Child Education Journal (2023), **5.2**, 86–96

Child Education Journal

Teachers' learning agility: A catalyst for creating learning transformation in early childhood education after the covid-19 pandemic

Dewa Ayu Puteri Handayani[1*], Didith Pramunditya Ambara[1]

[1]Early Childhood Education Program, Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Singaraja, Bali, Indonesia
[*]**Corresponding author:**
ayu.puteri@undiksha.ac.id

Article Information:

Submission	:	September 12, 2023
Revision	:	October 17, 2023
Accepted	:	October 25, 2023
Available Online	:	October 26, 2023
doi	:	10.33086/cej.v5i2.5109

Abstract

Teachers are faced with numerous difficulties during the COVID-19 Pandemic, particularly in ensuring that the learning process continues to run smoothly in the face of uncertainty. The aim of this study was to examine the relationship between learning agility and commitment to change among preschool teachers. The sample in this study were 118 preschool teachers in Buleleng District. The results indicated that there is a significantly positive relationship between learning agility and commitment to change, r (118) = 0.234, p < 0.01. Further results showed that learning agility is also correlated with two dimensions of commitment to change, namely affective commitment to change r (118) = 0.438, p < 0.01 and normative commitment to change r (118) = 0.181, p < 0.05. This means that the greater teachers' learning agility, the higher their commitment to respond to school changes. The results contribute to theoretical advances in understanding learning agility and commitment to change as well as promoting the success of change in early childhood educational institution.

Keywords: Agility, Change, Commitment To Change, Preschool Teacher

INTRODUCTION

The COVID-19 pandemic has been described as a threat to social life around the world. Organizations as well as people are affected by this pandemic. Many organizations make changes to the system, governance, structure, and other aspects in an effort to survive in an extremely challenging and uncertain environment like this. Essentially, every person and every organization experiences change at some point in time (Battilana et al., 2010). Large-scale change is difficult to implement in response to ambiguous external conditions, though. As a result of the pandemic, educational institutions have undergone significant shift, making numerous modifications to the learning process from what was first face-to-face learning to now converting to online learning. Both teachers and students are challenged by this online learning. Due to psychological effects of the pandemic, such as

feelings of uncertainty, dread, worry, and others, student satisfaction with online learning is at a moderate level (Nissim and Simon, 2020).

It is indisputable that teachers, particularly those working in early childhood education, go through the same thing. Notwithstanding all the restrictions brought on by the pandemic and all the new laws, preschool teachers have great hurdles in providing the best services to pupils. Teachers experienced rising levels of stress during the COVID-19 epidemic as a result of the expanding range of obligations, including domestic duties and being unprepared for online teaching (MacIntyre et al., 2020). Teachers encounter social and economic issues while providing online instruction. The COVID-19 pandemic's use of technology in the classroom inadvertently pushed teachers to instruct using digital tools without previous training (Hoang, 2020; Akartuna and Serin, 2022). The achievement of these reforms' objectives, namely the provision of the best possible educational services, is thus anticipated to depend on teacher acceptance of change. Teachers, students, and parents will all suffer if they choose not to participate in change efforts, in addition to the school itself as the institution in charge of them. An organization cannot successfully execute change if its personnel do not demonstrate change acceptance (Choi and Ruona, 2013).

To succeed in the planned change program, commitment to change is thought to be a key component of change management (Kayani et al., 2022). It is believed that teachers' commitment level was impacted by their degree of stress during the pandemic (Akartuna and Serin, 2022). A person's desire or attitude that ties them to a series of behaviors deemed necessary for the successful execution of change efforts is known as their commitment to change (Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002). The attitude of commitment to change can be driven by three things, a belief in the inherent benefits of change (affective commitment to change), losses that must be endured if changes are not made (continuance commitment to change), and the requirement to offer support for change (normative commitment to change) (Herscovith and Meyer, 2002). Individuals who are committed to affective change want to fully support change because they think it is necessary and will be beneficial (Morin et al., 2016). Individuals who are committed to ongoing change believe that there is a cost to be paid because they perceive that failing to comply with changes will result in negative outcomes, and they feel stuck in their jobs since they have no choice but to adhere to the changes. Those who are committed to normative change, however, believe that it is their duty to support current developments because of the reciprocal relationship between individuals and their organizations.

