

Exploring the Innovativeness, Proactiveness, Risk Taking, CSR Support, Organizational Engagement, Job Engagement, and Creativity on PR Tirta Bangunan Baru

Zoel Hutabarat, Khennedy Kuswanto

Universitas Pelita Harapan, Tangerang, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Companies that exist all around the world need to have the skills. Those skills are needed to become a flourishing company, because it's not just about strategies or goals. It's also bound by the worker in that company. That bond is the worker or the employees of that company that contribute to the company which makes a difference against other competitors. The purpose of this research is to analyze the factors that employees need to be able to contribute by Innovativeness, Proactiveness, Risk Taking, CSR Support, Organizational Engagement, Job Engagement, and Creativity to the company. The data gathered was through the use of a survey approach using google forms in a series of questionnaires. The subject of this research is the employees of PT.Tirta Bangunan Baru. The method used is quantitative research and a purposive sampling is used for this research, The Partial Least Square Structural Equation Modelling which is SMART-PLS SEM is used for the technique to scrutinise the data (v 4.0.8.4). Validity and reliability tests were performed in this study with a pretest of 40 respondents. Furthermore, a total of 210 respondents were chosen for the sample size of this study. Additionally, the data concluded having 9 supported hypotheses and 2 not supported hypotheses from all 11 hypotheses that are included in this research. The data that has been gathered produced results to show all the variables examined had a positive effect on PT.Tirta Bangunan Baru employees.

Keywords: Innovativeness; Proactiveness; Risk Taking; CSR Support; Organizational Engagement; Job Engagement; Creativity; Employees

INTRODUCTION

According to Hermina & Yosepha (2019) that individuals are working based on a contract that is formed with a company and that individuals also have their responsibility to be held responsible for their own action that has been done from the given task. Employees are known as individuals that need guidance from leaders to be able to work properly such as influence in performance, creativity, and encouragement to make these individuals aware of their position. Direct influence can result in empowerment in employee work performance such as strategic development, work enrichment, participative management, increase in motivation, innovative capabilities and quality control (Karakoc & Yilmaz, 2009). Based on Lepak et al (2004) small contributions trains employees to create their own value and goals in a contribution to a company which focuses on skills and efficiency in the company, so these employees are what makes a company create the value.

According to Handayani (2021) one of the reason that many companies are not recruiting many individuals meanwhile they're reducing employees because it concerns the efficiency of the employees that are in the same working section which have similarities, doing so by recruiting new individuals it won't solve the efficiency meanwhile it can cause a decline in company performance. According to (Shavinina, 2003) Innovativeness is being referred to how

people react to these new things that are interindividual differences. Beside that Proactiveness is the physical capability to act and the intellectual capability to think, including the ability to create and apply knowledge that are derived according to (Nafei, 2016; Nissen & von Rennenkampff, 2017). The next one is Risk Taking. According to (Mohr, Biele, & Heekeren, 2010; Van Duijvenvoorde & Crone, 2013) Risk Taking is based on a model that is a neuroeconomic of decision making, for CSR support has been describe as activities of a corporate that been aiming to recognize and also realise the importance of social responsibility, according to (Anderson et al., 2007). Based on Kang et al, 2021 organisational engagement and job engagement is part of employee engagement. According to (Macey and Schneider, 2015) employee engagement is conversations with client that ambiguous among academic researchers and among practitioners, and According to Maslach et al.'s (2001) that job engagement has been defined as paying attention as an individual, that is to the performance of their own role and work. The last one is creativity. According to amabile et al. (1996) has been defined creativity as “the production of novel and useful ideas in any domain”.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Innovativeness

Innovativeness is being referred to how people react to these new things that are interindividual differences (Shavinina, 2003). Besides that, according to (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996), innovativeness is understood as a support that creates new products, processes and services to promote a company's experiments, new ideas and creative processes. All of this can be studied. That in terms of outcome or process (Linton, 2019).

Proactiveness

Proactiveness from (Nafei, 2016; Nissen & von Rennenkampff, 2017) Have been described as physical capability to act and the intellectual capability to think, including the ability to create and apply knowledge that is derived. By that the firms will prosper in changing, unpredictable environments and even the potential to survive. Beside that (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996) also describe proactiveness as a company that is active to anticipate future opportunities and market demands. This also means that proactiveness can market cultivation power and preoccupy the market. After that Proactiveness reflects the willingness of a person to introduce new products. Pro-activeness also means boldly participate in the market, ready to change in the environment that will create future demand and to make service or new products before competitors, (Keh et al., 2007)

Risk Taking

According to (Mohr, Biele, & Heekeren, 2010; Van Duijvenvoorde & Crone, 2013) Risk is based on a model that is a neuroeconomic of decision making. This risk is also a general construct. This general construct is not restricted to dangerous behaviours or illegal. Other researchers also describe Risk-taking by the definition of risk-taking as the willingness of a person to challenge things, even if the conclusion of the result is uncertain (Sexton and Bowman, 1986). Beside that risk can be divided into three components that are variability in the likelihood of outcomes that is just a potential that is being realised, having the potential of reward and cost, and the uncertainty outcomes (Holton, 2004). Other than this there are many studies that claim to examine decision making that is under risk, using a broad range. That broad

range is of measures that indicates an individual level of risk taking. (BART, Lejuez et al., 2003). The sub dimension autonomy refers to valuing the owner's own decision making, which is making this more relevant for SME owners. SME owners also have lower importance for managers or employees (Krauss et al., 2005).

Support for CSR

According to (Anderson et al., 2007) CSR is described as activities of a corporation aiming to recognize and realise the importance of social responsibility. This also includes economic responsibility. All this social responsibility and economics is in the decision-making process of a corporate management. CSR also can provide rewards. That reward is growth that leads to sustainability, because of that SMEs need to approach support for CSR strategy (Stoian and Gilman, 2017). Substantial benefits from CSR activities that are visible are being expected by SMEs (Tilley, 2000).

