The mediation role of change management in employee development
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Abstract— In an increasing number of hotels, hospitality is being used to improve productivity and care quality. The research was conducted in the hospitality industry, specifically in private hotels in Sulaimaniah. The study looked at the perspective of change management in the hospitality industry, specifically in private hotels. However, due to an implementation difference: the gap between plan and execution, the hospitality industry has difficulty implementing reform initiatives. The aim of this paper, from a change management standpoint, is to increase scientific knowledge about factors that reduce the implementation gap and facilitate the transition from "toolbox lean" to real lean hospitality transformation. To find a change management perspective in the hospitality industry, the researchers used a quantitative analysis approach.

A total of 90 administrative staff members from private hotels were given the questionnaire at random. The participants in this study were 76 people from various private hotels in Iraq's Kurdistan province. The researchers used multiple regression analysis to assess their established research hypotheses, while the Sobel test was used to determine the function of the mediator, which is the change management initiative. The results showed that all research hypotheses are supported, with the third research hypothesis receiving the highest value, stating that change event mediates education and strategic success, and the first research hypothesis receiving the lowest value, stating that change event mediates technology change and strategic success. Furthermore, it was discovered that change eventplay a constructive and significant role in bridging the gap between change management and strategic performance.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Over the last few decades, there has been a growing awareness of the need for hospitality organizations to change and strengthen. Tighter budgets, fluctuating financial markets, central government decisions, safety regulations, regulation, and information technology, as well as more turbulent conditions, prompted hospitality organizations to introduce and incorporate improvements in the governance, structure, architecture, and quality of services offered to people after the 19th century (Neves et al. 2018). Several governments around the world have initiated reforms and innovations that have altered the governance of hospitality bodies in both developed and developing countries. The traditional hospitality model, which dominated most of the twentieth century, has changed to a more flexible, market-based form of hospitality since the mid-1990s (Ali, 2020). A modern model of hospitality governance emerged in both developed and developing countries by the end of the 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s. Although the current governance model for the hospitality industry has been referred to by a number of terms, such as 'fresh hospitality-NPM' (Luburić, 2019); 'post-bureaucratic paradigm' (Serugga et al., 2020); 'entrepreneurial democracy' (Anwar, 2017); or 'managerialism' (Hurtt et al. 2020), they all refer to the same phenomenon. That is, continued modernisation, development in hospitality, cost-cutting, privatization, and marketing of hospitality businesses. In other words, several
governments around the world have implemented hospitality governance reforms to improve the quality and effectiveness of hospitality goods and services (Hameed & Anwar, 2018), as well as to make hospitality organizations more adaptable and resilient to an evolving environment similar to that of others.

Hospitality management reform is described as a concerted attempt by political and senior management to alter structural, technological, or process features of "hospitality organizations in order to make them (in some sense) better controlled" (Ali, 2021). To date, the transformation of the hospitality industry has been studied from a number of theoretical viewpoints, all of which are similar. For example, Andavar & Ali (2020) looked at the transformation of the hospitality industry from an administrative standpoint, which is thought to be one of the most popular perspectives in the industry.