In the dynamic and rapidly evolving landscape of education during the pandemic, the role of teachers has become increasingly challenging. With advancements in technology, evolving pedagogical approaches, and diverse student needs, teachers must possess a unique set of skills to adapt, grow, and excel in their profession. Among these skills, learning agility stands out as a crucial attribute that enables teachers to navigate complexities, embrace change, and foster continuous professional development. A teacher needs to have learning agility so that he can readily adjust to these changes in order to have a commitment to change and be able to change in response to the demands at work (Miles, 2013). Learning agility refers to an individual's ability to learn, unlearn, and relearn in a rapidly changing environment. Furthermore, learning agility is described as the readiness and capacity to absorb knowledge from experience and then use it to produce positive outcomes in novel circumstances (Lombardo and Eichinger, 2000). This point of view contends that an individual with high learning agility continually seeks out challenges, solicits feedback, engages in self-reflection, and assesses experiences in order to make useful inferences. A flexible learner can pick up new information quickly and then apply it to different circumstances. Moreover, learning agility includes both speed (how quickly a person learns from experience) and flexibility (how well a person can apply what they know to varied contexts). Due to the rapid growth of technology and the need for ongoing self-improvement, it is crucial for teachers to be agile learners. A teacher can be deemed incompetent in his current position and in the future if this is not done (DeRue et al., 2012).

In the face of challenges, learning-agile teachers exhibit resilience and perseverance. They

view obstacles as opportunities for growth and learning rather than as setbacks. When confronted with setbacks, they reflect on their experiences, extract valuable lessons, and adapt their approaches accordingly. This mindset enables them to overcome barriers, remain motivated, and inspire their students to develop similar resilience in the face of academic or personal challenges. Learning agility has four dimensions, including people agility, outcomes agility, mental agility, and change agility (Lombardo and Eichinger, 2000). The ability to be self-aware, deal with different people and challenging situations with ease, learn from mistakes, treat others positively, and remain composed and resilient in the face of change are all examples of people agility. Outcomes agility is the capacity to produce quality outcomes despite challenging circumstances or novel circumstances, motivate others to do better, and inspire others' confidence. The capacity for creative problem-solving and comfort with ambiguity, complexity, and expressing one's viewpoint to others is known as mental agility. Change agility is a mindset that exhibits great curiosity, is passionate about novel concepts, enjoys trying new things, and engages in skill-building activities.

In addition, great learning agility can lessen a person's motivation to avoid difficulties at work (Tripathi et al., 2020). This occurs because an agile person is able to develop the talents he already posses, which makes him unafraid of sudden changes. Those who have high levels of learning agility also frequently have high levels of engagement in their jobs. Additionally, research revealed a favorable correlation between commitment to affective change and a learning culture (Malik and Garg, 2017). The organization's initiatives to provide learning opportunities for its staff or members are described by this learning culture. One of the prerequisites for the creation of learning agility is a culture of learning (Saputra et al., 2018), because of the organization's efforts to bring about beneficial changes, people can be adaptive learners.

According to the explanation above, learning agility and commitment to change can both contribute to the success of efforts to change in the direction of improvement; therefore researchers believe that a person with high agility also has a high commitment to change. According to previous study, learning agility has an impact on a person's engagement in his profession, which motivates these people to give their all at work (Saputra et al., 2018). In addition, learning agility is related to a person's capacity for adapting to new circumstances (Gravett et al., 2016), particularly that learning agility is a stronger predictor of performance than intelligence and personality (Connolly, 2001). This is done in order to promote business growth within the organization. However, despite substantial research on the topic of learning agility in the context of organizations generally, there is still a dearth of implementation in educational organizations when faced with ambiguous situations, particularly in light of the COVID-19 pandemic's effects right now.

Previous studies reveal that teachers' commitment to change has an impact on organizational change in elementary schools (Windasari et al., 2022). Several other studies also found the importance of teachers' commitment to create successful changes in schools. However, to our knowledge, similar research reported from preschool teachers are limited especially in case of pandemic where teachers were enduring significant changes, particularly in the learning process in an uncertain environment as a result of COVID-19. Therefore, we are interested in investigating the relationship between learning agility and commitment to change among preschool teachers who are hugely affected by change. Thus, the study questions are as follows: Are there any demographic traits that may be used to predict a teacher's commitment to change and learning agility? and is there a positive and significant relationship between learning agility and teacher commitment to change?