Organizational Engagement

According to (Macey and Schneider, 2015) employee engagement is conversations with clients that are ambiguous among academic researchers and among practitioners. Besides that, employee engagement is also being theories by Kahn (1990) that work role is a function suggested by that person. That function is the three different psychological conditions. The theory of engagement based on social exchange theory (SET) is the concept of employee engagement. This engagement based on social exchange theory is dividing it into organizational and job engagement.

CEOs prefer enthusiastic employees. The CEO prefers that because of the CEO, because they fulfil their roles and contribute to the organization. They do that with high job and organizational performance (Xanthopoulou et al., 2009; Rich et al., 2010). Organizational engagement is also described as an individual psychological role by doing their job with the best that they can as a member of the organization (Iddagoda, 2017).

Job Engagement

According to Maslach et al.'s (2001) that job engagement has been defined as paying attention as an individual, that is to the performance of their own role and work. That is why job engagement is the belief of the employees (Schaufeli and Bakker, 2010). Besides that, job engagement is also defined as someone that has enthusiastic and involvement in their job. (Roberts, 2002). Job engagement is also said to be an investment of the individual emotion, cognitive and physical energies into work performance (Kahn, 1990; Rich, Lepine, & Crawford, 2010).

Creativity

According to Amabile et al. (1996) has been defined creativity as “the production of novel and useful ideas in any domain”. In working creativity is needed to make new opportunities or to create innovative ideas to be better. This is also said by (Hirst et al., 2009) that in business employee creativity is needed that way the employee can bring innovative ideas and provide solutions to the problem. Besides that, this creativity can also increase the competitive advantage against other firms or other companies. This creativity can also be considered an asset for solving problem of an individual, organization and social problem, by doing this

creativity can bring achieving sustainable development (Barbot, Besançon, & Lubart, 2015; Lubart, Zenasni, & Barbot, 2013; Zeng, Proctor, & Salvendy, 2011).

RESEARCH METHOD

Sampling

This research is quantitative research with non-probability sampling and purposive methods. Data was collected by distributing questionnaires via online platforms such as Whatsapp. This research was conducted on 210 employees from PT Tirta Bangun Baru and processed using SmartPLS.

Table 1. Respondent Profile

| Category | No of Respondent | Result |
|-------------------------------|------------------|--------|
| Male | 116 | 55.2% |
| Female | 94 | 44.8% |
| Married | 125 | 59.5% |
| Unmarried | 85 | 40.5% |
| 18-21 | 16 | 7.6% |
| 22-25 | 79 | 37.6% |
| 26-30 | 75 | 35.7% |
| 30-35 | 35 | 16.2% |
| Over 35 | 6 | 2.9% |
| Below High School | 12 | 5.7% |
| High School | 114 | 54.3% |
| University | 23 | 11% |
| Bachelor's degree | 61 | 29% |
| Higher than bachelor's degree | 0 | 0% |
| Under 1 year | 15 | 7.1% |
| 1-3 Years | 79 | 37.6% |
| 3-5 Years | 70 | 33.3% |
| 5-7 Years | 28 | 13.3% |
| Over 7 Years | 18 | 8.6% |
| Sales | 147 | 70% |
| Manager | 10 | 4.8% |
| Other | 53 | 25.2% |

Table 2. Average Variance Extracted and Composite Reliability Results

| Indicators | Composite Reliability | Average Variance Extracted (AVE) | Results |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------------|---------|
| CSR Support | 0.804 | 0.511 | Valid |
| Creativity | 0.800 | 0.507 | Valid |
| Innovativeness | 0.836 | 0.563 | Valid |

| | | | |
|---------------------------|-------|-------|-------|
| Job Engagement | 0.783 | 0.644 | Valid |
| Organizational Engagement | 0.890 | 0.575 | Valid |
| Proactiveness | 0.779 | 0.639 | Valid |
| Risk Taking | 0.751 | 0.501 | Valid |

Source: Actual Data Processing Results using Smart-PLS 4.0 (2022)

According to Hair et al (2014), to determine convergent validity, each variable should have an Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value of at least 0.5 and a Composite Reliability (CR) value of at least 0.7. All variables met the given requirements of convergent validity with the value of the specified requirements of AVE and CR, according to above table.

RESULT

Table 3. Path Coefficient Hypothesis Results

| Hypothesis | Original sample (O) | T statistics (O/STDEV) | P values | Decision |
|--|---------------------|--------------------------|----------|---------------|
| H1 : CSR support -> Job Engagement | 0.186 | 2.024 | 0.022 | Supported |
| H2 : CSR support -> Organizational Engagement | 0.269 | 2.730 | 0.003 | Supported |
| H3 : Innovativeness -> Job Engagement | 0.234 | 3.242 | 0.001 | Supported |
| H4 : Innovativeness -> Organizational Engagement | 0.277 | 4.616 | 0.000 | Supported |
| H5 : Job Engagement -> Creativity | 0.492 | 5.941 | 0.000 | Supported |
| H6 : Organizational Engagement -> Creativity | 0.253 | 3.787 | 0.000 | Supported |
| H7 : Organizational Engagement -> Job Engagement | -0.043 | 0.490 | 0.312 | Not supported |
| H8 : Proactiveness -> Job Engagement | 0.358 | 4.818 | 0.000 | Supported |
| H9 : Proactiveness -> Organizational Engagement | 0.095 | 1.023 | 0.153 | Not supported |
| H10 : Risk taking -> Job Engagement | 0.158 | 2.372 | 0.009 | Supported |
| H11 : Risk taking -> Organizational Engagement | 0.298 | 4.315 | 0.000 | Supported |

Source: Actual Data Processing Result using Smart-PLS 4.0(2022)

H1: CSR support has positive effect on Job Engagement

Based on table it shows the test result for T statistic and P value. In the following table the T statistic value which is 2.024 which is greater than 1,64, so it shows there is an effect of CSR support has an effect on Job Engagement. The P value shows the value of 0,022, so it's lower than 0,05. It can be shown that CSR support has an effect on Job Engagement. Other than that, the original value of sample data on CSR supports 0.186 or 18,6 % on Job Engagement. So, with that we can have the conclusion that CSR Support has a positive effect on Job engagement.