The restructuring of government. Improvement and adaptation are imposed by the external background of organizations, according to institutional researchers, rather than deliberately initiating and implementing improvements and modifications to maximize efficiency and effectiveness (Anwar & Shukur, 2015). Other analysts have looked at the transformation of the hospitality industry from a practical standpoint. According to the instrumental perspective on transition, hospitality institutions serve as instruments for elected officials and senior executives (Anwar, 2017). This point of view is primarily concerned with improvements in the institutional characteristics of hospitality establishments. In addition, elected leaders of hospitality organizations identify and express the goals and objectives of the change and development process. Business leaders believe that the effective implementation of new policies and transformation plans "will be dependent on government control of what happens to programs and initiatives" (Neves et al. 2018). While these different perspectives provide specific perspectives on reform and development in the hospitality industry, they all focus on national or sector-level reform and improvement. To put it another way, none of these perspectives offers insight into how change is implemented and managed within a single governmental body. Change management is a viewpoint that highlights the dynamics of transition and organizational transformation (Anwar & Ghafoor, 2017). While elected or publicly appointed politicians and administrators often institute new policies and programs, the real changes in hospitality institutions are enforced by middle- and first-line management as well as front-line workers. According to the change management perspective, the reform design can and should be separated from the change implementation; after those in charge of reform design the reform, the task of executing or translating the reform should be turned over to those who are capable of doing so in the most realistic and efficient way possible (Demir et al. 2020). In other words, after political and senior management have endorsed the change, it is up to staff at the middle and lower levels of management to implement it. As a result, change is described as what is occurring in the structural, technological, or process of hospitality organizations, as well as employee attitudes and behavior (Anwar & Shukur, 2015). To put it another way, it is a means of implementing reforms initiated by political and senior executive officials by lower-level managers and civil servants who are transition beneficiaries. Political and senior administrative officials will continue to place pressure on hospitality organizations to make improvements, but if middle managers and lower-level hospitality employees (change recipients) are unable to implement these reforms, the chances of failure are high (Ali, 2021). It's also important to note that not all changes result in actual improvements in the hospitality industry. In some cases, decision-makers' plans seem to be constructive at first glance; but, since hospitality bodies are reluctant to implement them, the improvements are not implemented and the measures remain on paper (Anwar & Balcioğlu, 2016). It's also worth remembering that the changes are broad in scope and are usually orchestrated by political and administrative leaders through a major political process (Jones-Schenk, 2019).