METHOD

Research Design

In terms of its purpose, this research is categorized as correlational research, which aims to find relationships/correlations/dependencies between two or more aspects of a situation (Kumar, 2018). This is used because it aims to seek and describe the relationship between two variables, without seeking an explanation regarding the cause-effect relationship established between those variables (Gravett et al., 2016). In this case, the variables being investigated for their relationship are learning agility and commitment to change. Based on the approach of investigation, this research is categorized as a quantitative approach. In this approach, all processes in the research, including the methods used, are pre-planned. This approach is used because we wanted to quantify variations in a phenomenon using statistical data processing. Based on the number of contacts with respondents, this research falls under the cross-sectional design. A cross-sectional study aims to determine the prevalence of a phenomenon, situation, issue, attitude, or problem by conducting a one-time data collection (Kumar, 2018). Through this method, an overall picture of the study object will be obtained. In this case, the researcher only collects data from respondents once, without any ongoing process in the future.

Participants

Based on information gathered from the Communication, Informatics, Coding and Statistics Office of Buleleng Regency, the population in this study is 215 preschool teachers in Buleleng District. As many as 118 were recruited as sample of this study because they had met the following criteria: (1) They were permanent or non-permanent teachers in the kindergarten; (2) They had to feel the effects of the changes that took place in their organization; (3) They had to have completed at least high school in order to better understand the statements in the questionnaire; and (4) The participant's age was not a restriction. The sample for this study was gathered utilizing a convenience sampling method using a non-probability sampling strategy. In a convenience sample, participants are chosen because they are willing to participate.

Measurement

To measure learning agility, researchers adapted the Learning Agility Self-Assessment developed (Gravett et al., 2016).The instrument consists of 25 items that are divided into four groups: people agility (PA), mental agility (MA), result agility (RA), and change agility (CA). With the exception of the result agility, each group has six statement items. Some examples include "I enjoy working with others to try to solve a problem," "if I don't know the answer to something, then I'm okay to ask questions," "I feel comfortable when conditions affecting my work change," "I easily retain information," and "I enjoy looking up words I don't understand in a conversation." The Likert Scale utilized in this test has five scales: almost never (1 point), seldom (2 points), occasionally (3 points), generally (4 points), and always (5 points).

The Commitment to Change Inventory (CCI) instrument converted into Indonesian and has been used repeatedly in numerous studies linked to commitment to change, is used by academics to gauge commitment to change (Mangundjaya, 2014). Affective commitment to change (ACtC), continuation commitment to change (CCtC), and normative commitment to change are the three characteristics that this tool measures (NCtC). Each dimension has six statement items, for a total of 18 statement items. Some of the sample items are: "I think this change is important," "I have no choice but to follow the changes at work," and "I'll be irresponsible if I resist change". Strongly disagree (1 point), disagree (2 points), somewhat disagree (3 points), somewhat agree (4 points), agree (5 points), and strongly agree (1 point) are the six scales on the Likert Scale that was employed in this instrument (6 points).

The instruments used in this study were tested for its validity and reliability. In this study, it was discovered that the learning agility instrument's alpha coefficient was 0.864 and the commitment to change instrument's alpha coefficient was 0.702. This demonstrates the high reliability of the

two instruments used in this study, indicating that the items on this instrument are homogeneous and have a high enough level of internal consistency to assess a single component. This study used a correlation test from the Pearson Product Moment Correlation between each item with a total score of the instrument and a significance level of 5% to assess the validity of the measuring tool. According to the validity test, all items are legitimate since $p < 0.05$.

The data in this study were obtained using a questionnaire which was disseminated to preschool teachers in Buleleng District. Questionnaires were distributed online using Google Forms and hardcopy to anticipate teachers who are not used to using Google Forms. The questionnaire consists of 3 parts, namely participants' identity, a scale for measuring commitment to change, and a scale for measuring learning agility.