H2: CSR Support has positive effect on Organizational engagement

Based table it shows the test result for T statistic and P value. In the following table the T statistic value which is 2.730 which is greater than 1,64, so it shows there is an effect of CSR support has an effect on Organizational Engagement. The P value shows the value of 0,003, so it's lower than 0,05. It can be shown that CSR support has an effect on Organizational Engagement. Other than that, the original value of sample data on CSR supports 0.269 or 26,9 % on organizational Engagement. So, with that can come the conclusion that CSR Support has a positive effect on Organizational engagement.

H3: Innovativeness has positive effect on Job Engagement

Based table it shows the test result for T statistic and P value. In the following table the T statistic value which is 3.242 which is greater than 1,64, so it shows there is an effect of Innovativeness that has an effect on Job Engagement. The P value shows the value of 0,001, so it's lower than 0,05. It can be shown that Innovativeness has an effect on Job Engagement. Other than that, the original value of sample data on Innovativeness 0.234 or 23.4 % on Job Engagement. So, with that we can have the conclusion that Innovativeness has positive effect on Organizational engagement.

H4: Innovativeness has positive effect on Organizational engagement

Based table it shows the test result for T statistic and P value. In the following table the T statistic value which is 4.616 which is greater than 1,64, so it shows there is an effect of Innovativeness that has an effect on Organizational Engagement. The P value shows the value of 0.000, so it's lower than 0,05. It can be shown that Innovativeness has an effect on Organizational Engagement. Other than that, the original value of sample data on Innovativeness 0.277 or 27,7 % on Organizational Engagement. So, with that can come the conclusion that Innovativeness has a positive effect on Organizational engagement.

H5: Job Engagement has positive effect on Creativity

Based on table it shows the test result for T statistic and P value. In the following table the T statistic value, which is 5.941, which is greater than 1,64, so it shows there is an effect of Job Engagement that has an effect on Creativity. The P value shows the value of 0.000, so it's lower than 0,05. It can be shown that Job Engagement has an effect on Creativity. Other than that, the original value of sample data on CSR support 0.492 or 49.2 % on Job Engagement. So, with that can come the conclusion that Job Engagement has a positive effect on Creativity.

H6: Organizational Engagement has positive effect on Creativity

Based on table it shows the test result for T statistic and P value. In the following table the T statistic value which is 3.787 which is greater than 1,64, so it shows there is an effect of Organizational Engagement that has an effect on Creativity. The P value shows the value of 0.000, so it's lower than 0,05. It can be shown that Organizational Engagement has an effect on Creativity. Other than that, the original value of sample data on Organizational Engagement 0.253 or 25,3 % on Creativity. So, with that can come the conclusion that Organizational Engagement has a positive effect on Creativity.

H7: Organizational Engagement has positive effect on Job Engagement

Based on table it shows the test result for T statistic and P value. In the following table the T statistic value which is 0.490 which is lower than 1,64, so it shows there is no effect of Organizational Engagement that has no effect on Job Engagement. The P value shows the value of 0.312, so it's greater than 0,05. It can be shown that Innovativeness has no effect on Organizational Engagement. Other than that, the original value of sample data on Organizational Engagement -0.043 or -4,3 % on Job Engagement. So, with that can come the conclusion that Innovativeness has no effect on Organizational engagement.

H8: Proactiveness has positive effect on Job Engagement

Based on table it shows the test result for T statistic and P value. In the following table the T statistic value which is 4.818 which is greater than 1,64, so it shows there is an effect of Proactiveness that has an effect on Job Engagement. The P value shows the value of 0.000, so it's lower than 0,05. It can be shown that Proactiveness has an effect on Job Engagement. Other than that, the original value of sample data on Proactiveness 0.358 or 35.8 % on Job Engagement. So, with that can come the conclusion that Proactiveness has a positive effect on Job Engagement.

H9: Proactiveness has positive effect on Organizational Engagement

Based on table it shows the test result for T statistic and P value. In the following table the T statistic value which is 1.023 which is lower than 1,64, so it shows there is an effect of Proactiveness that has no effect on Organizational Engagement. The P value shows the value of 0.153, so it's greater than 0,05. It can be shown that Proactiveness has no effect on Organizational Engagement. Other than that, the original value of sample data on Proactiveness 0.095 or 9.5 % on Organizational Engagement. So, with that can come the conclusion that Proactiveness has no effect on Organizational engagement.

H10: Risk Taking has positive effect on Job Engagement

Based on table it shows the test result for T statistic and P value. In the following table the T statistic value which is 2.372 which is greater than 1,64, so it shows there is an effect of Risk Taking that has an effect on Job Engagement. The P value shows the value of 0.009, so it's lower than 0,05. It can be shown that Risk Taking has an effect on Job Engagement. Other than that, the original value of sample data on Risk Taking 0.158 or 15.8 % on Job Engagement. So, with that can come the conclusion that Risk Taking has a positive effect on Job engagement.

H11: Risk Taking has positive effect on Organizational Engagement

Based on table it shows the test result for T statistic and P value. In the following table the T statistic value which is 4.315 which is greater than 1,64, so it shows there is an effect of

Risk Taking that has an effect on Organizational Engagement. The P value shows the value of 0.000, so it's lower than 0,05. It can be shown that Risk Taking has an effect on Organizational Engagement. Other than that, the original value of sample data on Risk Taking 0.298 or 29.8% on Job Engagement. So, with that can come the conclusion that Risk Taking has a positive effect on Organizational engagement.

DISCUSSION

Based on the results, the data have been tested in the hypothesis actual data by processing all the respondents, that is 210 respondents. There are many hypotheses that are 9 hypotheses that are approved and 2 hypotheses that are rejected. Therefore, not all the hypotheses in this research or study are accepted. This is based on the data analysis of the hypotheses testing. The two hypotheses are rejected because they failed to meet the established requirements, the relationship of each variable and correlation are described in the following discussion.

