



# International Journal of Research in Management

ISSN Print: 2664-8792  
ISSN Online: 2664-8806  
Impact Factor: RJIF 8  
IJRM 2023; 5(2): 175-180  
[www.managementpaper.net](http://www.managementpaper.net)  
Received: 23-06-2023  
Accepted: 28-07-2023

**Aruoren Emmanuel Ejiroghene**  
Department of Business  
Administration, Faculty of  
Management Sciences, Delta  
State University, PMB 1,  
Abraka, Nigeria

**Odiri Vincent Ivwighrevero**  
Department of Business  
Administration, Faculty of  
Management Sciences, Delta  
State University, PMB 1,  
Abraka, Nigeria

**Erhuen Ebikeseiye President**  
Department of Business  
Administration, Faculty of  
Management Sciences, Delta  
State University, PMB 1,  
Abraka, Nigeria

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Aruoren Emmanuel Ejiroghene**  
Department of Business  
Administration, Faculty of  
Management Sciences, Delta  
State University, PMB 1,  
Abraka, Nigeria

## Relationship between self-efficacy and innovative workplace behavior

**Aruoren Emmanuel Ejiroghene, Odiri Vincent Ivwighrevero and Erhuen Ebikeseiye President**

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33545/26648792.2023.v5.i2b.108>

### Abstract

This study aims to explore the relationship between self-efficacy and innovative workplace behavior, adopting social cognitive theory as theoretical framework. A descriptive survey research design was adopted in the study in which participants were 126 employees of NNPC Retail Limited (NRL), a subsidiary of Nigerian National Petroleum Company Limited. Findings obtained from linear regression analysis indicated that self-efficacy was positive and significantly related to innovative workplace behavior ( $\beta = +0.3486, p < 0.05$ ). It was recommended that the management of NNPC Retail Limited (NRL) should train employees on developing high level of self-efficacy, since this will enhance employees' innovative workplace behavior.

**Keywords:** Self-efficacy, innovative workplace behavior, linear regression, social cognitive theory

### Introduction

Organizations that want to maintain a lasting competitive advantage must be able to adjust to the pace and direction of change in today's uncertain and dynamic world. The organization's innovative human resources capacity is what will maintain this balance and continue to drive the transformation. An essential performance metric is the creation, sharing, and application of new ideas (Ng and Lucianetti, 2016) <sup>[19]</sup>. According to this perspective, the organization's human resources that display innovative behaviors are a crucial component in producing strategic superiority for long-term success. It is insufficient, though, for staff members to only have creative ideas. These concepts need to be used in real life and the outcomes need to be tracked in order for them to be worthwhile (Oboreh & Aruoren, 2020) <sup>[21]</sup>. Organizations should therefore support innovative behavior if they don't want to fall behind on change. Developing, introducing, and putting into practice new ideas are all part of the intricate process of engaging in innovative work behavior with the goal of improving organizational performance.

The idea of self-efficacy, which conveys the conviction that one can accomplish a task and, when required, overcome obstacles, comes to light as a crucial component in generating original ideas and demonstrating inventive behaviors. The idea of self-efficacy conveys one's ideas and convictions about their own abilities. Self-efficacy is the idea that a person believes in their own strengths, talents, and ability to perform difficult tasks that call for endurance and effort. According to Guripek, Cemal, and Serdar (2021) <sup>[12]</sup> those who exhibit high levels of inventive behavior are known to be more fearless, enterprising, and creative thinkers. Upon reviewing the literature, it is evident that a multitude of studies have explored the correlation between innovative behaviors and self-efficacy. However, while some found a positive and significant link between these variables, others found a negative and insignificant relationship. Consequently, contradictory results appear. This study therefore intends to fill this research gap by examining the association between innovative workplace behavior and self-efficacy in a Nigerian organization.