Data Analysis

In analysing the data, researchers used descriptive statistical techniques to see an overview of each variable, namely learning agility and commitment to change in terms of gender, age, length of work, and employment status. In addition, high, medium and low categories will also be made for the two variables in this study. Meanwhile, to see the correlation between the two variables, a non-parametric test was used using the Spearmen's Rank Correlation. The dimensions of each variable are also sought for correlations to find out more about the relationship that occurs between the two variables. Data were then analysed using IBM SPSS Statistics 25.0.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Result

There were 118 participants in this study consisting of preschool teachers in Buleleng Regency, Bali. There were 25.4% of participants in the age range of 20-29 years, 27.1% of participants in the age range of 30-39 years, 28.0% in the age range of 40-49 years, and 19.5% in the age of 50 and above. The majority were female participants, namely 91.5%, and males as much as 8.5%. Based on their last education, the majority had a bachelor's degree at 90.7% of the total participants, then continued with master's education at 4.2%, high school or equivalent at 3.4%, and D3 at 1.7%. Then, from the length of work as a teacher, as much as 12.7% worked under 2 years, 16.9% worked for 2-5 years, 9.3% worked for > 5-10 years, and 61.0% worked over 10 years. Meanwhile, based on employment status, 41.5% were non-permanent teachers, 32.2% were permanent (school contract) teachers, and 26.3% were permanent (government contract) teachers. From the data obtained, female participants who worked for more than 10 years and those with Bachelor's degree tended to dominate. Meanwhile, based on age and employment status, the distribution of participants tends to be quite balanced.

1. Demographic Characteristics

   Below is a table of general descriptions of learning agility in each sample group based on age, gender, last education, length of work, and employment status. Each dimension of learning agility is also described in the table below:

Table 1. General Description of Learning Agility

Category	Mean RA	Mean PA	Mean CA	Mean MA	Mean Total LA
Age					
20-29	26.80	23.10	22.13	24.00	96.03
30-39	27.03	22.50	22.21	23.81	95.56
40-49	26.18	22.51	20.81	22.84	92.36
>50	27.04	22.39	21.17	21.65	92.26
Sex					
Male	26.80	23.20	20.80	22.40	93.20
Female	26.73	22.58	21.67	23.24	94.23
Educational Background					
High School	29.75	24.75	22.25	26.00	102.75
Associate's Degree	25.00	21.00	20.00	20.00	86.00
Bachelor's Degree	26.66	22.55	21.78	23.15	94.15
Master's Degree	26.60	23.40	17.80	22.40	90.20
Work Length					
Under 2 years	28.80	24.13	22.53	25.93	101.40
2-5 years	25.35	21.85	21.40	23.15	91.75
>5 – 10 years	25.73	21.27	20.54	23.18	90.73
Above 10 years	26.85	22.75	21.63	22.59	93.82
Employment Status					
Non-permanent	26.53	22.59	21.86	23.49	94.47
Permanent (school contract)	26.74	22.71	21.58	23.39	94.42
Permanent (government contract)	27.06	22.61	21.23	22.39	93.29

According to the above table, participants between the ages of 20 and 29 had the highest average learning agility score, 96.03, followed by those between the ages of 30 and 39, who averaged 95.56, those between the ages of 40 and 49, 92.36, and participants over 50, who had the lowest average learning agility score, 92.26. Moreover, male participants demonstrated higher RA and PA than female participants, whereas female participants demonstrated higher CA, MA, and LA than men. When compared to participants with greater educational backgrounds, participants with a high school diploma showed the highest LA on all dimensions. According to the findings, participants who have worked for less than two years have the highest LA and all of its aspects in comparison to participants who have worked for longer periods of time. Ultimately, when compared to participants who are contract teachers and non-PNS permanent teachers, participants who are permanent PNS teachers had the greatest RA and PA. Contrarily, contract teachers demonstrated the highest CA, MA, and LA scores.

Below is a table of general descriptions of commitment to change in each sample group based on age, gender, last education, length of work, and employment status. Each dimension of commitment to change is also described in the table below:

Table 2. General Description of Commitment to Change

Category	Mean ACtC	Mean NCtC	Mean CCtC	Mean Total CtC
Age				
20-29	23.43	28.43	30.83	62.73
30-39	21.25	28.63	30.31	58.41
40-49	21.39	29.39	29.79	59.82
>50	22.17	28.35	30.22	60.13
Sex				
Male	22.40	29.00	32.80	63.60
Female	21.99	28.71	30.05	59.93
Educational Background				