Change management, on the other hand, is concerned with the internal administration and implementation of structural change or restructuring. In this article, I focus on single hospitality organizations' internal change management processes rather than reforms at the national or sector level. In other words, the issue addressed in this dissertation is how recipients of change perceive the changes undertaken by senior hospitality executives in a single hospitality establishment, as well as the conditions under which recipients of change react favorably and, if possible, proactively to these organizational change efforts. The reason for concentrating my attention on change recipients' responses is that the effectiveness of every transformation or enhancement effort is highly reliant on change recipients' attitudes and ability to effectively design, schedule, and implement organizational change (Anwar, 2017).
II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Shift beneficiaries are not robots, according to change management theory; they are simply carrying out changes imposed from on high by policymakers. Rather, this viewpoint implies that change recipients are knowledgeable, that they are aware of the issues that their organizations are tasked with solving, that they have valuable ideas for solving those problems, and that, given the chance, they can easily convert those ideas into meaningful action (Kirrane et al. 2017). The beneficiaries of change are (Anwar & Abd Zebari, 2015) encouraged to engage in the decision-making process under the change management model. According to the change management view, nothing can change without the involvement of change recipients (Anwar & Qadir, 2017). In other words, according to the change management viewpoint, reform and change programs must "ultimately result in improvements in the operating processes of hospitality organizations, as well as in the attitudes and actions of workers working in those organizations" in order to have some effect (Anwar & Surarchith, 2015). Organizational participants are required to act, act, and conduct their duties differently as a result of the restructuring and change of initiatives. Employees are expected to leave their comfort zones as a result of organizational changes (Hussain et al. 2018), and they are expected to abandon old habits and systems in favor of new ones that are aligned with the change effort's task (Abdullah et al. 2017). Anwar (2017) argues that "if people do not improve, there will be no organizational change" (Goksoy, 2020) and that "change only persists over time when individuals change their on-the-job actions in an acceptable manner" (Ali, 2021). Others claim that "organizations cannot improve meaningfully until workers change—people must think, believe, and act differently" (Ali, 2020). Employee attitudes and actions toward organizational change activities, among other variables, can thus be argued to be one of the key determinants of performance and efficacy of most organizational change efforts. Researchers and practitioners have established a variety of factors that are suggested to affect the reaction of change recipients to organizational change proposals after Kurt Lewin's early work on organizational reform in the 1940s. Anwar, (2016) summarized and analyzed the literature on organizational change and development, which was a critical step toward the theoretical synthesis of the literature on organizational change management variables. On the basis of a broad literature review, their study provided a framework for the classification of organizational change variables. Their classification system divides actionable change management variables into four categories: material change, method, context, and criterion or outcomes. Person attributes were added to the organizational change process by Hameed & Anwar, (2018) in another report. Ali, (2020) applied leadership to the taxonomy in a more recent review of the literature on hospitality change management. The classification of organizational change management variables allows for the identification of predictors of the psychological processes that cause change beneficiaries'
This taxonomy has gotten a lot of attention from analysts and administrators in recent years, and it has found methodological support in a number of countries, both in the hospitality and private sectors (Anwar, 2017). The importance of the parameter variables regularly evaluated as the outcomes of organizational change programs is one of the research topics reviewed by Serugga et al. (2020). In the hospitality industry, it is proposed that government officials and senior executive leaders of hospitality organizations often express reform and transformation goals in ambiguous or even contradictory language, making it difficult to decide whether or not the outcomes are compatible with the intended outcomes (Hameed & Anwar, 2018). As a result, before determining proof of outcomes, it is essential to define what is considered an outcome (Ali, 2021). The term "effect" can be applied to a variety of situations and can include a wide range of meanings (Andavar & Ali, 2020). Furthermore, philosophers and clinicians differentiate between a narrow and a wide concept of outcomes. The narrow concept of outcomes emphasizes anticipated or expected outcomes, such as success, quality, and productivity (Lu et al. 2020). When evaluating narrow performance, whether the enhancement and transformation programs' targets are translated into decisions and outputs is considered. The expanded concept of outcomes, on the other hand, is concerned with dysfunctions, side effects, and political and social effects, "such as those resulting from socio-democratic leadership" (Anwar, 2017). The approach for evaluating the outcomes of change programs differs depending on whether the change is anticipated or unexpected. Organizational change is viewed as a process that moves an institution from an undesirable, current, fixed state to an ideal future state through a series of pre-defined phases in the planned approach to transition (Anwar & Climis, 2017). The priorities of transition are formulated at the start of the change process in this top-down approach to transformation, which heavily relies on management's effect on its implementation (Anwar & Ghafoor, 2017). Change usually begins with an examination of the current unfavorable situation and the development of an ideal future state (Demir et al. 2020). In preparation for the proposed reform approaches, the results are also scheduled (Anwar & Shukur, 2015). Transition effects, on the other hand, are not currently implemented in the evolving reform plan, but rather arise during the change phase as the change itself occurs (Anwar & Louis, 2017). Since the transition's priorities and expected outcomes aren't known ahead of time, predicting the outcomes of the change in the emerging approach to change is more challenging. Improved performance (Anwar & Balcioglu, 2016), efficiency (Ali & Anwar, 2021 & Anwar, 2017), customer loyalty (Ham et al. 2020), equity and security (Anwar & Qadir, 2017), increased performance, or "increase in the total capacity/flexibility/resilience of the administrative structure as a whole" (Baporikar & Kaloia, 2020). Some researchers have taken a more objective approach to evaluating the effects of modification on output shifts. For example, Bivona & Cosenz (2021) calculated the number of applicants for a new hospital charitable care scheme to determine the outcomes of the reform program. As previously stated, long-term organizational transition is primarily dependent on positive perceptions and behavioral support for planned employee change activities. In other words, how change recipients respond to change attempts is one of the most important determinants of the degree to which any organizational transformation can succeed. Despite this early interest in the role of transfer recipients' attitudes in the process of organizational change, researchers and practitioners did not pay attention to organizational change until the late 1940s. Indeed, there has been a surge in organizational transformation research in the last 70 years, highlighting the importance of employees' attitudes and behaviors in understanding change initiatives (Abdullah et al. 2017). Behaviors have been conceptualized through a number of contexts in the literature on organizational change, with little consistency in their definitions or the terms used. According to the literature review, various terms or terminology are used to explain the same phenomenon at times, and the same word is used for structures with different meanings at other times (Anwar, 2017). Despite the disintegration and muddled manifestations of employee attitudes toward change, they defined seven recurring constructs: (1) resistance to change, (2) skepticism about organizational change, (3) commitment to change, and (4) openness to change. "All reflect an individual's overall positive or negative view of a specific change program," according to the first six attitudinal frameworks (Goksouy, 2020). Despite similarities, there are a number of significant differences in terms of ramifications and focus between them, and as a result, researchers and clinicians can provide varying evidence of employee evaluation and concerns about individual reform initiatives. The seven outcome variables mentioned above can be divided into three classes based on how they respond to change. The first, and most likely the first form. One consists of negative answers and suggestions regarding transformation situations, such as resistance to change (Abdullah & Anwar, 2021 ) or cynicism toward change (Bae, 2020). (Li & Hu, 2020). More optimistic responses, such as tolerance for change, desire to improve, willingness to adjust, and commitment to change, are
III. METHODOLOGY