## Conceptual Review

### Innovative Workplace Behavior

As a result of globalization, innovative workplace behavior (IWB) is generally acknowledged as essential for companies' performance and success (Mielniczuk & Laguna, 2020; Breier, Kallmuenzer, Clauss, Gast, Kraus, & Tiberius, 2021) <sup>[18, 9]</sup>. IWB is a term used to describe employee behaviors that promote the adoption and use of novel concepts, goods, and practices that are advantageous to the team or company (Kim, 2022) <sup>[16]</sup>. Adam (2022) <sup>[1]</sup> posits that IWB is indicative of an employee's efforts to create, embrace, and use new ideas concerning goods, technology, and work procedures in order to improve the caliber and efficiency of their output. Understanding innovation in an organization is enabled by studying the stages of involvement that its members could follow. More precisely, these phases encompass the new idea's development, discussion among the organization's members, execution, and attempt to transmit and propagate the idea in a wider context outside the organization's boundaries.

IWB is the intentional development, introduction, and use of new ideas within an organization with the goal of achieving advantages for both the person and the company as a whole. The individual behavior of the members of an organization aiming to introduce and implement new and useful ideas is an essential contribution to the development of the organization's innovation, and comprise an iterative process of multiple stages in which employees conceive new ideas after exploration and ponder their promotion and sustainable implementation.

### Self-Efficacy

The concept of self-efficacy (SE) was originally coined and defined by Bandura (1977) <sup>[6]</sup> as a belief pattern of people's judgments of their capabilities to organize and execute courses of action required for attaining designated types of performances in an organizational setup. SE is what a person feels about him/herself while performing work by utilizing his/her abilities or actions (Singh, Pradhan, Panigrahy & Jena, 2019) <sup>[26]</sup>. SE affects self-confidence, which in turn affects a person's willingness to undertake and persevere in performing a given task (Artino, 2012) <sup>[3]</sup>. High SE people are confident in their ability to complete a task (Albrecht & Marty, 2020) <sup>[2]</sup>. Individuals with poor SE, on the other hand, seem to doubt their ability to complete a task (Hameli & Ordun, 2022) <sup>[14]</sup>. A person who possesses self-confidence is more assured in their abilities at work. Thus, someone with good SE will be able to determine how they think, feel, and motivate themselves which is manifested in their behavior. Confidence in one's abilities enables someone to complete tasks, even though they have to face difficulties in achieving a goal, and this is different from someone who has doubts about their abilities, they easily get discouraged and do not have a good commitment to completing a task (Yulanie & Irawanto, 2021) <sup>[28]</sup>.



Fig 1: Conceptual Framework

### Theoretical Framework

This study is anchored on the Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) which emphasizes that observational learning is not a

simple imitative process; human beings are the agents or managers of their own behaviors (Bandura, 2001) <sup>[8]</sup>. Therefore, cognitive, behavioral, and environmental factors influence learning (Bandura, 1991) <sup>[7]</sup>. As an alternative to the conventional psychology theories that placed an emphasis on learning via firsthand experience, Bandura proposed that almost all learning events can be observed through the behavior of others and the results that follow (Bandura, 1986) <sup>[5]</sup>. SCT provides a theoretical linkage between self-efficacy and innovative workplace behavior. A person's degree of perseverance and effort in the face of adversity, as well as their best use of their strengths, are all indicators of their level of self-efficacy. Employees with high self-efficacy tend to display more innovative workplace behavior as they are confident on their abilities (knowledge and skills) to generate ideas and put those ideas to work (Liao, Li, Zhang, & Yang, 2022) <sup>[17]</sup>. They would then put in extra efforts to seek supports for new ideas, create prototypes and devote time on creative cognitive processes in problem recognition and solutions. Furthermore, workers who have a high degree of self-efficacy would think of themselves as competent and better suited to deal with problems that may arise during innovation processes.

### Empirical Review

The association between self-efficacy and innovative workplace behavior has been explored by previous researcher, although these studies are relatively rare in the Nigerian context. Gkontelos, Vaiopoulou, and Stamovlasis (2023) <sup>[11]</sup> study investigated the association between IWB, SE, burnout, and irrational beliefs using structural equation modeling. Participants were 964 teachers in Greece. Findings revealed that SE significantly predicted IWB. Rahmah, Purnama, Fatmah, Hakim, Hasani, Rahmah, and Rahmah (2022) <sup>[23]</sup> study examined the direct and indirect effects of SE on job performance through IWB. Participants were 96 digital printing employees in Mojokerto, East Java, Indonesia. Findings obtained from partial least squares analysis revealed that SE has no direct effect on job performance, but SE has direct effects on IWB and that IWB has direct effects on job performance. Furthermore, IWB fully mediates the effect of SE on job performance. Santoso, Elidjena, Abdinagoro and Arief (2019) <sup>[24]</sup> study focused on the effect of IWB on employee perspective of SE, transformational leadership and tested the digital literacy role on moderating the relationship between innovative work and employee performance. Participants were 235 employees who worked in the top three telecommunication companies in Indonesia. Findings obtained from structural equation modeling indicated that there was a positive and significant relationship between SE, transformational leadership and IWB, IWB was positively related to performance, digital literacy gave significant moderating influences on the relationship between IWB and performance.

