

## Self-efficacy, Innovative Work Behavior and Job Performance in Digital Printing

Mirhamida Rahmah<sup>1\*</sup>, Chamdan Purnama<sup>2</sup>, Dinda Fatmah<sup>3</sup>, Lukman Hakim<sup>4</sup>, Syaiful Hasani<sup>5</sup>,  
Yusriyah Rahmah<sup>6</sup>, Zakiyah Zulfa Rahmah<sup>7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Management Department, Faculty of Economics, School of Economics Al-Anwar, Mojokerto,  
Indonesia.

<sup>2</sup>Management Education Department, Management Education, Sabilillah Sampang Islamic Boarding  
School, Sampang Madura, Indonesia.

<sup>3</sup>Teknik informatika Department, Faculty of Computer Science, University of Brawijaya, Malang,  
Indonesia.

<sup>4</sup>Shariah banking Department, Faculty of Economics and Business, state Islamic religious institute,  
Kediri, Indonesia.

E-mail: mirhamidar@gmail.com<sup>1\*</sup>, chamdan.p@gmail.com<sup>2</sup>, fatmah.dinda@gmail.com<sup>3</sup>  
lucky.saputra85@gmail.com<sup>4</sup>, syaifulhasani28@gmail.com<sup>5</sup>, riyahyus@gmail.com<sup>6</sup>  
zrahmah44@gmail.com<sup>7</sup>

Received: 27<sup>th</sup> 05 2022

Revised: 10<sup>th</sup> 09 2022

Approved: 20<sup>th</sup> 10 2022

### Abstract

*Human resources in organizations play a very important role because the company's success in achieving its goals cannot be separated from the role of its employees. Organizational progress will also be achieved if human resources have good performance. The objective of this research is to deeply study the direct and indirect effects of self-efficacy on job performance through innovative work behavior. This study was conducted on digital printing workers in Mojokerto, East Java, using a saturated technique of sampling, 96 workers were selected as the respondents. Using the partial least squares analysis technique performed in SmartPLS 3.0, this study finds that self-efficacy has no direct effect on job performance, but self-efficacy has direct effects on innovative work behavior and that innovative work behavior has direct effects on job performance. Furthermore, innovative work behavior fully mediates the effect of self-efficacy on job performance. The novelty of this research is the finding that innovative work behavior is digital printing workers in Mojokerto, East Java. The findings above are expected to be used to improve digital printing workers' innovative work behaviors for higher performance attainment.*

**Keywords:** *Self-efficacy, Innovative work behavior, Job performance*

### INTRODUCTION

The theoretical description above suggests that innovative work behavior is an important factor in minimizing the impact of self-efficacy on performance. As a result, researchers attempted to analyze these variables on the research object, namely employees

of the graphic design department at a digital printing company in Mojokerto, East Java. This is because these aspects are still not optimal for employees. Based on the results of initial observations, it was found that most of the employees had fairly good performance. However, there are still some employees who have below average performance.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, human resources in organizations play a very important role because the company's success in achieving its goals cannot be separated from the role of its employees. Moreover, at this time, the Indonesian economy is also being faced with a disruptive era, which is an era where innovation from various lines moves very quickly. Innovation has become a concern of scientists and business specialists in the present serious business climate (Alshammari et al., 2014) on the grounds that development is a vital variable in world financial development (Babkin et al., 2015) and corporate growth (Babkin et al., 2015) and corporate growth (Back et al., 2012). Under these conditions, researchers and businesses seek to develop strategies and resources to innovate in order to maintain sustainable competitiveness (Bernardo, 2014) which will also increase income and benefit development in the long term. The large number of scientists and experts' attention to innovation has suggested suggestions for the development of development changeability.