The research was conducted in the hospitality industry, specifically in private hotels in Sulaimaniah. The study looked at the perspective of change management in the hospitality industry, specifically in private hotels. To assess hospitality's strategic success, the researchers used five change management dimensions, such as technological change, change climate, and strategic success, education, communication, and an effective systematic strategy. Furthermore, the researcher used change events as a mediator between all five independent variables in order to assess the competitive performance of hospitality businesses. To find a change management perspective in the hospitality industry, the researchers used a quantitative analysis approach. A total of 90 administrative staff members from private hotels were given the questionnaire at random. The participants in this study were 76 people from various private hotels in Iraq's Kurdistan province. The questionnaire contained 59 things ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree, all of which were measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3= Neutral, 4= Agree, and 5= Strongly Agree.

IV. ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Table 1: KMO and Bartlett Sphericity Test of Self-rating Items

| Factors                        | N of items | n  | KMO  | Bartlett test |
|--------------------------------|------------|----|------|---------------|
| Technology Change              | 8          | 76 | .751 | 2155.2        |
| Environment of the Change      | 9          | 76 |      | .000          |
| Education                      | 8          | 76 |      |               |
| Communication                  | 8          | 76 |      |               |
| Effective systematic plan      | 9          | 76 |      |               |
| Strategic success              | 9          | 76 |      |               |
| Change Management              | 8          | 76 |      |               |

As we can see in table (1), the result of KMO for all five independent variables (technology change, environment of the change, education, communication, and effective systematic plan), and Strategic success as dependent variable also change management as mediator factor; is .751 which is higher than .001 this indicates that the sample size used for the current study was more than adequate. Furthermore, the result of Chi-Square is 2155.2 with the significant level .000.

Table 2: Reliability analysis

| Variables                      | N of items | n  | Cronbach's Alpha |
|--------------------------------|------------|----|------------------|
| Technology change              | 8          | 76 | .733             |
| Environment of the Change      | 9          | 76 | .729             |
| Education                      | 8          | 76 | .768             |
| Communication                  | 8          | 76 | .791             |
| Effective systematic plan      | 9          | 76 | .788             |
| Employee development           | 9          | 76 | .774             |
| Change Management              | 8          | 76 | .739             |

As seen in table (2), the reliability analysis for 59 items used to measure the influence of five independent variables (technology change, environment of the change, education, communication, and effective systematic plan), and Strategic success as dependent variable also change management as mediator factor. The above 59 questions
were distributed as follow; 8 items for Technology change, 9 items for Environment of the Change, 8 items for Education, 8 items for Communication, 9 items for Effective systematic plan, 9 items for Employee development, and items for 8 items for change management. The researchers applied reliability analysis to find out the reliability for each factor, the findings revealed as follow: as for Technology change was found the Alpha to be .733 with the sample size of 76 for 8 questions which indicated that all 8 questions used to measure Technology change were reliable for the current study, as for Environment of the Change was found the Alpha to be .729 with the sample size of 76 for 9 questions which indicated that all 9 questions used to measure Environment of the Change were reliable for the current study, as for Education was found the Alpha to be .768 with the sample size of 76 for 8 questions which indicated that all 8 questions used to measure Education were reliable for the current study, as for Communication was found the Alpha to be .791 with the sample size of 76 for 9 questions which indicated that all 9 questions used to measure Communication were reliable for the current study, as for Effective systematic plan was found the Alpha to be .788 with the sample size of 76 for 9 questions which indicated that all 9 questions used to measure Effective systematic plan were reliable for the current study, as for Employee development was found the Alpha to be .774 with the sample size of 76 for 9 questions which indicated that all 9 questions used to measure Employee development were reliable for the current study, and as for Change Management was found the Alpha to be .739 with the sample size of 76 for 8 questions which indicated that all 8 questions used to measure Change Management were reliable for the current study.