Furthermore, Nurmala and Widyasari (2023) <sup>[20]</sup> study determined whether there was an influence of leadership and SE towards IWB in the Ministry of Home Affairs, Indonesia. Participants were 183 State Civil Apparatus, and findings obtained from multiple regression indicated that leadership and SE have a significant effect towards IWB. Wijayana, Rahayu and Wahyuningsih (2022) <sup>[27]</sup> study analyzed the effect of SE on performance with IWB as

intervening variable. A total of 200 employee from the production division of PT. Indah Kiat, Indonesia. The result from path analysis indicated that SE and IWB has a positive and significant effect on performance. However, SE has a negative and insignificant effect on IWB, and SE has no significant effect on performance with IWB as an intervening variable for employees of PT. Indah Kiat. From the review of empirical studies, we propose that:

H<sub>0</sub>: Self-efficacy (SE) is positive and significantly related to innovative workplace behavior (IWB).

**Model Specification**

The following model guided the study

$$IWB = f(SE) \tag{1}$$

$$IWB = \beta_0 + \beta_1 SE + \mu \tag{2}$$

Where, IWB = Innovative workplace behavior; SE = Self-efficacy;  $\beta_1$  = Regression coefficient;  $\beta_0$  = Constant term;  $\mu$  = Error term; A priori expectation was that  $\beta_1 > 0$

**Methods**

**Participants**

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design in which the population consisted of 157 employees of NNPC Retail Limited (NRL), a subsidiary of Nigerian National Petroleum Company Limited. Since this population was not large, it also constituted the sample adopted in the study. A structured questionnaire was used in the collection of data. Although, 157 copies of questionnaires were administered to the respondents, 126 completed and useful questionnaire were retrieved. This amounted to a response rate of 80.25 percent.

**Measures**

This study adopted measures used in previous studies. Self-efficacy was measured by ten items from the general self-efficacy scale developed by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995) [25]. Respondents were required to indicate the extent of their agreement with each statement using a 4 point Likert scale ranging from ‘1 = not at all true’ to ‘4 = exactly true’. Sample item include ‘I can usually handle whatever comes my way’. Furthermore, ten items adopted from De Jong and Den Hartog (2010) [10] measured innovative workplace behavior. These items were rated on a 4-point Likert scale ranging from ‘1 = strongly disagree’ to ‘4 = strongly agree’. Sample item includes ‘I systematically introduce innovative ideas into work practices’.

**Results**

**Respondents’ Socio-Demographic Profile**

Table 1 shows the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants. In terms of gender, 70 (55.56%) respondents were males, while 56 (44.44%) respondents were females. This indicates that majority of the respondents were males. As regards respondent’s age, 40 (31.75%) respondents were between 21 to 30 years, 50 (39.68%) respondents were between 31 to 40 years, 28 (22.22%) were between 41 to 50 years, while 8 (6.35%) respondents were over 50 years. This shows that majority of the respondents were between 31 to 40 years. In terms of marital status, 46 (36.51%)

respondents were single, 60 (47.62%) respondents were married, 8 (6.35%) were separated, while the remaining 12 (9.52%) were widowed. Thus indicating that most respondents were married. Furthermore, 24 (19.05%) respondents were OND/NCE holders, 98 (77.78%) respondents were HND/B.Sc. holders, while 4 (3.17%) respondents had postgraduate degrees. This signals that most respondents were graduates with HND or B.Sc. degrees. Additionally, 70 (55.56%) respondents have worked for 1 to 10 years, 34 (26.98%) respondents have cognate experiences of 11 to 20 years, 18 (14.29%) respondents have cognate experiences of 21 to 30 years, while 4 (3.17%) respondents have cognate experiences of 30 years and above.