The theoretical description above suggests that innovative work behavior is an important factor in minimizing the impact of self-efficacy on performance. As a result, researchers attempted to analyze these variables on the research object, namely employees of the graphic design department at a digital printing company in Mojokerto, East Java. This is because these aspects are still not optimal for employees. Based on the results of initial observations, it was found that most of the employees had fairly good performance. However, there are still some employees who have below average performance.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW AND RESEARCH HYPOTHESES**

### **Self-efficacy influences innovative work behavior and job performance.**

According to Eastman & Marzillier (1984) self-efficacy is characterized as an individual's confidence in their capacity to coordinate and complete activities to accomplish put forward objectives and seeks to assess levels and strengths across activities and contexts. An individual's fearlessness about his capacity to perform a given task. While innovation is a person's desire or desire to learn about new things in broad and diverse concepts (Klein & Bhagat, 2016). Martinette et al. (2014) revealed that innovation is the application of the ability of new ideas that have the function of responding to the environment to achieve success. Research conducted by Martinette et al. (2014) found evidence that innovation significantly affects worker execution. Various outcomes were found by Puryantini et al. (2017) found proof that innovation had no critical effect on performance.

As explained above, innovation is one of the factors to improve employee performance. In order to support innovation, self-efficacy or self confidence is also absolutely needed. Self-efficacy is a sense of confidence that individual has about how far they can carry out their

duties and responsibilities (Santrock & Santrock, 2007). Santrock & Santrock (2007) states that self-efficacy also the factor which can influence representative development and execution.

In this review, innovation behavior is defined as converting knowledge and ideas into products, processes, improving existing methods, products and services to meet customer needs and provide benefits to the company. This indicator was developed from research by Klein & Bhagat (2016) which consists of creativity, passion, expertise, thinking, and psychographics.

While self-efficacy indicator according to Hasanah & Others (2018) state that consists of five that are execution achievement, vicarious encounters, social influence, enthusiastic and physiological states. While related to the dimensions of employee performance according to Purnama et al. (2021) and Edy et al. (2022), namely: work, quality, initiative, cooperation and discipline. Research by Dissanayake et al. (2019) self-efficacy positively affects employee performance. Existence of a belief in employees psychologically can help the successful implementation of innovation by the organization. The outcomes showed self-efficacy has a solid and positive relationship to behavior innovation and job performance. Therefore, the research speculation is as per the following:

H1 : Self-efficacy significantly affects job performance

H2 : Self-efficacy significantly affects innovative work behavior.

### **Innovative Work Behavior Affects Job Performance**

Innovation is a person's desire or desire to learn about new things in broad and diverse concepts (Klein & Bhagat, 2016). This means that innovation begins with an urge to try something new on what you want to learn without any specific limitations. There are five indicators that can be used to measure innovation. The following are five indicators according to Klein & Bhagat (2016) creativity, passion, expertise, thinking style, and psychographics. In this study, innovative work behavior is defined as converting knowledge and ideas into products, processes, improving existing methods, products and services. to meet customer needs and provide benefits to the company. This indicator was developed from Damanpour, (1991) research which consists of; administrative innovation, technical innovation, service innovation, product innovation.

Research conducted by Cottam et al. (2001) explains that innovation strategy is one of the strategies for companies to create competitive advantage so that they can survive in a competitive business environment. Research conducted by Kusuma et al. (2021) found evidence that innovation significantly influence worker execution. In light of the portrayal formulated in this study can be

H3: Innovative work behavior significantly affects job performance.

H4: Innovative work behavior mediates the connection of self-efficacy and job performance.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

### **Research Design**

In general, this review plans to describe and analyze the connection between self-efficacy and innovative work behavior on job performance. In accordance with its objectives, this examination is a kind of exploration. The design of the research, when associated with the paradigm of the research methodology, is an informative examination that intends to give a clarification of the causal connection between factors through theory testing and expects to acquire proper testing in making causal determinations between two or more variables through hypothesis testing (Sugiyono, 2012).

### **Population And Sample**

The populace in this review were all 96 workers of Digital Printing. The sample is part of the population that will be used as objects in conducting research and testing data. The sample size in this study was 96 employees. The examining method utilized in this review is a saturated sampling technique. As Sugiyono (2012) the saturated sampling technique is a technique for determining the number of samples by utilizing all individuals from the populace as an example, this is frequently done when population is relatively small, which is less than 100 people.

### **Method of Data Collection**

The measurement scale this study used is Likert. The distribution of questionnaires to a number of respondents contains statements on research variables in order to obtain answers according to the perceptions of the respondents. To answer all the statements that exist, namely by using five categories of scale, Likert in this study, the weights given are 1 to 5. Examples of alternative answers used in this research questionnaire are: strongly agree (SA) is given a score of 5, agree (AG) is given a score of 4, less agree (LA) is given a score of 3, disagree (DA) is given a score of 2, strongly disagree (SD) is given a score of 1 (Sugiyono, 2012).