According to the result H1, that is CSR support has a positive impact on job engagement. This hypothesis of H1 is accepted and it's supported based on the result of the hypothesis findings from table 4.19. Based on my observation the employee is comfortable working in the company and with that the employee becomes more enthusiastic about working. They become like that because they are still young. The age of the employee is determined young and still think if i get salary that enough for the employee feel satisfied. Based on table 4.3 the highest respondent is with the age of 22 to 25 years old. Based on the data collected from CSR support in table 4.10 it proves that CS1 with the statement of I am trying to improving my work environment with the highest mean and based on the data collected from organisational engagement in table 4.11 proves that OE6, “I am committed to this company” and OE1 “Working in this company is very interesting” has the highest mean. According to (Haque, 2020) also stated that CSR Support has a positive effect on Organisational Engagement.

The second hypothesis H2 which is CSR Support has a positive effect on Organisational engagement which is stated based on the results that has been conducted that it's accepted. Based on my observation the employee is comfortable with their work with that the employee is trying to make their environment better than before. Based on the data collected from CSR support in table 4.10 it proves that CS1 with the statement of I am trying to improving my work environment with the highest mean and based on table 4.11 the highest mean which is OE6 that has a statement of “I am committed to this company” that the employee is committed to the company. Based on the data received its stated that the employees are committed to their work in the company, which proves a positive relationship between CSR Support and organizational engagement. Besides that, based on the result, this hypothesis is supported because T statistics are above 1.64 and the P value is below 0.05.

The hypothesis H3 is accepted and supported based on the findings of the hypothesis testing, which is the relation between innovativeness to job engagement as the third hypothesis. This has a relation based on my observation that the employee is still young and still has creative ways to come up with new ideas. Based on table 4.3 proves that 22 to 25 years old is the highest respondent. So, it can be seen that the respondent is still young. Based on the data collected from Innovativeness in table 4.7 proves that IN1 with the statement “I am interested in improving products for the customer.” is the highest mean. Beside that based on the result of table 4.12 which has the highest mean JE5 with the statement “The job I have makes me

enthusiastic about working”. According to (Pandey et al., 2021) claim that innovativeness has a positive effect on Job Engagement.

The fourth hypothesis is H4 which is the relation between innovativeness to organizational engagement. This hypothesis has a positive relationship between each other. The employee is interested in improving the company and also makes the employee committed to the company. This is because of their age, which is the younger the age the more creative innovativeness in the company. Besides that, based on my observation that the worker of the age of 22 to 25 is the one that is enthusiastic and the one that is eager to be more creative. Based on table 4.7 proves that IN1 with the statement “I am interested in improving products for the customer.” is the highest mean. Besides that, the data collected from organizational engagement in table 4.11 proves that OE6, “I am committed to this company” and OE1 “Working in this company is very interesting” has the highest meaning. (Kang et al., 2021) has been investigated the relationship between Innovativeness and Organizational Engagement. In that research it has been claimed that Innovativeness has a positive effect on Organizational Engagement.

The next hypothesis is H5 which also has a positive relationship between Job engagement and creativity, which we can state that it is accepted and supported from table 4.19. This is because the worker is enthusiastic about their work and that will result in willingness to make creative ideas. Besides that, based on my observation that the worker between the age of 22 to 25 is the one that is enthusiastic and the one that is eager to do something. That also results in the worker to be creative in their work. Based on the table 4.3 proves that the highest respondent is between the age of 22 to 25. Beside that based on the result of table 4.12 which has the highest mean JE5 with the statement “The job I have makes me enthusiastic about working”. Beside that table 4.13 with the highest mean of CY3 and the statement of I want to create new innovative ideas in my field. This hypothesis, which is stated based on the results that has been conducted that it's accepted, according to the result of table 4.19 that this hypothesis is supported. Based on the result that this hypothesis is supported because T statistics is above 1.64 and the P value is below 0.05. According to (Ismail et al., 2019) also investigated this and the results say that Employee engagement will have a positive effect on creativity.

The sixth hypothesis is H6 which is organizational engagement that has a positive effect on creativity. Organizational engagement has an effect on creativity because organizational engagement has an important role that brings their motivation into their work performance to reach the company goals, with their motivation they will feel more creative to reach their goal. That is a usual thing to do in a company. The worker has to be creative in their work. That also will become the result of being more efficient at their work. Based on the result 4.4 it showed that High school education level is the highest respondent which explains that the company has workers that are open minded. Besides that, the data collected from organizational engagement in table 4.11 proves that OE6, “I am committed to this company” and OE1 “Working in this company is very interesting” has the highest meaning. Beside that table 4.13 with the highest mean of CY3 and the statement of I want to create new innovative ideas in my field. This hypothesis, which is stated based on the results that has been conducted that it's accepted, according to the result of table 4.19 that this hypothesis is supported. Based on the result that this hypothesis is supported because T statistics is above 1.64 and the P value is below 0.05. Besides that, according to (Ismail et al., 2019) stated that organizational engagement will have a positive effect on creativity and the other researcher.

The next hypothesis is H7 which is organizational engagement that has a positive effect on job engagement which is stated based on the result that has been conducted. That this hypothesis is being rejected because the P value of the result is higher than 0.05 which is 0.312 and the T statistics is lower than 1.64 and the result of the test is 0.490 and based on one tailed test that has been conducted these values are not supported and rejected. This is because from my observation in the company the employee is committed to the company, but they still do not focus on their work, that is why the company has to give some guidance to the employee or the worker in the company. This is because the high respondents have the education of a high school degree based on table 4.4. High school graduates have high motivation, but they are still young and not focused on the work that they receive. Based on the result of table 4.11 which proves that OE6, “I am committed to this company” and OE1 “Working in this company is very interesting” have the highest meaning. And table 4.12 proves that JE2 “Sometimes, I am so into my job that I lose track of time” has the lowest meaning. Beside that according to (Malinen and Harju, 2016). They stated that organizational engagement has a positive effect on Job Engagement. But based on table 4.19 this is not supported. Because the previous study ran the research in different industries.