Table 3: Correlation Analysis

| Correlations                        | technology change | environment of the change | education | communication | effective systematic plan | Strategic success |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------------|
| technology change                   | Pearson Correlation | 1                          |           |               |                          |                   |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)    |                            |           |               |                          |                   |
|                                    | N                 | 76                         |           |               |                          |                   |
| environment of the change          | Pearson Correlation | .544**                    | 1         |               |                          |                   |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)    | .002                       |           |               |                          |                   |
|                                    | N                 | 76                         | 76        |               |                          |                   |
| education                           | Pearson Correlation | .601**                   | .638**    | 1             |                          |                   |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)    | .000                      | .000      |               |                          |                   |
|                                    | N                 | 76                         | 76        | 76            |                          |                   |
| communication                       | Pearson Correlation | .611**                   | .598**    | .522**        | 1                        |                   |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)    | .000                      | .001      | .000          |                          |                   |
|                                    | N                 | 76                         | 76        | 76            | 76                       |                   |
| effective systematic plan          | Pearson Correlation | .639**                   | .701**    | .633**        | .528**                   | 1                 |
|                                    | Sig. (2-tailed)    | .000                      | .000      | .000          | .000                     |                   |
|                                    | N                 | 76                         | 76        | 76            | 76                       | 76                |
| Strategic success                  | Pearson Correlation | .599**                   | .602**    | .617**        | .697**                   | .501**            |
|                                    |                   |                            |           |               |                          |                   |
As it can be seen in table (3), the correlation analysis between technology change, environment of the change, education, communication, and effective systematic plan, and Strategic success as dependent variable also change management as mediator factor. The finding revealed that the value of Pearson correlation (r = .599**, p<0.01), between technology change and strategic success this indicated that there is positive and strong correlation between technology change and strategic success, the value of Pearson correlation (r = .602**, p<0.01), between environment of the change and strategic success this indicated that there is positive and strong correlation between environment of the change and strategic success, the value of Pearson correlation (r = .617**, p<0.01),

| Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| N              | 76   | 76   | 76   | 76   | 76   |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4-Hierarchal Multiple Regression

| Coefficients | Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t     | Sig. |
|--------------|-------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|------|
|              |       | B                            | Std. Error                | Beta  |      |
| 1            | (Constant) | 1.119                      | .1221                     | 7.254 | .000 |
|              | CG     | .522                        | .036                      | .529  | 7.362| .000 |
| 2            | (Constant) | 1.002                      | .214                      | 3.653 | .000 |
|              | CG     | .533                        | .062                      | .537  | 1.622| .001 |
|              | CMI    | .558                        | .074                      | .561  | 3.524| .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Strategic Success

Table (4), demonstrates a hierarchal multiple regression analysis to investigate first research hypothesis which stated that change management initiative mediates technology change and Strategic success. Concerning model (1) the direct relationship between technology change and strategic success, the value of B = .522, the value of Beta = .529 with P-value = .000 this indicated that there is a significant and positive relationship between technology change and strategic success. As for model (2) which applied multiple regression analysis to find both technology change as independent factor and change events a mediator factor with strategic success as dependent factor, the findings showed that the value of B =.533, the value of Beta = .537 with P-value .001 as indirect relationship between technology change and strategic success, on the other hand the value of B =.558, the value of Beta = .561 with P-value .000 as mediation between change event and strategic success. The findings proved that there is a positive and significant direct and indirect relationship between technology change and strategic success, moreover change event has a positive and significant mediating role between technology change and strategic success.

H1: Change event mediates technology change and Strategic success.
Table 5: Sobel Test

| Input: | Test statistic: | Std. Error: | p-value: |
|--------|-----------------|-------------|----------|
| a .533 | Sobel: 5.66883007 | 0.05246479 | .0002 |
| b .558 | Aroian test: 5.64727784 | 0.05266502 | .0003 |
| s_a .062 | Goodman test: 5.69063094 | 0.0522638 | .0002 |
| s_b .074 | Reset all | Calculate | |

P-value is significant at level 0.005

Table (5), illustrates the findings of Sobel test to find the mediation analysis, the result demonstrates the direct relationship between technology change and strategic success, P-value =.0002 this indicated that there is a significant and positive direct relationship between technology change and strategic success. Furthermore, P-value is .0003 as indirect relationship between technology change and strategic success. Moreover, the results proved that there is a positive and significant direct and indirect relationship between technology change and strategic success, moreover change event has a positive and significant mediating role between technology change and strategic success.

