www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 620-631 | ISSN:2251-6727



Enhancing Innovation in Organizations through Psychological Ownership: Exploring the Impact of Employee Mindset on Idea Realization

Mohd Safwan Ramli^{1*}, Nur Hidayah Ayob², Nor Farhana Mohd Azmi³, Nurul Zahidah Md Juperi⁴ Nur Hanisah Mohamad Razali⁵ Al Amirul Eimer Ramdzan Ali⁶ Tasnimul Islam⁷

^{1,2,3,4} Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA Jengka, Pahang, Malaysia.

⁵ Faculty of Business and Management, Universiti Teknologi MARA (UiTM) Segamat, Johor, Malaysia

⁶ Kuliyyah of Languages and Management, International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM), Pagoh Edu Hub, Muar, Johor, Malaysia

D. . . 1 11 M. . 1 2024

⁷ School of Business, Primeasia University, Bangladesh

(Deserved, 04 February 2024

(Receivea.	04 February 2024 Revisea. 11 March 2024 Acceptea. 06 April 2024)
KEYWORDS	ABSTRACT: This study examines the critical role of employee mindset in fostering idea realization within two
Idea realisation, employee mindset, Government- linked companies.	prominent Malaysian Government-Linked Companies (GLCs)—Automobile and Airlines— underscoring its importance for maintaining competitiveness and spurring economic growth in Malaysia. Utilizing a correlational design and quota sampling method, this research aims to delineate the relationships between various facets of employee mindset and their impact on the effective implementation of innovative ideas. Analysis of data from both companies reveals that all six studied variables exhibit significant positive correlations with idea realization. Notably, the entrepreneurial mindset emerged as the most decisive factor influencing idea realization across both sectors. These findings suggest that understanding employees' expectations, along with their aspirations and apprehensions regarding innovation, can greatly enhance organizational strategies to cultivate a conducive environment for innovation. By integrating these insights, firms can better harness the creative potentials of their workforce, ultimately driving greater organizational and economic advancement.

1. Introduction

Idea realization is crucial in driving societal progress, yielding significant economic and social benefits. This process demands a deliberate application of knowledge, creativity, and initiative to transform innovative concepts into viable products or services (Lukoschek et al., 2018). To maintain competitiveness, organizations frequently explore new product lines, business models, and markets. This exploration often involves consulting with experts, establishing innovation teams, and forming stakeholder panels to ensure strategic alignment and optimal timing (Mascareño et al., 2020; Kmieciak, 2020). Interestingly, one of the richest but often overlooked sources of innovation is the intellectual capital embedded within the organization's own workforce.

In today's fast-paced business environment, companies are burdened with continuous operational demands and rapidly evolving market conditions (Palazzeschi et al., 2018). Harnessing the untapped ideas from employees can lead to cost savings, new growth opportunities, and enhanced employee well-being. In Malaysia, promoting idea realization is integral to the national development strategy, aiming to boost productivity and competitive edge essential for evolving into a modern, inclusive society (Suliman, 2020). The strategic initiatives under the Tenth and Eleventh Malaysia Plans underscore this

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 620-631 | ISSN:2251-6727



focus by investing heavily in R&D and the commercialization of innovative ideas to enhance the country's global competitiveness and operational efficiency.

2. Problem Statement

Employee innovativeness, particularly in the realm of idea realization, is increasingly recognized as a vital contributor to organizational success, economic prosperity, and policy development. Numerous nations acknowledge the pivotal role of innovation in driving economic growth. Yet, the methodologies for evaluating the impact of employee-driven innovation remain underexplored in scholarly literature (Van Zyl et al., 2021). Research specifically focusing on Government-Linked Companies (GLCs) and their innovation practices is sparse, and the existing studies often suffer from a lack of empirical integration, leading to fragmented insights (Odoardi et al., 2019). Lukoschek et al. (2018) assert the critical importance of innovativeness in organizational performance and economic development. They note the complexities involved in the implementation of innovative ideas, which frequently require leadership roles to be assumed by individuals spearheading these initiatives. Given these challenges, comprehensive research into idea realization within organizational settings is imperative for advancing theoretical understanding and practical applications.

3. Research Questions

1) What are the relationships between employee mindset (cognitive complexity, entrepreneurial mindset, boundary-spanning, adaptability, creative thinking skill and work culture) and Idea Realization at two selected government-linked companies (GLCs)?

2) To what extent do employee mindset elements (cognitive complexity, entrepreneurial mindset, boundary-spanning, adaptability, creative thinking skill and work culture) predict idea realization at two selected government-linked companies (GLCs)?