**Table 1:** Socio-demographic features of Participants

Variables	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
<b>Gender</b>			
Male	70	55.56	55.56
Female	56	44.44	100.00
Total	126	100.00	
<b>Age</b>			
21 – 30 years	40	31.75	31.75
31 – 40 years	50	39.68	71.43
41 – 50 years	28	22.22	93.65
Above 50 years	8	6.35	100.00
Total	126	100.00	
<b>Marital Status</b>			
Single	46	36.51	36.51
Married	60	47.62	84.13
Separated	8	6.35	90.48
Widowed	12	9.52	100.00
Total	126	100.00	
<b>Highest Educational Qualification</b>			
OND/NCE	24	19.05	19.05
HND/BSc/BA	98	77.78	96.83
Postgraduate	4	3.17	100.00
Total	126	100.00	
<b>Work Experience</b>			
1 – 10 years	70	55.56	55.56
11 – 20 years	34	26.98	82.54
21 – 30 years	18	14.29	96.83
Above 30 years	4	3.17	100.00
Total	126	100.00	

Source: Researcher’s Compilation

**Mean, Standard Deviation (SD), Cronbach Alpha Coefficient (α)**

Table 2 shows the mean, SD, α coefficients and correlation coefficients of the study variables. As indicated in Table 2, the mean for SE and IWB were 3.221 and 3.011 which were greater than the mid-point of 2.00 on a 4 point Likert scale. The SD for these variables were 0.710 and 0.621 indicating acceptable spread of responses (Aruoren & Echewa, 2023) [4]. The α coefficients for SE and IWB were 0.83 and 0.78 respectively, and these were greater than the cut-off point of 0.7 as recommended by Hair, Black, Babin, and Anderson (2019) [13] which provides evidence of good reliability. Furthermore, Table 2 shows the correlation coefficients, which are in the anticipated directions and provide preliminary support for our study hypothesis. Self-efficacy (SE) has a positive and significant correlation with innovative workplace behavior (IWB) (r = +0.343, p < 0.05).

**Table 2:** Mean, Standard Deviation, Cronbach Alpha Coefficient

Variable	Mean	SD	$\alpha$	Gender IWB	Age	MS	HEQ	WE	SE
Gender	-	-	-	1.000					
Age	-	-	-	0.057	1.000				
MS	-	-	-	0.004	0.692*	1.000			
HEQ	-	-	-	0.104	0.440*	0.476*	1.000		
WE	-	-	-	-0.056	0.737*	0.496*	0.289	1.000	
SE	3.221	0.710	0.83	0.209*	0.011	0.154	-0.013	-0.005	1.000
IWB	3.011	0.621	0.78	-0.020	0.242*	0.251*	-0.004	0.184	0.343*

Source: Researcher’s Compilation

**Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)**

EFA was performed on the data to examine its factor structure. Table 3.0 shows that Kaiser Meyer Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO) was 0.893 that exceeded the cut-off value of 0.70 (Kaiser, 1974). In addition, Bartlett’s test of Sphericity indicated a Chi-square value of 673.888, with degree of freedom of 190, and a significant  $p = 0.0000 < 0.05$ . These results indicate that the data was adequate for EFA. To optimize the number of factors, the study adopted Kaiser’s criterion which recommended that retained factors should have eigenvalues greater than one (Kaiser, 1974). Table 3.0 indicates that two factors (SE and IWB) were retained. Each of these factors (SE and IWB) explained 39.7 and 43.2 percent variance respectively, amounting to 82.9 percent of the variance in the data. This indicates that common method bias may not be a problem in this study as none of the factors explained more than 50% of the variance (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003) [2]. The standardized factor loadings for the retained factors ranges from 0.67 to 0.85, while the average variance extracted (AVE) for SE and IWB were 0.59 and 0.54 respectively (Table 3.0) and these were greater than 0.5 the cut-off value as recommended by Hair et al. (2019) [13]. Furthermore, the composite reliability (CR) for SE and IWB were 0.92 and 0.82 respectively, and these were greater than 0.6 the cut-off value as recommended by Hair et al. (2019) [13]. These results suggest construct validity of the measuring instrument.