H2: Change event mediates environment of the change and Strategic success.

Table 6: Hierarchal Multiple Regression

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---|------|
|       | B Std. Error Beta            |                           |   |      |
| 1     | (Constant) 1.011 .121 | .601 .011 | 7.985 | .000 |
|       | DG .596 .039 | .559 | 7.356 | .000 |
| 2     | (Constant) 1.002 .144 | | 3.568 | .000 |
|       | DG .553 .038 | .559 | 1.574 | .000 |
|       | CMI .601 .071 | .609 | 3.652 | .000 |

Table (6), demonstrates a hierarchal multiple regression analysis to investigate second research hypothesis which stated that change management initiative mediates environment of the change and Strategic success. Concerning model (1) the direct relationship between environment of the change and strategic success, the value of B = .596, the value of Beta = .601 with P-value =.001 this indicated that there is a significant and positive relationship between environment of the change and strategic success. As for model (2) which applied multiple regression analysis to find both environment of the change as independent factor and change event as a mediator factor with strategic success as dependent factor, the findings showed that the value of B =.533, the value of Beta =.559 with P-value .001 as indirect relationship between environment of the change and strategic success, on the other hand the value of B =.601, the value of Beta = .609 with P-value .000 as mediation between change event and strategic success. The findings proved that there is a positive and significant direct and indirect relationship between environment of the change and strategic success, moreover change event has a positive and significant mediating role between environment of the change and strategic success.
Table 7: Sobel Test

| Input:  | Test statistic: | Std. Error: | p-value: |
|-------|----------------|------------|----------|
| a .553 | 7.31700617     | 0.04542199 | 0        |
| b .601 | 7.30413234     | 0.04550205 | 0        |
| s_a .038 | 7.3299483     | 0.04534179 | 0        |
| s_b .071 | Reset all      | Calculate  |          |

P-value is significant at level 0.005

Table 8: Hierarchal Multiple Regression

| Model | Unstandardized Coefficients | Standardized Coefficients | t      | Sig. |
|-------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
|       | B                           | Std. Error                | Beta   |      |
| 1     | (Constant) 2.191 .3101      | 3.258 .000               |        |      |
|       | CA .611 .034 .617           | 4.522 .000               |        |      |
| 2     | (Constant) 1.009 .189       | 3.588 .000               |        |      |
|       | CA .622 .029 .629           | 1.955 .000               |        |      |
|       | CMI .633 .071 .639          | 4.522 .000               |        |      |

a. Dependent Variable: Strategic Success

Moreover, the results proved that there is a positive and significant direct and indirect relationship between environment of the change and strategic success, moreover change event has a positive and significant mediating role between environment of the change and strategic success.

H3: Change event mediates education and Strategic success.

Table (8), demonstrates a hierarchal multiple regression analysis to investigate third research hypothesis which stated that change management initiative mediates education and Strategic success. Concerning model (1) the direct relationship between education and strategic success, the value of B = .611, the value of Beta = .617 with P-value =.000 this indicated that there is a significant and positive relationship between education and strategic success. As for model (2) which applied multiple regression analysis to find both dur education as independent factor and change event as a mediator factor with strategic success as dependent factor, the findings showed that the value of B =.622, the value of Beta = .629 with P-value .001 as indirect relationship between education and strategic success, on the other hand the value of B =.633, the value of Beta = .639 with P-value .000 as mediation between change event and strategic success. The findings proved that there is a positive and significant direct and indirect relationship between education and strategic success, moreover change event has a positive and significant mediating role between education and strategic success.
Table (9), illustrates the findings of Sobel test to find the mediation analysis, the result demonstrates the direct relationship between education and strategic success, P-value =.000 this indicated that there is a significant and positive direct relationship between education and strategic success. Furthermore, P-value is .000 as indirect relationship between education and strategic success. Moreover, the results proved that there is a positive and significant direct and indirect relationship between education and strategic success, moreover change event has a positive and significant mediating role between education and strategic success.

H4: Change event mediates communication and Strategic success.