### **Data Analysis**

Method The PLS analysis method in this study was completed in two phases. The principal stage is to evaluate the estimation model or external model. The four measures for surveying the external model, namely dimensional reliability, internal consistency reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity, have been met. The subsequent stage is to evaluate the structural model or inner model that has been completed to see the connection between the development, importance, R-square and Q-square of the exploration model. Testing empirical models of PLS-based research with SmartPLS software (Ghozali & Latan, 2015).

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Result of Structural Model**

Testing Inner Model Test. Primary models center around theorized connections or ways between dormant factors. The primary model was assessed utilizing R-square for the reliant

develop and t-test just as the meaning of the coefficients of the underlying way boundaries Structural model evaluation is an estimation to assess the degree of precision of the model in the examination in general by being framed through a few factors and their markers. Model fit (goodness of fit models) which implies a record and a proportion of the integrity of the connection between inert factors that are built inside an examination idea structure. Integrity of fit models in the PLS examination were completed utilizing R-square and Q-square prescient importance. The consequences of the decency of fit model have been summed up in the accompanying table.

**Table 1.** Results of R-Square and Q-Square Predictive Relevance

Variabel	R-Square	Q-Square
Job Performance	0.467	0.788
Innovative Work Behavior	0.119	0.779

Source: processed data

In light of Table 1, the R-square worth of job performance is 0.467 or 46.7%. These outcomes show that the variety of job performance factors can be clarified by self-efficacy and innovative work behavior of 46.7%. In other words, the contribution of self-efficacy and innovative work behavior to job performance is 46.7%, while the leftover 43.3% is the commitment of different factors not talked about in this review. The worth of r-square on the innovative work behavior variable is 0.119 or 11.9%. These outcomes demonstrate that the variety of innovative work behavior factors can be clarified by self-efficacy of 11.9%. All in all, the contribution of self-efficacy is 11.9% while the leftover 88.1% is a commitment from different factors not examined in this review.

In the worth of Q-square prescient significance, the job performance variable has a value of 0.788. This shows that self-efficacy and innovative work behavior have very strong predictive power on job performance. The innovative work behavior variable has a Q-square prescient significance value of 0.779. This shows that self-efficacy has a very strong predictive power on innovative work behavior.

### **Hypothesis Testing Results Hypothesis**

Testing in this review utilizes SmartPLS version 3.0 because the utilization of this program can distinguish nonlinear connections between dormant factors and right way coefficient esteems dependent on these connections. The exploration theory is acknowledged or dismissed. The aftereffects of testing the total theory are in the accompanying portrayal beneath.

#### **1. Hypothesis Testing Direct Effects**

The consequences of theory testing and the way coefficients of direct impact between the factors of self-efficacy and innovative work behavior on job performance are as introduced in Table 2 beneath.

**Table 2.** Results of Direct Effect Hypothesis Testing

Variable Independent	Variable Dependent	Path Coefficients	T-Statistics	P-Value	Conclusion
Self-efficacy	Job performance	0.033	0.405	0.686	Not Significant
Self-efficacy	Innovative work behavior	0.345	4.118	0.000	Significant
Innovative work behavior	Job performance	0.671	9.847	0.000	Significant

Source: processed data

Based on table 2. The results of the research on the effect of self-efficacy on job performance have a path coefficient value of 0.033 and a T-Statistic of 0.405 which is smaller than t-table with a significance level (p-value) of 0.686. Considering the T-Statistic value of 0.405 is smaller than the t-Table and the p-value 0.686 is greater than the level of significance ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ), then there is evidence that empirically rejects the influence of self-efficacy on job performance. Effect of self-efficacy on innovative work behavior has a path coefficient value of 0.345 which is greater than t-table with a significant level (p-value) of = 0.000. Considering that the t-statistic value is 4,188 which is greater than the t-table and the p-value is <0.05, there is evidence that empirically accepts the influence of self-efficacy on innovative work behavior. Testing the effect of innovative work behavior on job performance has a path coefficient value of 0.671 and a t-statistic value of 9.847 with a significant level (p-value) of 0.000. Considering the t-statistic of 9,847 is greater than the t-table and the p-value of 0.000 is less than the level of significance of 0.05, then there is evidence that empirically accepts the influence of innovative work behavior on job performance.