The eighth hypothesis is H8, which has the relationship between proactiveness and job engagement. This hypothesis has a positive relationship between each other. Proactiveness has an effect on job engagement because the worker is enthusiastic about finding new working innovation in the company and by making new working innovation, they as the employee have to be more creative. Based on the result 4.4 it showed that High school education level is the highest respondent which explains that the company has workers that are open minded, more enthusiastic and eager to earn money from their work based on their age. The age of people older than 26 years old is usually not open minded. Based on table 4.3 it showed that 22-25 years old is the highest respondent, so the employee is considered creative people. Based on table 4.8 proves that PA3 with the statement of “I tend to find new working innovation in this company” with the highest mean. Besides that, based on JE5 with the statement of “The job I have makes me enthusiastic about working” has the highest meaning. This hypothesis, which is stated based on the results that has been conducted that it’s accepted, according to the result of table 4.19 that this hypothesis is supported. Based on the result that this hypothesis is supported because T statistics is above 1.64 and the P value is below 0.05. Beside that according to (Ismail et al., 2019) this and the result say that Employee engagement will have a positive effect on creativity.

The ninth hypothesis is H9 which is proactiveness that has a positive effect on organizational engagement which is stated based on the result that has been conducted. That this hypothesis is being rejected because the P value of the result is higher than 0.05 which is 0.153 and the T statistics is lower than 1.64 and the result of the test is 1.023 and based on one tailed test that has been conducted these values are not supported and rejected. This is because from my observation the employee tends to be active in the company while the owner or the boss is there. By doing so the employee is not happy because the employee wants to do what they want, not what the company wants them to do. This has to do with the age and education level of the employee. Since the majority of employees are high school graduates with the age between 22 to 25, they still want to do what they want. Based on table 4.3 proved that the highest respondent is with the age between 22 to 25 and based on table 4.4 proved that the highest respondent is with a high school degree. So, it can be seen that they are eager to be active but with that age and education still want to do what they want, not what they have to

do. Based on table 4.8 it is proven that the PA3 “I tend to find new working innovation in this company” with the highest mean and based on table 4.11 that proved that OE4 “Working in this company is making me happy” with the lowest mean. Beside that according to (Kang et al., 2021) The last researcher or the previous study also has been investigating this. The result says that proactiveness has a positive effect on organizational engagement but based on table 4.19 this is not supported. Because the previous study ran the research in different industries.

The next hypothesis is H10, which is the relationship between risk taking and job engagement. This hypothesis has a positive relationship between each other. Risk taking has that effect on job engagement because the employee is active to try with uncertain situations with such enthusiasm. This will involve the age of the respondent. Based on my observation, between the ages of 22-25 they are still eager to learn new stuff. Based on the table 4.3 proves that the highest respondent is the age between 22 to 25. Based on the result of table 4.9 prove that RT1 with the statement “I am trying to actively enter new work areas even in uncertain situations” is the highest mean. Beside that based on the result of table 4.12 proves that JE5 with the statement of “The job I have makes me enthusiastic about working” is the highest mean. This hypothesis, which is stated based on the results that has been conducted that it's accepted, according to the result of table 4.19 that this hypothesis is supported. Based on the result that this hypothesis is supported because T statistics is above 1.64 and the P value is below 0.05. Besides that, according to (Pandey et al., 2021) the result also says that risk taking has a positive effect on job engagement.

The last hypothesis is H11, which is the relationship between risk taking and organizational engagement. This hypothesis has a positive relationship between each other. Risk taking has that effect on organizational engagement because the employee is active to try with uncertain situations that the employee feels interested in working. This also involves age and working period. This is because based table 4.3 on the age category that the highest respondent is the age between 22 to 25 years old and many young adults today are eager to try something new outside of their area of expertise and that's why many individuals at that certain age usually takes risk to increase their knowledge and work experience in different categories. Besides that, table 4.5 proves that working periode in this company is between 1 to 3 years and is the highest respondent. Based on that working period is taking risk in 1-3 years with work experience in the company is considered an ambitious decision because usually the employees who would take risk even though working in that company the period duration isn't too long are still not confident they should contribute through risk taking with the duration only 1-3 years' experience in that company but with the risk taking it can be concluded that if the decision brings a positive outcome it would increase the company's popularity and it would guarantee acknowledgement to the individual who took that risk. Based on the table 4.9 proves that RT1 with the statement “I am trying to actively enter new work areas even in uncertain situations” is the highest mean. Beside that based on the result of table 4.11 which proves that OE6, “I am committed to this company” and OE1 “Working in this company is very interesting” has the highest meaning. Beside that according to (Hamdan and Alheet, 2020) the result says that risk taking has a positive effect on organisational engagement.

IMPLICATION

The managerial implications that can be included in the company are based on the research that has been conducted. The implication of innovativeness can affect the company to

increase their confidence in the company to improve products. Based on my observation the company can give more freedom to give suggestions and also give more motivation, so the employees are willing to give their suggestions to the company, such as making a session or meeting between the employee and the leader with the leader asking the employee for suggestions for the company in any aspect of the company. Besides that, a company can search risk taking of the employee to know their willingness to take risk, this can be done by searching other methods such as the weakness of the company and ask the solution from the employee. When that solution has been taken the provider of the solution has to take responsibility, because that solution is from the one that gives that solution or suggestion, such as making an event in the morning before the company opens and the leader gives the problem and asking the employee for solution of the problem.

RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Recommendation for the future research is to expand the survey area such as not be strictly to only on companies but other targets such as SME or others. Other than that, the location can also be expanded. The area of the research depends on the company location and highly recommended that the respondent is an individual not just an organization or rather than individual. Besides that, it's highly recommended that the respondent has at least a working period of one year. That way the research has more significant and accurate data on the adaptation to the company value and goals. In this study's geographic focus is in one company where the results cannot be generalized to other companies. In a company there are just a limited number of workers that work there. Therefore, the future recommendation is to gather more samples or only focus on companies that have many employees that are particular in the country of research for a more sophisticated result. Questionnaires are also one of the crucial things in doing research. Therefore, making more questionnaires can help make results easier and can get more valid results. Besides that, the other recommendation is to conduct this research in a different industry or the same industry at another location. Because if this research is being done in the same industry with the same location most likely will have the same result.

REFERENCES

- Alan M. Saks. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7).
<https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/02683940610690169/full/html>
- Andrew H. Gold, Arvind Malhotra, & Albert H. Segars. (2001). Knowledge management: an organizational capabilities perspective. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18(1), 185–214.
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/07421222.2001.11045669>
- Anna C. K. Van Duijvenvoorde, & Eveline A. Crone. (2013). The Teenage Brain: A Neuroeconomic Approach to Adolescent Decision Making. *Sage Journals*, 22(2).
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0963721413475446>

- Ante Glavas. (2016). Corporate Social Responsibility and Employee Engagement: Enabling Employees to Employ More of Their Whole Selves at Work. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00796/full>
- Anuradha Iddagoda, & Henarath H. D. N. P Opatha. (2017). Identified Research Gaps in Employee Engagement. *International Business Research*, 10(2), 63–73. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311908732_Identified_Research_Gaps_in_Employee_Engagement
- Arvind Kumar. (2020). Business Research Methodology. *Chapter- Hypothesis Testing*. https://www.lkouniv.ac.in/site/writereaddata/siteContent/202004021910157977arvind_kumar_com_BRM_hypothesis_testing.pdf
- Baptiste Barbot, M. Besançon, & T. Lubart. (2015). Creative potential in educational settings: its nature, measure, and nurture. *Education*, 3–13. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Creative-potential-in-educational-settings%3A-its-and-Barbot-Besan%C3%A7on/f626d5e27491ecc375e9e759cd280cdd6c531569>
- Bruce Louis Rich, Jeffrey A. Lepine, & Eean R. Crawford. (2017a). Job Engagement: Antecedents and Effects on Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3). <https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/amj.2010.51468988>
- Bruce Louis Rich, Jeffrey A. Lepine, & Eean R. Crawford. (2017b). Job Engagement: Antecedents and Effects on Job Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(3). <https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/amj.2010.51468988>
- C. Lejuez, W. Aklin, Heather A Jones, J. Richards, D. Strong, C. Kahler, & J. Read. (2003). The Balloon Analogue Risk Task (BART) differentiates smokers and nonsmokers. *Experimental and Clinical Psychopharmacology*. [https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Balloon-Analogue-Risk-Task-\(BART\)-smokers-and-Lejuez-Aklin/858705e027e79e9836ca5be0bcbd3e3debdf5c41](https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/The-Balloon-Analogue-Risk-Task-(BART)-smokers-and-Lejuez-Aklin/858705e027e79e9836ca5be0bcbd3e3debdf5c41)
- Carmen Stoian, & Mark Gilman. (2016). Corporate Social Responsibility That “Pays”: A Strategic Approach to CSR for SMEs. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 55(1), 5–31. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jsbm.12224>
- Christina Maslach, Wilmar B. Schaufeli, & Michael P. Leiter. (2001). Job Burnout. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 397–422. <https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.397>
- Crina Damşa, & Alfredo Jornet. (2021). The unit of analysis in learning research: Approaches for imagining a transformative agenda. *Learning, Culture and Social Interaction*, 31. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S2210656120300775>
- Darryl R. Roberts, & Thomas O. Davenport. (2002). Job engagement: Why it’s important and how to improve It. *Employment Relations Today*, 29(3), 21–29. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229504789_Job_engagement_Why_it%27s_important_and_how_to_improve_It
-

- David P. Lepak, Jennifer A. Marrone, & Riki Takeuchi. (2004). The relativity of HR systems: Conceptualising the impact of desired employee contributions and HR philosophy. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 27, 6–7. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/247832545_The_relativity_of_HR_systems_Conceptualising_the_impact_of_desired_employee_contributions_and_HR_philosophy
- Deddy Lukman Shaid. (2021). PEKERJA DI DKI JAKARTA PADA AGUSTUS 2021. *Unit Pengelola Statistik*.
- Despoina Xanthopoulou, & Wilmar B. Schaufeli. (2009). Reciprocal relationships between job resources, personal resources, and work engagement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 74(3), 235–244. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0001879108001243?via%3Dihub>
- Feroze Kaliyadan, & Vinay Kulkarni. (2019). Types of Variables, Descriptive Statistics, and Sample Size. *Indian Dermatol Online J*, 10(1), 82–86. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6362742/>
- Fiona Tilley. (2002). Small firm environmental ethics: how deep do they go? *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 9(1), 31–41. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/1467-8608.00167>
- Frederic Hilkenmeier, Carla Bohndick, Thomas Bohndick, & Johanna Hilkenmeier. (2020). Assessing Distinctiveness in Multidimensional Instruments Without Access to Raw Data – A Manifest Fornell-Larcker Criterion. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00223/full>
- Gabriel Linton. (2019). Innovativeness, risk-taking, and proactiveness in startups: a case study and conceptual development. *Journal of Global Entrepreneurship Research*, 9(20), 701. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s40497-019-0147-5>
- Gaëlle Duthler, & Ganga S. Dhanesh. (2018). The role of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and internal CSR communication in predicting employee engagement: Perspectives from the United Arab Emirates (UAE). *Public Relations Review*, 44(4), 453–462. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0363811118301139>
- G.D. Garson. (2016). Partial Least Squares (PLS-SEM) Regression and Structural Equation Models. . *Statistical Associates Publishers*.
- Giles Hirst, Daan Van Knippenberg, & Jing Zhou. (2009). A Cross-Level Perspective on Employee Creativity: Goal Orientation, Team Learning Behavior, and Individual Creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 52(2). <https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/amj.2009.37308035>
- Glyn A. Holton. (2004). Defining Risk. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 60(6), 19–25. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4480615>
-

Hair, F Joseph, W. C Black, B. J. Babin, & R. E. Anderson. (2014). *Pearson Education Limited*.