Table (10), demonstrates a hierarchal multiple regression analysis to investigate fourth research hypothesis which stated that change management initiative mediates communication and Strategic success. Concerning model (1) the direct relationship between communication and strategic success, the value of B = .687, the value of Beta = .691 with P-value =.000 this indicated that there is a significant and positive relationship between communication and strategic success. As for model (2) which applied multiple regression analysis to find both communication as independent factor and change event as a mediator factor with strategic success as dependent factor, the findings showed that the value of B =.621, the value of Beta = .628 with P-value .001 as indirect relationship between communication and strategic success, on the other hand the value of B =.671, the value of Beta = .677 with P-value .000 as mediation between change event and strategic success. The findings proved that there is a positive and significant direct and indirect relationship between communication and strategic success, moreover change event has a positive and significant mediating role between communication and strategic success.
Table (11), illustrates the findings of Sobel test to find the mediation analysis, the result demonstrates the direct relationship between communication and strategic success, P-value = .000 this indicated that there is a significant and positive direct relationship between communication and strategic success. Furthermore, P-value is .000 as indirect relationship between communication and strategic success. Moreover, the results proved that there is a positive and significant direct and indirect relationship between communication and strategic success, moreover change event has a positive and significant mediating role between communication and strategic success.

H5: Change event mediates effective systematic plan and Strategic success.

Table (12), demonstrates a hierarchal multiple regression analysis to investigate fifth research hypothesis which stated that change management initiative mediates effective systematic plan and Strategic success. Concerning model (1) the direct relationship between effective systematic plans and strategic success, the value of B = .528, the value of Beta = .531 with P-value =.000 this indicated that there is a significant and positive relationship between effective systematic plan and strategic success. As for model (2) which applied multiple regression analysis to find both effective systematic plan as independent factor and change event as a mediator factor with strategic success as dependent factor, the findings showed that the value of B =.539, the value of Beta = .542 with P-value .001 as indirect relationship between effective systematic plan and strategic success, on the other hand the value of B =.593, the value of Beta = .598 with P-value .000 as mediation between change event and strategic success. The findings proved that there is a positive and significant direct and indirect relationship between effective systematic plan and strategic success, moreover change event has a positive and significant mediating role between effective systematic plan and strategic success.
Table 13: Sobel Test

| Input: | Test statistic: | Std. Error: | p-value: |
|--------|-----------------|-------------|----------|
| $a$ .539 | 5.1760321 | 0.06175136 | 0 |
| $b$ .593 | 5.15310149 | 0.06202614 | 0 |
| $s_a$ .081 | 5.19927157 | 0.06147534 | 0 |
| $s_b$ .072 | Reset all | Calculate | |

P-value is significant at level 0.005

Table (13), illustrates the findings of Sobel test to find the mediation analysis, the result demonstrates the direct relationship between effective systematic plan and strategic success, P-value = .000 this indicated that there is a significant and positive direct relationship between effective systematic plan and strategic success. Furthermore, P-value is .000 as indirect relationship between effective systematic plan and strategic success. Moreover, the results proved that there is a positive and significant direct and indirect relationship between effective systematic plan and strategic success, moreover change event has a positive and significant mediating role between effective systematic plan and strategic success.

V. CONCLUSION

Change is an unavoidable aspect of life. Technology, institutional innovations and processes, internal laws and regulations, the transition of government departments to private companies, organizational restructuring schemes, shifts in management decisions, and other external factors all play a role in different ways. The researchers used multiple regression analysis to assess their established research hypotheses, while the Sobel test was used to determine the function of the mediator, which is the change management initiative. The results showed that all research hypotheses are supported, with the third research hypothesis receiving the highest value, stating that change event mediates education and strategic success, and the first research hypothesis receiving the lowest value, stating that change event mediates technology change and strategic success. Technology transition, the climate of change and strategic success, education, communication and strategic success, and a successful systematic strategy are only a few examples of external factors. Different views and perspectives on change exist in the hospitality industry, which can have both positive and negative consequences. More precisely, successfully managing transformation resistance aided businesses in smoothly implementing change. Organizational transformation helps companies to devise ways to effectively implement change management with the aid of different transition models. Finally, once the transition is in line with the organization's goals and plans, change management provides the company with many benefits.
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