## 2. Hypothesis Testing Indirect Effects

The consequences of theory testing and the way coefficients of indirect influence between the variable self-efficacy on job performance and the variable innovative work behavior as a mediation can be presented in Table 3 beneath.

**Table 3.** Results of Indirect Effect Hypothesis Testing

Variable Independent	Variable Mediation	Variable Dependent	Path Coefficients	T-Statistics	P-Value	Conclusion
Self-efficacy	Innovative Work Behavior	Job Performance	0.232	3.971	0.000	Significant

Source: processed data

In light of table 2, it tends to be clarified that the consequences of testing the immediate impact of every factor are as per the following:

H1: Self-Efficacy positively affects job performance.

The aftereffects of the exploration on the impact of self-efficacy on job performance have a coefficient of worth of 0.033 and a t-Statistics of 0.405, which is more modest than the t-Table with an importance level (p-value) of 0.686. Considering the t-Statistic value of 0.405 is smaller than the t-Table and the p-value of 0.686 is more noteworthy than the degree of importance ( $\alpha=0.05$ ), then, at that point, there is proof that experimentally dismisses the impact of self-efficacy on job performance. Then, at that point, self-efficacy has an effect expanding on increasing job performance. Consequently, it tends to be presumed that self-efficacy doesn't positively affect job performance (H1 is dismissed).

Experimentally, the aftereffects of this review show self-efficacy in the organization can't further develop job performance. This happens in light of the fact that self-efficacy does not prioritize emotionality. It is also the reason that self-efficacy in the company cannot improve the work ability of employees in carrying out cooperative activities. In addition, self-efficacy that wishes to improve job performance is a state of organization that focuses on being further developed and created. This implies that representatives partaking in work interests don't greatly affect work execution. In this way, the mentality of workers in self-viability as above can't urge a representative to work on their exhibition.

Hypothetically, these outcomes contradict the review led by Dissanayake et al.(2019) found evidence that self-efficacy positively affects employee performance. The importance of self-efficacy in a person needs to be a concern for organizational management. The management must be able to generate self-efficacy in its employees because it can help improve employee innovation behavior and improve performance.

H2: Self-Efficacy Positively Affects Innovative Work Behavior

The results of testing the impact of self-efficacy on innovative work behavior have a path coefficient value of 0.345 and a t-statistic value of 4.188, which is more noteworthy than the t-table with a significant level (p-value) of = 0.000. Taking into account that the value is t-statistic 4.188, which is more noteworthy than the t-table and the p-value is  $<0.05$ , there is proof that exactly acknowledges the impact of self-efficacy on innovative work behavior. The way coefficient has a positive sign. This shows that the immediate impact between self-efficacy and innovative work behavior is unidirectional. That is, the better self-efficacy, the better innovative work behavior. On the other hand, the more terrible the self-efficacy, the more regrettable the innovative work behavior. Accordingly, it may very well be presumed that self-efficacy positively affects innovative work behavior (H2 is accepted).

Experimentally, the aftereffects of this review demonstrate that the company's self-efficacy is able to increase innovative work behavior. According to Basmar et al. (2021) the level

of individual self-efficacy is different from one another. If someone has a high level of efficacy, then he is always sure of his ability to do something, while people who do not have efficacy feel that they are low, and they will always hesitate to complete their task. This is Experimentally, self-efficacy in company employees prioritizes emotionality. This statement is the reason that self-efficacy in company employees can increase innovative work behavior and cooperation. In addition, self-efficacy that desires to further develop innovative work behavior is a hierarchical circumstance that focuses on emotional enhancement. That is, the company's employees put forward the emotion, giving a decent effect on innovative work behavior. Along these lines, the mentality of employees in self-efficacy as above can urge an employee to increase innovative work behavior on employee altruism and sportsmanship in the company.

Hypothetically, the consequences of the review are in accordance with research led by Desiana (2019) which states that self-efficacy is one of the factors that can influence representative innovation and performance. Self-efficacy is a sense of belief that a person has about how far they can carry out their duties and responsibilities (Santrock & Santrock, 2007).

