 0.080$ ,  $t = 1.069$ ). Thus, hypothesis H2 is also rejected. Table 5 shows that RFC mediates the relation among TL and CTE ( $\beta = 0.410$ ,  $t = 5.990$ ). Therefore, hypothesis H3 is accepted. However, RFC did not mediate the relation among mindfulness and CTE ( $\beta = 0.069$ ,  $t = 1.719$ ). Thus, hypothesis H4 is rejected.

Table 4 Summary of direct effect

| H  | Relationship     | $\beta$ values | Standard error | t-values | p-values | Result   |
|----|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| H1 | TL->CTE          | 0.085          | 0.090          | 0.939    | 0.350    | Rejected |
| H2 | Mindfulness->CTE | 0.080          | 0.068          | 1.069    | 0.279    | Rejected |

Table 5 Summary of indirect effect

| H  | Relationship          | $\beta$ values | Standard error | t-values | p-values | Result   |
|----|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------|----------|----------|
| H3 | TL->RFC->CTE          | 0.410          | 0.070          | 5.990    | 0.000    | Accepted |
| H4 | Mindfulness->RFC->CTE | 0.069          | 0.039          | 1.719    | 0.089    | Rejected |

## 9. Conclusion

Current research investigates the impact of mindfulness and TL on lecturer's CTE with mediating impact of RFC in polytechnics of Thailand. Several significant findings have been identified in this research. Firstly, the findings indicate that TL did not have an effect on CTE. Findings were not consistent with prior researches that support the impact of TL on commitment. Ibrahim and Ling (2013) noted that teacher commitment in public schools is influenced by TL. This study has a diverse workplace culture in comparison to the prior research conducted by Ibrahim and Ling (2013) in public schools and the findings can therefore be illustrated by the fact that current research focuses on polytechnics. Mansell and Fischer (2009) also found that the culture of workplace in various countries could influence major difference in association among leadership behaviors and engagement.

Secondly, findings show that CTE has not been influenced by mindfulness. The outcomes are different from those of Bair (2007), which revealed that mindfulness show positive results. For example, Harrison et al. (2016) stated outcomes show that teachers can enhance their self-compassion as well as working memory through mindfulness training. The findings can therefore be illuminated by inspiring employees with mindfulness to act according to their values and interests. Employees could therefore display negative behavior. Individuals motivated by mindfulness to perform the tasks. This can be supposed that if the lecturers had no interests in TE, then the lecturers will not be focused while TE. Their commitment will therefore be influenced. Thirdly, RFC mediates the relation among TL and CTE. The outcomes support the results of Jimmieson, Jones, and Griffiths (2005), which show that TL improves and motivates the RFC between employees. It therefore improves employee's commitment to implement change.

Fourthly, findings indicate that RFC does not mediate the relation among mindfulness and CTE. The findings are opposite to Marques, Rego, Sousa, and e Cunha (2012) research, which has shown that mindfulness probably enhance individuals RFC and thus enhance employee's commitment. Glass, Kaufman, and Arnkoff (2009) argued that mindfulness can benefit some

individuals with a certain profile and at the same time mindfulness may not benefit some individuals, could therefore justify the non-significant results. Thus, a potential reason is that mindfulness doesn't allow lecturer's to adequately prepare themselves for problems. It does not consequently affect their CTE.

### **Limitations and Implications**

Results provide managerial data to polytechnics management that they should improve the RFC of the lecturers and therefore enhance their CTE. Results indicated that department heads who have practiced TL did not directly enhance the CTE of the lecturers except to create RFC of the lecturers. The results have become a strategy for department heads for practical implications to enhance leadership as well as improve RFC of the lecturers. The results provide the higher education policymakers with a considerable insight. The higher education policy makers are therefore realized the significance of RFC of lecturers that can contribute to CTE. The current research limitation is the scale of TL used earlier in school contexts, like a research by Ibrahim and Ling (2013). In this regard, the development of a leadership questionnaire relevant to the polytechnic contexts might be useful. Secondly, there are a number of potential effects that were not investigated in the workplace. It will be very useful to discover further measures of mindfulness if researchers offer better understanding on mindfulness which is important in polytechnics framework. Thirdly, the accuracy of self-reporting data could be damaged by social desirability response bias. Therefore, future studies must involve the social desirability bias assessment. In conclusion, the current research indicates that TL in higher education should emphasize the significance of RFC because only making RFC of the lecturers can produce positive results to polytechnic context.