High School	23.50	28.25	29.25	61.50
Associate's Degree	22.00	31.00	30.00	59.00
Bachelor's Degree	22.00	28.68	30.22	60.12
Master's Degree	21.40	29.40	32.40	62.20
Work Length				
Under 2 years	21.87	28.53	31.53	61.67
2-5 years	23.25	27.80	30.01	61.20
>5 – 10 years	25.09	28.90	29.00	62.09
Above 10 years	21.25	28.73	30.26	59.39
Employment Status				
Non-permanent	21.55	29.06	29.84	59.73
Permanent (school contract)	23.03	28.58	30.50	61.08
Permanent (government contract)	21.55	28.42	30.71	60.00

Based on the table above, it was found that participants aged 20-29 years showed the highest ACtC, CCtC, and CtC compared to the higher age group. Meanwhile, based on gender, male participants showed higher CtC and all dimensions compared to female participants. Then based on recent education, there are variations in the results between each group. Participants with master's degree education had the highest CCtC and CtC, then participants with a associate's degree background had the highest NCtC, and high school participants had the highest ACtC. If viewed based on length of service, participants who worked 5-10 years had the highest ACtC, NCtC, and CtC, while participants who worked under 2 years had the highest CCtC. Furthermore, when viewed from the status of work, the results obtained vary greatly.

2. Main Analysis

Below is the general overview of Learning Agility and Commitment to Change. Correlation of each dimension of variables are also provided:

Table 3. General Description of Learning Agility and Commitment to Change

					Low	High
Variable	Mean	SD	F	%	F	%
RA	26.74	3.35	6	5	112	95
PA	22.63	2.88	9	7	103	93
CA	21.60	2.63	9	7	103	93
MA	23.17	2.86	3	2	115	98
LA Total	94.14	9.54	3	2	115	98
ACtC	30.28	2.85	0	0	118	100
NCtC	28.74	2.77	3	2	115	98
CCtC	22.03	3.96	56	48	62	52
CtC Total	60.24	6.36	3	2	115	98

Based on the table above, it was found that the average participant's score on the Learning Agility variable was as follows: the average participant's score on the RA variable was 26.74 with an SD of 3.35, the average participant's score on the PA variable was 22.63 with SD 2.88, the average participant's score on the CA variable is 21.60 with an SD of 2.63, the average participant's score on the MA variable is 23.17 with an SD of 2.86, while the average participant's score is on the LA variable of 94.14 with an SD of 9.54. On the other hand, the average participant's score on the Commitment to Change variable is as follows: the average participant's score on the ACtC variable is 30.28 with SD 2.85, the average participant's score on the NCtC variable is 28.74 with SD 2.77, the average participant's score on the CCtC variable was 22.03 with an SD of 3.96, while the average participant's score on the CtC variable was 60.24 with an SD of 6.36. Furthermore, based on the high and low categories, the majority of participants showed high categories in all the variables studied, where as many as 90 -100%

of participants were in the high category in all variables. However, on the CCtC dimension, the number of participants in both categories was relatively balanced, namely 48% had low CCtC and 52% had high CCtC.

Furthermore, based on the normality and linearity tests, the data in this study did not meet the requirements for parametric testing. Therefore, to find a relationship between learning agility and commitment to change, a non-parametric test was performed using Spearmen's Rank Correlation. The table below displays the results of the correlation between variables including each dimension:

Table 4. Test of Correlation

Variable Pair	N	r	R2	p
LA and CtC	118	0.234	0.054	0.01**
LA and ACtC	118	0.438	0.191	0.00**
LA and NCtC	118	0.181	0.032	0.05*
LA and CCtC	118	-0.024	0.001	0.79
RA and CtC	118	0.193	0.037	0.03*
RA and ACtC	118	0.516	0.266	0.00**
RA and NCtC	118	0.120	0.014	0.19
RA and CCtC	118	-0.092	0.008	0.32
PA and CtC	118	0.164	0.027	0.07
PA and ACtC	118	0.210	0.044	0.02*
PA and NCtC	118	0.091	0.008	0.33
PA and CCtC	118	-0.022	0.000	0.81
CA and CtC	118	0.161	0.026	0.08
CA and ACtC	118	0.290	0.084	0.00**
CA and NCtC	118	0.109	0.012	0.24
CA and CCtC	118	0.007	0.000	0.94
MA and CtC	118	0.264	0.069	0.00**
MA and ACtC	118	0.446	0.198	0.00**
MA and NCtC	118	0.261	0.068	0.00**
MA and CCtC	118	0.028	0.000	0.76