### H3: Innovative Work Behavior Positively Affects Job Performance

The results of testing the impact of innovative work behavior on job performance, have a way coefficient value of 0.671 and a t-statistic value of 9,847 with a significant level (p-value) of 0.000. Considering the t-statistic of 9,847 is more prominent than the t-table and the p-value of 0.000 is more modest than the level of significance of 0.05, there is proof that exactly acknowledges the impact of innovative work behavior on job performance. The way coefficient has a positive sign, this demonstrates that the immediate impact between innovative work behavior and job performance is unidirectional. That is, the better the innovative work behavior, the better the job performance. On the other hand, the worse the innovative work behavior, the worse the job performance. In this manner, it very well may be presumed that innovative work behavior positively affects job performance (H3 is accepted). Exactly, the consequences of this review demonstrate that the innovative work behavior of company employees is able to improve their job performance.

Hypothetically, the consequences of this review are in accordance with the exploration of (MacKenzie et al., 1998) which the outcomes that innovative work has a positive and critical impact on job performance. Relevant past research related to innovative work behavior Among other things, research Purnama (2013) observed that innovative work behavior as a positive impact in influencing the company's performance.

In view of Table 3, it tends to be clarified that the aftereffects of testing the backhanded impact of are as per the following:

The investigation of interceding factors should be possible through the methodology that is the distinction in the coefficient of direct influence and the coefficient of indirect influence, the approach of the difference in coefficient uses the assessment strategy by examining with and without including the intervening variable.



#### H4: Innovative Work Behavior Becomes a Mediating Variable Relationship Between Self-efficacy and Job Performance

The H4 test expects to see the interceding job of innovative work behavior on the effect of self-efficacy on job performance. In view of table 2. The immediate impact of self-efficacy on job performance = 0.03 and in table 3 the backhanded impact of self-efficacy on job performance through innovative work behavior with a value of 0.232. The results of testing the impact of self-efficacy on job performance with the mediator of innovative work behavior, it is known that the path coefficient of self-efficacy on innovative work behavior and innovative work behavior on job performance is significant, but the coefficient on the path of self-efficacy on job performance is not significant.

Thus, it very well may be reasoned that the intercession of innovative work behavior between self-efficacy and job performance is classified as complete mediation. Based on these calculations, it tends to be reasoned that innovative work behavior can intervene the connection between self-efficacy and job performance. The consequences of the intercession test additionally show that innovative work behavior gives a full intervening job (H4 is accepted).

The consequences of the backhanded relationship test show that innovative work behavior as an intercession affects the impact on the effect of self-efficacy on job performance. The full intervention results outline that innovative work behavior is an extension between the factors of self-efficacy and job performance.

Innovative work behavior on the effect of self-efficacy on job performance goes about as an ideal intervention, which implies, self-efficacy can influence job performance through the intercession of innovative work behavior, while self-efficacy can't straightforwardly influence job performance. As to observational circumstance, the consequences of this investigation demonstrate that innovative work behavior is a mediating variable that goes about as a reflection on the ideal connection between self-efficacy and job performance.

#### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the consequences of information investigation and conversation identified with self-efficacy, innovative work behavior, and job performance of company representatives, the following conclusions can be drawn:

Self-efficacy has no direct effect on job performance. This shows that higher self-efficacy has not been able to increase the job performance of companies. But self-efficacy has direct effects on innovative work behavior and that innovative work behavior has direct effects on job performance. In the meantime, self-efficacy indirectly affects job performance through innovative work behavior. This shows that innovative work behavior can increase the impact of self-efficacy on job performance, which means that self-efficacy can beneficially affect job performance if it is joined by the innovative work behavior and conduct possessed by

organization representatives. Furthermore, innovative work behavior fully mediates the effect of self-efficacy on job performance on digital printing workers in Mojokerto, East Java.