### **References**

- Al-Laham, A., Souitaris, V., & Zerbinati, S. (2007). Do entrepreneurship programmes raise entrepreneurial intention of science and engineering students? The effect of learning, inspiration and resources. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(4), 566-591.
- Armenakis, A. A., Holt, D. T., Harris, S. G., & Feild, H. S. (2007). Readiness for organizational change: The systematic development of a scale. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 43(2), 232-255.
- Avolio, B., & Bass, B. (1995). *MLQ multifactor leadership questionnaire*: Mind Garden.
- Baeley, R. (2006). Physical education and sport in schools: A review of benefits and outcomes. *Journal of School Health*, 76(8), 397-401.
- Bair, R. A. (2007). Mindfulness, assessment, and transdiagnostic processes. *Psychological Inquiry*, 18(4), 238-242.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA.
- Becker, J. S., Wende, S., & Ringle, C. (2015). 3 (Version 3.2. 3). *SmartPLS GmbH: Boenningstedt, Germany*.

- BinBakr, M. B., & Ahmed, E. I. (2015). An empirical investigation of faculty members' organizational commitment in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *An Empirical Investigation of Faculty Members' Organizational Commitment in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia*, 3(8), 1020-1026.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). Exchange and power in social life. New York: John Wiley and Sons. In: Inc.
- Bourgeois, S. J., & Boberg, J. E. (2016). The effects of integrated transformational leadership on achievement. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 54(3), 357-374.
- Dobe, S. (2007). Reflections on a well-traveled path: Self-awareness, mindful practice, and relationship-centered care as foundations for medical education. *Academic Medicine*, 82(4), 422-427.
- Eichorn, B. R. (2014). Common method variance techniques. *Cleveland State University, Department of Operations & Supply Chain Management. Cleveland, OH: SAS Institute Inc.*
- Elias, H., Sadeghi, A., & Pihie, Z. A. L. (2011). Analysis of head of departments leadership styles: Implication for improving research university management practices. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 29(2), 1081-1090.
- Enriquez, G., & Jones, S. (2009). Engaging the intellectual and the moral in critical literacy education: The four-year journeys of two teachers from teacher education to classroom practice. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 44(2), 145-168.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(1), 39-50.
- Glass, C. R., Kaufman, K. A., & Arnkoff, D. B. (2009). Evaluation of Mindful Sport Performance Enhancement (MSPE): A new approach to promote flow in athletes. *Journal of Clinical Sport Psychology*, 3(4), 334-356.
- Griffiths, A., Jimmieson, N. L., & Jones, R. A. (2005). The impact of organizational culture and reshaping capabilities on change implementation success: The mediating role of readiness for change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(2), 361-386.
- Griffiths, A., Jones, R. A., & Jimmieson, N. L. (2005). The impact of organizational culture and reshaping capabilities on change implementation success: The mediating role of readiness for change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(2), 361-386.
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a silver bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139-152.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. (2017). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*: Sage publications.
- Harrison, J., Taylor, C., Oberle, E., Haimovitz, K., Thomson, K., Roeser, R. W., & Schonert-Reichl, K. (2016). Examining ways that a mindfulness-based intervention reduces stress in public school teachers: A mixed-methods study. *Mindfulness*, 7(1), 115-129.
- Hult, G. T. M., Hair Jr, J. F., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. (2016). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)*: Sage publications.