** Significant at p<0.01 *Significant at p<0.05

Based on the table above, the results of the correlation test show that there is a positive and significant relationship between LA and CtC of a teacher r (118) = 0.234, p <0.01. This means that an increase in LA is accompanied by an increase in CtC. The same results were shown for the relationship between LA and ActC and between LA and NCtC where each showed a positive and significant relationship respectively r (118) = 0.438, p < 0.01 and r (118) = 0.181, p < 0.05. Then, in each dimension of LA, several positive and significant relationships were also found, including the relationship between RA and CtC, RA and ACtC, PA and ACtC, CA and ACtC, MA and CtC, MA and ACtC, and MA and NCtC. Based on these results it can be concluded that all dimensions of LA are positively and significantly correlated with CtC and ACtC. Conversely, in the relationship between LA and CCtC, there is no positive and significant relationship with r (118) = -0.024, p > 0.05. Likewise with the relationship between RA and NCtC, RA and CCtC, PA and CtC, PA and NCtC, PA and CCtC, CA and CtC, CA and NCtC, CA and CCtC, and MA and CCtC.

The R2 value indicates how much of the total variability in CtC as the dependent variable can be explained by LA as the independent variable. The value of r = 0.234 (R2 = 0.055) in the relationship between LA and CtC indicates the proportion of variability in CtC that is determined by the relationship with LA. In this case, the value of R2 = 0.055 means that there is as much as 5.5% of the CtC variability determined by LA. The value of R2 = 0.191 in the relationship between LA and ACtC means that there is 19.1% of the ACtC variability determined by LA. The value of R2 = 0.032 in the relationship between LA and NCtC means

that there is 3.2% of the NCtC variability determined by LA. Correlation between each dimension of LA and ACtC had the strongest value in comparison to other correlations. These results indicate that the contribution of LA to determine the amount of CtC is low which has an impact on the need for further studies.

Discussion

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship between teachers' learning agility and commitment to change especially during hard times of pandemic. Learning agility is the capacity to build on knowledge gained through experience and apply it to novel situations or for the first time. On the other hand, commitment to change refers to an individual's willingness and dedication to embrace and support organizational or personal transformations. It involves a psychological attachment and determination to actively participate in the change process and contribute to its success. According to the findings of this study, the majority of the preschool teachers who took part in this study showed a high degree of learning agility and commitment to change. The commitment to change variable encompasses affective commitment to change, normative commitment to change, and continuation commitment to change, listed in order from highest to lowest. This order of commitment aligns with a study conducted in China during the COVID-19 pandemic, focusing on preschool teachers, which found that while emotional and normative commitments to change were generally positive, there was a need to strengthen commitments to ongoing change (Wei et al., 2021).

The COVID-19 pandemic brought significant and profound changes to the community, particularly impacting teachers both directly and indirectly. It is these changes that are believed to have influenced the current condition. Teachers, compelled by circumstances, experienced the necessity of making adjustments, leading them to realize the significance of embracing modifications. As a result, affective and normative commitments to change tend to be high, particularly in challenging situations like a pandemic. Ultimately, the teachers' perception of having limited alternative employment options in such a precarious scenario served as a catalyst for their decision to take action. Shortly, teachers recognize the critical need to proactively adjust their teaching strategies and approaches as a means to navigate and overcome the challenges presented by the pandemic.

The results also indicated that while teachers' commitment to change grew with age, their learning agility dropped. Older employees reported higher commitment to change in comparison to younger employees (Handayani and Mangundjaya, 2022). This can be explained using Donald Super's career model which contended that each stage of career development signifies different goals (Brown, 2002). In the age group of 14-24 years, individuals tend to focus more on exploring fields of work that interest them, allowing for the possibility of transitioning between different places and not displaying commitment. On the other hand, in the age group of 25-44 years, individuals have entered the stage of maintenance, meaning they start considering staying with an organization even though they may not yet demonstrate maturity. The next stage is establishment, where individuals have committed to their work and follow its demands. Referring to this concept, the commitment to change should differ among different age groups, as reflected in this study. On the other hand, there is a gradual decline in learning agility, with the effect on mental agility being most pronounced in people over the age of 35 (Haring et al., 2020). Younger people had a stronger capacity for learning than older, more experienced people (Handayani and Ambara, 2021). This is apparently due to the person's decreasing degree of participation in higher education as they age. In addition to a lack of opportunities, this is also a result of how they view their own capacity for learning (Friebe and Schmidt-Hertha, 2013). Nonetheless, the idea of learning agility itself is around experience-based learning. Since people gain opportunities to use their knowledge and abilities in a wider range of contexts as they become older, learning agility should rise. Aging significantly improves learning agility, however the association is tenuous. As we become older, learning agility develops at its own pace (Deepa et al., 2021). People naturally get more life experience as they become older, both

personally and professionally (Deepa et al., 2021).