4. Theoretical Review

Psychological Ownership Theory elucidates how personal feelings of ownership over work-related objects or ideas can significantly enhance employee motivation and thereby foster innovation within organizations (Pierce et al., 2001). According to this theory, when employees perceive themselves as psychological owners of a task or project, they are more likely to exhibit higher engagement, creativity, and persistence, all critical for the successful realization of new ideas (Pierce, Kostova, & Dirks, 2001). Empirical studies support that such ownership feelings not only boost job satisfaction and organizational commitment but also directly contribute to superior job performance by encouraging autonomy, risk-taking, and accountability (Avey et al., 2009; Brown et al., 2014). Thus, psychological ownership can act as a powerful lever for innovation, particularly in environments where employees are empowered to take control of and identify personally with their work.

4.1 Importance of theoretical

From a theoretical standpoint, it deepens the understanding of Psychological Ownership within the context of organizational innovation, providing a nuanced view of how personal ownership feelings can influence creative processes and idea implementation. This research enriches the interdisciplinary dialogue between psychology, business management, and organizational behavior, expanding the existing literature on employee mindset and its impact on performance.

Practically, the findings offer crucial implications for human resource practices and leadership strategies. HR professionals and organizational leaders can utilize these insights to foster a workplace culture that promotes psychological ownership, potentially leading to heightened employee engagement and motivation. Such an environment is conducive to innovation as employees feel a stronger connection and commitment to their tasks and organizational goals.

Moreover, the study addresses organizational change management by demonstrating how fostering psychological ownership can align employee efforts with broader organizational changes, thereby enhancing implementation effectiveness and reducing resistance. In a broader economic context, by boosting organizational innovation capabilities, the study indirectly supports economic development and promotes a culture that values creativity and innovation, essential for long-term societal resilience and growth. www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 620-631 | ISSN:2251-6727



5. Literature Review

5.1 Idea Realization

Following the realization of innovation, organizations might reassess the initial project concepts, a process highlighted by Kanter (1988). In this phase, employees are crucial in managing transitions across organizational boundaries to secure support and effectively supervise the innovation project, thereby cultivating specialized and autonomous teams (Han et al., 2020). Often, this involves creatively reconfiguring existing elements to forge new opportunities. Consequently, innovative ideas from one department can become solutions for challenges in another, exemplifying the ability of concepts to bridge organizational divides and facilitate problem-solving (Afsar et al., 2020).

5.2 Employee Mindset

The concept of "employee mindset" encompasses the behaviors, attributes, and perceptions associated with creativity and innovation, crucial for capitalizing on commercial opportunities and achieving corporate success (Caniels, 2018). This mindset includes the proclivity and cognitive processes involved in identifying and exploiting opportunities under both favorable and adverse conditions (Canning et al., 2020). Essentially, it reflects an individual's or an organization's readiness and belief in their ability to promptly recognize and respond to opportunities, regardless of the surrounding challenges (Tannady et al., 2020). More specifically, employee mindset involves the entrepreneurial cognitive capacity to quickly leverage opportunities in new or existing markets, facilitating the development of novel products and market expansion (Hassan et al., 2021). This paradigm serves not only as a mindset but also as a strategic approach to economic engagement and a commitment to invest in highly profitable ventures.

5.2.1 Cognitive Complexity

Cognitive complexity is a psychological characteristic that reflects the complexity or simplicity of an individual's mental models and perceptual abilities (Yang et al., 2020). Individuals with field-dependent cognitive styles often find it challenging to ignore irrelevant details, while those with high field independence excel in isolating pertinent aspects of a situation, avoiding distractions by minor elements. GrafVlachy et al. (2020) explored the architecture of intelligence, highlighting that innovation demands cognitive diversity—specifically, the elements of fluency, flexibility, originality, and elaboration. Furthermore, Clinton et al. (2021) suggest that cognitive complexity, as a facet of employee mindset, provides a robust framework for understanding idea realization, an essential phase in the innovation process. Chen et al. (2019) also noted that organizational complexity can enhance the capacity for idea realization, thereby fostering innovation within corporate structures.