**Table 3:** Retained Factor Loadings, CR, and AVE

Retained Items	SE	IWB	CR	AVE
SE1	0.85		0.92	0.59
SE2	0.79			
SE3	0.73			
SE5	0.69			
SE6	0.80			
SE7	0.71			
SE8	0.83			
SE9	0.75			
IWB1		0.77	0.89	0.54
IWB3		0.67		
IWB4		0.70		
IWB6		0.80		
IWB7		0.75		
IWB9		0.68		
IWB10		0.79		

Source: Researcher’s Compilation

**Testing of Hypothesis**

The relationship between the dependent variable (IWB) and the independent variable (SE) was tested using linear regression analysis. As shown in Table 4, the regression coefficient value ( $\beta = +0.3486$ ) is significant at  $p < 0.05$ . Hence,  $H_0$  cannot be rejected. Therefore, a unit increase in SE will result in an increase of 34.86 percent in IWB. Furthermore, the R-square value of 0.1177,  $F = 16.54$ , and  $p = 0.0001 < 0.005$  reveals that SE explains 11.77 percent variance in IWB.

**Table 4:** Linear Regression Results

Source	SS	df	MS	Number of obs = 126		
Model	.956749194	1	.956749194	F( 1, 124) = 16.54		
Residual	7.17150439	124	.057834713	Prob > F = 0.0001		
Total	8.12825359	125	.065026029	R-squared = 0.1177		
				Adj R-squared = 0.1106		
				Root MSE = .24049		
iwb	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P> t	[95% Conf. Interval]	
se	.3485728	.0857016	4.07	0.000	.1789454	.5182001
_cons	2.278762	.3076401	7.41	0.000	1.669856	2.887668

Source: STATA Result

## Discussion of Findings

This study investigated the impact of self-efficacy on innovative workplace behavior among employees of NNPC Retail Limited (NRL), a subsidiary of Nigerian National Petroleum Company Limited. Findings revealed that self-efficacy is positive and significantly related to innovative workplace behavior. This indicates that self-efficacy has a strong predictive ability on innovative workplace behavior. This finding is consistent and supports the finding of Gkontelos et al. (2023) <sup>[11]</sup>, Rahmah et al. (2022) <sup>[23]</sup>, and Nurmala & Widyasari (2023) <sup>[20]</sup>. However, this result did not support the findings of Wijayana et al. (2022) <sup>[27]</sup> who found a negative and insignificant association between SE and IWB.

## Conclusion and Recommendations

This study sought to establish the association between self-efficacy and innovative workplace behavior. Although some studies had found a positive relationship between these variables, others found negative association. To assess the research hypothesis, data were collected from employees of NNPC Retail Limited (NRL), a subsidiary of Nigerian National Petroleum Company Limited. The conclusion drawn from the findings was that self-efficacy was positive and significantly related to innovative workplace behavior. Based on the conclusion drawn from this study, it was recommended that the management of NNPC Retail Limited (NRL) should train employees on developing high level of self-efficacy, since this will enhance employees' innovative workplace behavior.