- Ibrahim, M., & Ling, S. (2013). Transformational leadership and teacher commitment in secondary schools of Sarawak. *International Journal of Independent Research and Studies*, 2(2), 51-65.
- Jimmieson, N. L., Jones, R. A., & Griffiths, A. (2005). The impact of organizational culture and reshaping capabilities on change implementation success: The mediating role of readiness for change. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(2), 361-386.
- Kim, H. J., Min, H., & Park, J. (2016). Common method bias in hospitality research: A critical review of literature and an empirical study. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 56(1), 126-135.
- Langer, E. J. (2014). *Mindfulness*: Da Capo Lifelong Books.
- Lin, C.-P., Pan, Y.-H., & Hsu, W.-T. (2012). The development and examination of a teaching commitment scale for elementary school health and physical education teachers. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 70(10), 981-986.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., Podsakoff, N. P., & Lee, J.-Y. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: a critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903.
- Mansell, A., & Fischer, R. (2009). Commitment across cultures: A meta-analytical approach. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40(8), 1339-1358.
- Marques, C., Rego, A., Sousa, F., & e Cunha, M. P. (2012). Authentic leadership promoting employees' psychological capital and creativity. *Journal of business Research*, 65(3), 429-437.
- Masal, D., & Weiherl, J. (2016). Transformational leadership and followers' commitment to mission changes. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 39(11), 861-871.
- Mccormick, D. W., White, J. A., & Kernochan, R. A. (2007). Spirituality and the management teacher: Reflections of three Buddhists on compassion, mindfulness, and selflessness in the classroom. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 16(1), 61-75.
- Medina, J. C., Lomas, T., Rupperecht, S., Ivtzan, I., & Eiroa-Orosa, F. J. (2017). The impact of mindfulness on the wellbeing and performance of educators: A systematic review of the empirical literature. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 61(2), 132-141.
- Minon, M. E. (2014). The relationship between transformational leadership, perceived leader effectiveness and teachers' job satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 52(4), 509-528.
- Naveed, S., & Saleem, A. (2017). Leadership and employees reaction towards change: role of leaders' personal attributes and transformational leadership. *Pakistan Administrative Review*, 1(1), 61-82.
- Niazi, G. S. K., Bakari, H., & Hunjra, A. I. (2017). How does authentic leadership influence planned organizational change? The role of employees' perceptions: Integration of theory of planned behavior and Lewin's three step model. *Journal of Change Management*, 17(2), 155-187.

- Othman, N., & Nasrudin, N. (2012). Evaluation of polytechnic entrepreneurship programs in Malaysia. *International Journal of Trade, Economics and Finance*, 3(5), 356-362.
- Palacios, S. T., Gondo, M., & Patterson, K. D. (2013). Mindfulness and the development of a readiness for change. *Journal of Change Management*, 13(1), 36-51.
- Ramkissoon, H., & Nunkoo, R. (2012). Power, trust, social exchange and community support. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 997-1023.
- Ryan, R. M., & Brown, K. W. (2003). The benefits of being present: mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(4), 822-848.
- Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., & Ringle, C. M. (2013). Partial least squares structural equation modeling: Rigorous applications, better results and higher acceptance. *Long Range Planning*, 46(1-2), 1-12.
- Scott, B. A., Amel, E. L., & Manning, C. M. (2009). Mindfulness and sustainable behavior: Pondering attention and awareness as means for increasing green behavior. *Ecopsychology*, 1(1), 14-25.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1997). The Power of Mindful Learning. *The American Journal of Psychology*, 110(2), 309.
- Subich, L. M., & Diegelman, N. M. (2001). Academic and vocational interests as a function of outcome expectancies in social cognitive career theory. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 59(3), 394-405.
- Sun, J. (2015). Conceptualizing the critical path linked by teacher commitment. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 53(5), 597-624.
- Thien, L. M., Abdullah, A. G. K., & Yeap, S. B. (2020). Lecturers' commitment to teaching entrepreneurship: do transformational leadership, mindfulness and readiness for change matter? *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*.
- Trivedi, R. H. (2017). Entrepreneurial-intention constraint model: A comparative analysis among post-graduate management students in India, Singapore and Malaysia. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 13(4), 1239-1261.