The study's main finding was that there is a positive and significant association between learning agility and commitment to change, particularly affective commitment to change and normative commitment to change. This indicates that as a teacher's capacity for learning increases, so does their commitment to bringing about affective and normative commitment to change. Previous study found that there is a significant positive association between employees' learning agility and personal engagement with their work (Saputra et al., 2018).

Another reported that learning agility has a favorable impact on employees' affective commitment to change (Kim and Lee, 2016). The autonomy in their work, which enables them to continuously learn new things and develop, strengthens this bond. One of the things that makes it difficult for teachers to stay committed and motivated to their work is the lack of autonomy in pedagogical decisions during classroom practice (Yuan and Zhang, 2017) . Due to the nature of their jobs and the dynamic work environments, preschool teachers have a great degree of professional autonomy. They are allowed to develop whatever effective teaching methods they see fit for the classroom environment. Teachers are also aware that the changes in schools are inevitable given the pandemic conditions' effects on a variety of facets of daily life. Thus, all they can do is commit to the change and follow it.

Another explanation for this result is that teachers with high learning agility are more tolerant to ambiguity, vision, and innovation (Eichinger and Lombardo, 2004), which is also an indicator or having future orientation. They are able to see that change is important for the future so that they adapt to it. Previous study discovered that when an individual is having a future orientation, they can become more committed to change (Handayani and Mangundjaya, 2022). On the other hand, it was also discovered that continuance commitment to change diminishes as learning agility increases, however this association was not significant. Individuals with continuance commitment to change believe they have no other employment options and are stuck in their current positions (Herscovitch and Meyer, 2002). This is not relevant under the challenging pandemic circumstances. Given the large number of employees who have been laid off as a result of the uncertain economic climate in the nation and the world, teachers are even more happy to still be able to work.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

According to the results of the study, it can be concluded that the research hypotheses is accepted because there is a positive and significant association between learning agility and commitment to change. In addition, every dimension of learning agility has a positive correlation with every aspect of commitment to change, particularly affective commitment to change. This study also discovered that despite the COVID-19 Pandemic's unpredictability, teachers' degrees of learning agility and commitment to change tended to be high. Another important finding is that, as we age, the less agile we are, but the more committed we become to change. In order to hasten the process of adapting to new circumstances, the researcher thinks it is crucial to conduct comparable study that looks at the factors that can contribute to shape individual's commitment to change, thus accelerating the process of adaptation to new conditions. In light of the correlation between learning agility and a commitment to change, the school administrator should provide teachers room to develop their learning agility. By embracing learning agility, educators can adapt to new teaching methods, leverage technological advancements, and foster a student-centered approach. Through collaboration, reflection, and resilience, teachers can continuously enhance their professional skills, leading to improved student outcomes and an enriched educational experience. As we progress into the future, nurturing and supporting the learning agility of teachers must be a priority to ensure educational excellence and empower students to thrive in an ever-evolving world.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was funded by the Institute of Research and Community Service Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Bali, Indonesia.

REFERENCES

Akartuna, I. Ş. S., & Serin, O. (2022). Covid-19 impact on teachers' organizational commitment in schools. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *13*, 810015.

Battilana, J., Gilmartin, M., Sengul, M., Pache, A.-C., & Alexander, J. A. (2010). Leadership competencies for implementing planned organizational change. *The leadership quarterly*, *21*(3), 422–438.

Brown, D. (2002). *Career choice and development*. John Wiley & Sons.

Choi, M., & Ruona, W. E. (2013). Individual readiness for organizational change. *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Leadership, Change, and Organizational Development*, 331–345.

Connolly, J. (2001). *Assessing the construct validity of a measure of learning agility*. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/46953391.pdf

Deepa, V., Sujatha, R., & Baber, H. (2021). Ageing and learning agility–mediating role of learning perception and moderating role of technology leverage. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *40*(5-6), 514–531.