Hamed Taherdoost. (2016). Sampling Methods in Research Methodology; How to Choose a Sampling Technique for Research. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 5(2), 18–27. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319998246_Sampling_Methods_in_Research_Methodology_How_to_Choose_a_Sampling_Technique_for_Research

Haque Adnan Ul, Aston John, Kozlovski Eugene, & Caha Zdeněk. (2020). Role of external CSR and social support programme for sustaining human capital in contrasting economies. *POLISH JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES*, 22(1). <https://yadda.icm.edu.pl/baztech/element/bwmeta1.element.baztech-911c0476-c885-47e2-a8b4-92402b9f57d9>

Harriet Hunt, Alex Pollock, Pauline Campbell, Lise Estcourt, & Ginny Brunton. (2018). An introduction to overviews of reviews: planning a relevant research question and objective for an overview. *Systematic Reviews*, 7(39). <https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13643-018-0695-8>

Hean Tat Keh, & Hwei Ping Ng. (2007). The effects of entrepreneurial orientation and marketing information on the performance of SMEs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(4), 592–611. <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0883902606000498>

Helen Anderson. (2007). Corporate Social Responsibility—The Case for Unsecured Creditors. *Oxford University Commonwealth Law Journal*, 7(1), 93–124. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14729342.2007.11421479>

Hussein Nabil Ismail, Adnan Iqbal, & Lina Nasr. (2019). Employee engagement and job performance in Lebanon: the mediating role of creativity. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 68(3). <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/IJPPM-02-2018-0052/full/html>

J. B. Ullman, & P. M. Bentler. (2012). Structural equation modeling. *Handbook of Psychology, Second Edition*, 2.

J. De Carvalho, & F. O. Chima. (2014). Applications of Structural Equation Modeling in Social Sciences Research. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 4(1), 6–11. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Applications-of-Structural-Equation-Modeling-in-Carvalho-Chima/e1b77d09820a27714060989fabe20592a3d914f5>

Jatin Pandey, Manish Gupta, & Yusuf Hassan. (2021). Intrapreneurship to engage employees: role of psychological capital. *Management Decision*, 59(6). <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/MD-06-2019-0825/full/html>

Joseph F Hair, Marko Sarstedt, Christian M. Ringle, & Siggi Siegfried Gudergan. (2017). Advanced Issues in Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling. *Book Project: Advanced Issues in Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/317400451_Advanced_Issues_in_Partial_Least_Squares_Structural_Equation_Modeling

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Acad. Manage*, 33, 692–724. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256287>

L Sexton, & B. Bowman. (1986). Validation of personality index: comparative psychological characteristics analysis of female entrepreneurs,. *Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research*, 40–51.

Larisa V Shavinina. (2003). *THE INTERNATIONAL HANDBOOK ON INNOVATION*. <https://epdf.tips/the-international-handbook-on-innovation.html>

Lee Anna Clark, & David Watson. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment*, 7(3), 309–319. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/1996-93318-001>

Liang Zeng, Robert W. Proctor, & Gavriel Salvendy. (2011). Can Traditional Divergent Thinking Tests Be Trusted in Measuring and Predicting Real-World Creativity? *Creativity Research Journal*, 23(1), 24–37. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/10400419.2011.545713?scroll=top&needAccess=true>

Liat Eldor, & Itzhak Harpaz. (2015). A process model of employee engagement: The learning climate and its relationship with extra-role performance behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 37(2), 213–235. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/job.2037>

Lumpkin, G. T., & Dess, G. G. (1996). Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management. The Academy of Management Review*, 21(1), 135. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/258632?origin=crossref>

M R Ab Hamid, W Sami, & M H Mohmad Sidek. (2017). Discriminant Validity Assessment: Use of Fornell & Larcker criterion versus HTMT Criterion. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series*. <https://iopscience.iop.org/article/10.1088/1742-6596/890/1/012163/pdf>

Maria Tri Handayani. (2021). 14 alasan kenapa perusahaan melakukan PHK. *Careers*. <https://www.ekrut.com/media/alasan-perusahaan-melakukan-phk>

Melissa J. Krauss, Bradley Evanoff, Eileen Hitcho, Kinyungu E, Ngugi, B., William Claiborne Dunagan, Irene Fischer, Stanley Birge, Shirley Johnson, Eileen Costantinou, & Victoria J. Fraser. (2005). A Case-control Study of Patient, Medication, and Care-related Risk Factors for Inpatient Falls. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, 20, 116–122. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1111/j.1525-1497.2005.40171.x>

Moustafa Abdelmotaleb, & Sudhir K. Saha. (2018). Exploring the impact of being perceived as a socially responsible organization on employee creativity. *Management Decision*,

56(11). <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/MD-06-2017-0552/full/html>

Muhammad Asif, Miao Qing, Jinsoo Hwang, & Hao Shi. (2019). Ethical Leadership, Affective Commitment, Work Engagement, and Creativity: Testing a Multiple Mediation Approach. *Sustainability*, 11(16), 143–747. <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/11/16/4489/htm>

Nihat Karakoc, & Ayşe Kucuk Yilmaz. (2009). Employee Empowerment and Differentiation in Companies: A Literature Review and Research Agenda. *Enterprise Risk Management*, 1(2), 1937–7916. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/277049247_Employee_Empowerment_and_Differentiation_in_Companies_A_Literature_Review_and_Research_Agenda

Noora Shrestha. (2020). Detecting Multicollinearity in Regression Analysis. *American Journal of Applied Mathematics and Statistics*, 8(2), 39–42. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342413955_Detecting_Multicollinearity_in_Regression_Analysis