## References

1. Adam NA. Employees' Innovative Work Behavior and Change Management Phases in Government Institutions: The Mediating Role of Knowledge Sharing. *Administrative Sciences*. 2022;12:28. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12010028>
2. Albrecht SL, & Marty A. Personality, self-efficacy and job resources and their associations with employee engagement, affective commitment and turnover intentions. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*. 2020;31(5):657-681. DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2017.1362660
3. Artino AR. Academic self-efficacy: From educational theory to instructional practice. *Perspectives on Medical Education*. 2012;1:76-85. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40037-012-0012-5>
4. Aruoren EE, Echewa OB. Employee Training, Development, and Empowerment as predictor of Employee Retention in Consumer Goods Companies in Nigeria. *IRE Journals*. 2023;7(3):321-331.
5. Bandura A. *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall; c1986.
6. Bandura A. Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*. 1977;84(2):191-215. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295x.84.2.191
7. Bandura A. Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. 1991;50:248-287. DOI: 10.1016/0749-5978(91)90022-L
8. Bandura A. Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Reviews Psychology*. 2001;52:1-20. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1
9. Breier M, Kallmuenzer A, Clauss T, Gast J, Kraus S, Tiberius V, et al. The role of business model innovation in the hospitality industry during the COVID-19 crisis. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*. 2021;92:102723. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijhm.2020.102723
10. De Jong J, Den Hartog D. Measuring innovative work behavior. *Creativity and Innovation Management*. 2010;19(1):23-36.
11. Gkontelos A, Vaiopoulou J, Stamovlasis D. Teachers' Innovative Work Behavior as a Function of Self-Efficacy, Burnout, and Irrational Beliefs: A Structural Equation Model. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*. 2023;13:403-418. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe13020030>
12. Guripek E, Cemal İ, Serdar E. The Relationship between Individual Innovation Classification and Self-Efficiency: A Research in Kitchen Employees. *International Journal of Society Researches*. 2021;17(33):278-302.
13. Hair JF, Black WC, Babin BJ, Anderson RE. *Multivariate Data Analysis (Eighth ed.)*. Hampshire, United Kingdom: Cengage Learning, EMEA; c2019.
14. Hameli K, Ordun G. The mediating role of self-efficacy in the relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational commitment. *European Journal of Management Studies*. 2022;27(1):75-97. DOI 10.1108/EJMS-05-2021-0033
15. Kaiser HF. An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*. 1974;39(1):31-36.
16. Kim K. Supervisor leadership and subordinates' innovative work behaviors: creating a relational context for organizational sustainability. *Sustainability*. 2022;14:3230. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14063230>
17. Liao F, Li A, Zhang Q, Yang J. Recognizing opportunities when individual engaged in intrapreneurship: The role of creative self-efficacy and support for innovation. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2022;13:937971. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.937971
18. Mielniczuk E, Laguna M. Positive affect mediates the relationship between self-efficacy and innovative behaviour in entrepreneurs. *The Journal of Creative Behaviour*. 2020;54(2):267-278.
19. Ng TWH, Lucianetti L. Within-Individual Increases in Innovative Behavior and Creative, Persuasion, and Change Self-Efficacy over Time: A Social-Cognitive Theory Perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2016;101(1):14-34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/apl0000029>
20. Nurmala S, Widyasari SD. Innovative Work Behaviour in Bureaucratic Organizations: The Effect of Leadership and Self Efficacy in the Ministry of Home Affairs. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*. 2023;667:8-14. [https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-49-7\\_3](https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-49-7_3)
21. Oboreh J, Aruoren E. Effect of Creativity on Human Capital Development of Nigeria Graduates Entrepreneurs. *Academy of Entrepreneurship Journal*. 2020;26(3):1-9.
22. Podsakoff PM, MacKenzie SB, Lee JY, Podsakoff NP. Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 2003;88(5):879-903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>

23. Rahmah M, Purnama C, Fatmah D, Hakim L, Hasani S, Rahmah Y, et al. Self-efficacy, Innovative Work Behavior and Job Performance in Digital Printing. *Baskara Journal of Business and Entrepreneurship*. 2022;(1):1-11. DOI: 10.54628
24. Santoso H, Elidjena, Abdinagoro SB, Arief M. The role of creative self-efficacy, transformational leadership, and digital literacy in supporting performance through innovative work behavior: Evidence from telecommunications industry. *Management Science Letters*. 2019;9:2305-2314.
25. Schwarzer R, Jerusalem M. Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston (Eds.), *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs*. Windsor, UK: Nfer-Nelson; c1995. p. 35-37.
26. Singh SK, Pradhan RK, Panigrahy NP, Jena LK. Self-efficacy and workplace well-being: Moderating role of sustainability practices. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*. 2019;26(6):1692-1708. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-07-2018-0219>
27. Wijayana TT, Rahayu MKP, Wahyuningsih SH. The Influence of Self Efficacy on Performance with Innovation Work Behavior as an Intervening Variable (Case Study on PT. Indah Kiat Employee). *Economics and Business Quarterly Reviews*. 2022;5(3):166-177. DOI: 10.31014/aior.1992.05.03.445
28. Yulanie N, Irawanto DW. The effect of self-efficacy on job performance: Gen X and Gen Y Preferences in R/D Based University. *Advances in Engineering Research*. 2021;212:86-92. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aer.k.211221.011>