DeRue, D. S., Ashford, S. J., & Myers, C. G. (2012). Learning agility: In search of conceptual clarity and theoretical grounding. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *5*(3), 258–279.

Eichinger, R. W., & Lombardo, M. M. (2004). Learning agility as a prime indicator of potential. *People and Strategy*, *27*(4), 12.

Friebe, J., & Schmidt-Hertha, B. (2013). Activities and barriers to education for elderly people. *Journal of Contemporary Educational Studies/Sodobna Pedagogika*, *64*(1).

Gravett, L. S., Caldwell, S. A., Gravett, L. S., & Caldwell, S. A. (2016). *What is learning agility?* Springer.

Handayani, D. A. P., & Ambara, D. P. (2021). Does learning agility depend on age and work experience? *4th International Conference on Innovative Research Across Disciplines (ICIRAD 2021)*, 321–326.

Handayani, D. A. P., & Mangundjaya, W. L. (2022). Future orientation and commitment to change during large-scale organizational change in indonesia. *Change Management: An International Journal*, *23*(1).

Haring, S., Shankar, J., & Hofkes, K. (2020). The potential of learning agility.

Herscovitch, L., & Meyer, J. P. (2002). Commitment to organizational change: Extension of a three-component model. *Journal of applied psychology*, *87*(3), 474.

Hoang, A.-D. (2020). Pandemic and teacher retention: Empirical evidence from expat teachers in southeast asia during covid-19. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, *40*(9/10), 1141–1166.

Kayani, M. B., Ali, M., & Javed, H. (2022). What literature has to say about commitment to change: Philosophy of commitment to change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, (ahead-of-print).

Kim, T., & Lee, H. (2016). The impact of learning agility on commitment to organizational change and the moderating effect of job autonomy. *Agricultural Education and Human Resources Development*, *48*(1), 27–46.

Kumar, R. (2018). Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners. *Research methodology*, 1–528.

Lombardo, M. M., & Eichinger, R. W. (2000). High potentials as high learners. *Human Resource Management*, *39*(4), 321–329.

MacIntyre, P. D., Gregersen, T., & Mercer, S. (2020). Language teachers' coping strategies during the covid-19 conversion to online teaching: Correlations with stress, wellbeing and negative emotions. *System*, *94*, 102352.

Malik, P., & Garg, P. (2017). The relationship between learning culture, inquiry and dialogue, knowledge sharing structure and affective commitment to change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *30*(4), 610–631.

Mangundjaya, W. (2014). Psychological empowerment and organizational task environment in commitment to change. *International Journal of Business and Management*, *2*(2), 119.

Miles, A. (2013). Agile learning: Living with the speed of change. *Development and learning in organizations: An international journal*, *27*(2), 20–22.

Morin, A. J., Meyer, J. P., Bélanger, É., Boudrias, J.-S., Gagné, M., & Parker, P. D. (2016). Longitudinal associations between employees' beliefs about the quality of the change management process, affective commitment to change and psychological empowerment. *Human relations*, *69*(3), 839–867.

Nissim, Y., & Simon, E. (2020). Agility in teacher training: Distance learning during the covid-19 pandemic. *International Education Studies*, *13*(12), 11–26.

Saputra, N., Abdinagoro, S. B., & Kuncoro, E. A. (2018). The mediating role of learning agility on the relationship between work engagement and learning culture. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, *26*(T), 117–130.

Tripathi, A., Srivastava, R., & Sankaran, R. (2020). Role of learning agility and learning culture on turnover intention: An empirical study. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, *52*(2), 105–120.

Wei, Y., Wang, L., Tan, L., Li, Q., & Zhou, D. (2021). Occupational commitment of chinese kindergarten teachers during the covid-19 pandemic: Predictions of anti-epidemic action, income reduction, and career confidence. *Early childhood education journal*, *49*, 1031–1045.

Windasari, W., Roesminingsih, E., & Trihantoyo, S. (2022). Organizational change in elementary school. does teacher commitment important? *Jurnal Paedagogy*, *9*(4), 637–645.

Yuan, R., & Zhang, L. J. (2017). Exploring student teachers' motivation change in initial teacher education: A chinese perspective. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *61*, 142–152.