Olusegun Akinwande, H.G Dikko, & Samson Agboola. (2015). Variance Inflation Factor: As a Condition for the Inclusion of Suppressor Variable(s) in Regression Analysis. *Open Journal of Statistics*, 5(7), 754–767. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/288059310_Variance_Inflation_Factor_As_a_Condition_for_the_Inclusion_of_Suppressor_Variables_in_Regression_Analysis

Peter N. C. Mohr, Guido Biele, & Hauke R. Heekeren. (2010). Neural Processing of Risk. *Neuroscience*, 30(19), 6613–6619. <https://www.jneurosci.org/content/jneuro/30/19/6613.full.pdf>

Richa Chaudhary, & Anuja Akhouri. (2018). CSR perceptions and employee creativity: examining serial mediation effects of meaningfulness and work engagement. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 15(1). <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/SRJ-01-2018-0018/full/html>

Richard Klein, & Arun Rai. (2009). Interfirm Strategic Information Flows in Logistics Supply Chain Relationships. *MIS Quarterly*, 33(4), 735–762. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/220260109_Interfirm_Strategic_Information_Flows_in_Logistics_Supply_Chain_Relationships

Rizwan Ali, Muhammad Safdar Sial, Talles Vianna Brugni, Jinsoo Hwang, Nguyen Vinh Khuong, & Thai Hong Thuy Khanh. (2019). Does CSR Moderate the Relationship between Corporate Governance and Chinese Firm’s Financial Performance? Evidence from the Shanghai Stock Exchange (SSE) Firms. *Financial Risk Management and Sustainability*. <https://www.mdpi.com/2071-1050/12/1/149>

Roberta Heale, & Alison Twycross. (2016). Validity and reliability in quantitative studies. *Evidence-Based Nursing*, 18(3), 66–67. <https://ebn.bmj.com/content/18/3/66.long>

- Serkan Dolma. (2010). The central role of the unit of analysis concept in research design. *Journal of the School of Business Administration*, 39(1), 169–174. https://www.academia.edu/505289/The_central_role_of_the_unit_of_analysis_concept_in_research_design
- Simon L Albrecht, Arnold B Bakker, Jamie A Gruman, & William H Macey. (2015). Employee engagement, human resource management practices and competitive advantage: An integrated approach. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 2(1), 2051–6614. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/JOEPP-08-2014-0042/full/html>
- Sugiyono. (2012). *Memahami Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Sugiyono. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif, Kualitatif dan R&D*. Bandung: PT. Alfabet.
- Sugiyono. (2019). *Statistika untuk Penelitian*. Bandung: CV Alfabeta.
- T. Lubart, F. Zenasni, & Baptiste Barbot. (2013). Creative Potential and its Measurement. *Psychology*. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Creative-Potential-and-its-Measurement-Lubart-Zenasni/13aa5c1c61ed34c77172e1be1adecfa82e40af62>
- Tae-Won Kang, Paresha N. Sinha, Chang-Il Park, & Yong-Ki Lee. (2021). Exploring the Intra Entrepreneurship-Employee Engagement-Creativity Linkage and the Diverse Effects of Gender and Marital Status. *Frontiers in Psychology*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.736914/full>
- Teresa M. Amabile, Regina Conti, Heather Coon, Jeffrey Lazenby, & Michael Herron. (1996). Assessing the Work Environment for Creativity. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5), 1154–1184. <https://people.wku.edu/richard.miller/amabile.pdf>
- Thompson S.H. Teo, Shirish C. Srivastava, & Li Jiang. (2009). Trust and Electronic Government Success: An Empirical Study. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 25(3), 99–132. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/220591172_Trust_and_Electronic_Government_Success_An_Empirical_Study
- u Sekaran, & R. Bougie. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Utin Nina Hermina, & Sri Yanthy Yosepha. (2019). The Model of Employee Performance. . *International Review of Management and Marketin*, 9(3), 69–73. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332793540_The_Model_of_Employee_Performance
- v. Wiratna Sujarweni. (2014). *Metodologi penelitian lengkap, praktis, dan mudah dipahami*.
-

- Volker Nissen, & Alexander von Rennenkampff. (2017). Measuring the Agility of the IT Application Systems Landscape. *TRACK 5 - IT MANAGEMENT AND IT STRATEGY*. <https://aisel.aisnet.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1062&context=wi2017>
- Wageeh A. Nafei. (2016). The Role of Organizational Agility in Reinforcing Job Engagement: A Study on Industrial Companies in Egypt. *International Business Research*, 9(2), 1913–9012. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Wageeh-Nafei/publication/356262299_The_Role_of_Organizational_Agility_in_Reinforcing_Job_Engagement_A_Study_on_Industrial_Companies_in_Egypt/links/58f71498a6fdcc187f3a7d06/The-Role-of-Organizational-Agility-in-Reinforcing-Job-Engagement-A-Study-on-Industrial-Companies-in-Egypt.pdf
- Wilmar B. Schaufeli, & Arnold B. Bakker. (2010). Defining and measuring work engagement: Bringing clarity to the concept. *Work Engagement: A Handbook of Essential Theory and Research*, 10–24. <https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2010-06187-002>
- Won-Moo Hur, Tae-Won Moon, & Sung-Hoon Ko. (2018). How Employees’ Perceptions of CSR Increase Employee Creativity: Mediating Mechanisms of Compassion at Work and Intrinsic Motivation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153, 629–644. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10551-016-3321-5>
- Wynne W. Chin, & G. Marcoulides. (1998). The Partial Least Squares Approach to Structural Equation Modeling. *Advances in Hospitality and Leisure*, 8(2). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311766005_The_Partial_Least_Squares_Approach_to_Structural_Equation_Modeling
- Yacoub Hamdan, & Ahmad Fathi Alheet. (2020). Influence of organisational culture on proactiveness, innovativeness and risk taking behaviour of SMES. *Entrepreneurship And Sustainability Issues*, 8(1). http://jssidoi.org/jesi/uploads/articles/29/Hamdan_Influence_of_organisational_culture_on_proactiveness_innovativeness_and_risk_taking_behaviour_of_SMEs.pdf