## REFERENCES

- Alshammari, A. A., Rasli, A., Alnajem, M., & Arshad, A. S. (2014). An Exploratory Study on the Relationship between Organizational Innovation and Performance of Non-profit Organizations in Saudi Arabia. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 129, 250–256. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.674>
- Babkin, A. V., Lipatnikov, V. S., & Muraveva, S. V. (2015). Assessing the Impact of Innovation Strategies and R&D Costs on the Performance of IT Companies. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 749–758. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.153>
- Back, Y., Parboteeah, K. P., & Nam, D. (2012). Innovation in Emerging Markets: The Role of Consulting Firms. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2012(1), 15972. <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2012.15972abstract>
- Basmar, E., Purba, B., Damanik, D., Banjarnahor, A. R., Sipayung, P. D., Hutabarat, M. L. P., Astuti, A., Hendrawati, E., Lie, D., Simanjuntak, M., & others. (2021). *Ekonomi Bisnis Indonesia*. Yayasan Kita Menulis.
- Bernardo, M. (2014). Integration of management systems as an innovation: A proposal for a new model. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 82, 132–142. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2014.06.089>
- Cottam, A., Ensor, J., & Band, C. (2001). A benchmark study of strategic commitment to innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*.
- Damanpour, F. (1991). Organizational innovation: A meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(3), 555–590.
- Desiana, N. E. (2019). Pengaruh Efikasi Diri Terhadap Kinerja Karyawan Melalui Inovasi Sebagai Variabel Intervening (Studi Pada Divisi Sekretariat Dan Humas Pdam Surya Sembada Kota Surabaya). *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 7(2), 383–392.
- Dissanayake, I., Mehta, N., Palvia, P., Taras, V., & Amoako-Gyampah, K. (2019). Competition matters! Self-efficacy, effort, and performance in crowdsourcing teams. *Information & Management*, 56(8), 103158.
- Eastman, C., & Marzillier, J. S. (1984). Theoretical and methodological difficulties in Bandura's self-efficacy theory. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 8(3), 213–229.
- Edy, J., Darlius, D., & Ilyas, M. (2022). The Effect of Leadership Style, Work, Culture and Motivation on Performance of The State Civil Apparatus on The Secretariat of The Regional People's Representative Board, Bekasi City, West Java. *BASKARA: Journal of*

*Business and Entrepreneurship*, 4(2), 72–95.

- Ghozali, I., & Latan, H. (2015). Partial Least Squares Concepts, Techniques and Applications using the SmartPLS 3.0 Program. *Semarang: Issuing Board of Diponegoro University*.
- Hasanah, M., & Others. (2018). Dinamika Kepribadian Menurut Psikologi Islami. *Ummul Qura: Jurnal Institut Pesantren Sunan Drajat (INSUD) Lamongan*, 11(1), 110–122.
- Klein, A., & Bhagat, P. (2016). Comparative study of technological innovativeness between individuals in the USA and India. *Review of International Business and Strategy*, 26(1), 100–117. <https://doi.org/10.1108/RIBS-09-2013-0094>
- Kusuma, A., Purwanto, H., & Utama, P. (2021). Pengaruh inovasi terhadap kinerja karyawan dengan self-efficacy sebagai moderasi. *FORUM EKONOMI*, 23(2), 302–309.
- MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Ahearne, M. (1998). Some possible antecedents and consequences of in-role and extra-role salesperson performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 62(3), 87–98.
- Martinette, L., Obenchain-Leeson, A., Gomez, G., Webb, J., & others. (2014). Relationship Between Learning Orientation And Business Performance And The Moderating Effect Of Competitive Advantage: An Accounting Services Firms Perspective. *International Business & Economics Research Journal (IBER)*, 13(4), 779–792.
- Purnama, C. (2013). Influence Analysis of Organizational Culture Organizational Commitment Job and Satisfaction Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Toward Improved Organizational Performance. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, 3(5), 86–100.
- Purnama, C., Fatmah, D., Hasani, S., & Rahmah, M. (2021). Leadership style as moderating variable influence between islamic work ethic with performance. *Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences*, 42(2), 233–238. <https://doi.org/10.34044/j.kjss.2021.42.2.02>
- Puryantini, N., Arfati, R., & Tjahjadi, B. (2017). Pengaruh Knowledge Management Terhadap Kinerja Organisasi Dimediasi Inovasi Di Organisasi Penelitian Pemerintah. *Berkala Akuntansi Dan Keuangan Indonesia*, 2(2), 21–38. <https://doi.org/10.20473/baki.v2i2.5325>
- Santrock, J. W., & Santrock, J. W. (2007). *Psikologi Pendidikan edisi kedua*. Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Sugiyono, S. (2012). Metode penelitian kombinasi (mixed methods); (S. Sutopo, Ed.). *Bandung: Alfabeta*.