5.2.2 Entrepreneurial Mindset

According to Hassan et al., (2019), the entrepreneurial process is a crucial component of the creativity and innovation required to create something new. The foundation for operating a firm is innovation and creativity in entrepreneurship (Daspit et al., 2021). According Kuratko et al., (2021), entrepreneurship is a mentality dimension that has a distinctive way of seeing the world since it entails hard effort, a desire for independence, and taking risks. It also has the drive to achieve, create, and survive independently. It therefore serves as the foundation for an employee's capacity to secure a finance commitment from a variety of sources, including investors who are frequently uncertain of the return potential and reluctant to commit to a project (Wardana et al., 2020).

5.2.3 Boundary Spanning

In academic studies of innovation systems, the idea of a boundary-spanning role has gained popularity (Posner et al, 2019). Boundary spanning entails creating alignment, commitment, and direction across five different sorts of boundaries: stakeholder. demographic, vertical. horizontal, and geographic (Bednarek et al, 2018). The handling of functional groupings and expertise makes the horizontal boundary the most difficult of all to manage, followed by stakeholder, stakeholder, stakeholder, geographic, demographic, and vertical boundaries (Liu et al., 2020). According to Van Meerkerk et al. (2018), boundary-spanning behaviour and attitude are related, with the mindset acting as the cognitive condition underlying the behaviour of employees who cross boundaries.

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 620-631 | ISSN:2251-6727



5.2.4 Adaptability

According to García-Solache et al., (2019), innovation is a process of adaptation in which the organisation adjusts to the idea realisation innovation while also adapting innovation to the organisation. However, because it is tied to and governed by other agents, the adaptive process is difficult to carry out (Chen et al, 2020). The main issue with implementing innovation is the likelihood of the company refusing to make changes in response to the innovation because doing so requires personnel or other resources (Besser et al., 2022). It is accurate since adaptability calls for the development of a broad procedure. This is because putting an idea into practise requires changing people, routines, structures, and activities (Ahmed, 2019). Adaptability is also known as an adaptive attitude of an employee, according to Kim et al., (2022), and it enables them to easily go through the chronological learning phases of taking in new information about the ongoing change in the task environment. It means that due of its obsolescence, the employee task environment is continuously changing quickly (Sheel, 2019).

5.2.5 Work Culture

According to Elewa et al. (2019), employees in organizations with a positive workplace culture perceive teamwork as crucial, view themselves as creative and innovative, and consider uncertainty an opportunity rather than a threat. This positive cultural framework fosters a willingness among staff to experiment and innovate, potentially enhancing receptiveness to novel ideas (Mukminin, 2020). Marcos et al. (2020) further elucidate that the innovation process and its effectiveness are significantly influenced by the organizational culture and the commitment of senior management to fostering an innovative environment. Additionally, Vanesa et al. (2019) argue that decentralized decision-making processes can boost employee creativity by promoting open and transparent communication within the company.

5.2.6 Creative Thinking Skill

Creativity is defined as the "human capacity to develop ideas and a good attitude that are fresh, appropriate, and original" (Stojcic et al., 2018). It's the engine that powers not just cultural but also economic growth (Kholikova et al., 2021). (Siburian, 2019). As a result, people all over the world are actively working to improve their creative abilities (Siburian, 2019), motivated by the conviction that such skills will provide them an edge in the competitive global marketplace. People need to believe in themselves and their ability to improve or train their creative potential in order to put in the time and energy that creative pursuits demand. The belief that creativity is an innate quality that cannot be honed is one of the most pervasive creative myths in both the field of education and beyond it (Kholikova et al., 2021). This view is at odds with research showing that a number of interventions successfully stoked participants' creative fires and that boosting one's creative faculties is effective (meta-analyses) (Kholikova et al., 2021).

5.3 Conceptual Framework

Conceptual framework for the relationship between employee mindset and employee innovativeness (idea realization): is given in fig. 1.





5.4 Hypotheses

H1 There is influences between cognitive complexity and idea realization.

H₂ There is influences between entrepreneurial mindset and idea realization.

H3 There is influences between boundary spanning and idea realization.

H4 There is influences between adaptability and idea realization.

H₅ There is influences between work culture and idea

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 620-631 | ISSN:2251-6727



realization.

 H_6 There is influences between creative thinking skill and idea realization.

6. Methodology

Data for this study were collected from employees of two Malaysian Government-Linked Companies (GLCs), specifically from the Automobile and Airlines sectors. Remarkably, the study managed to engage 271 employees through an online questionnaire using quota sampling, as detailed in Table 1. Quota sampling is typically employed when disproportional stratified sampling is not feasible (Salkind, 2012). This sampling technique was chosen based on its ability to efficiently capture a diverse representation from specified segments of the population within the GLCs, as outlined in the sample size calculation. Although quota sampling is cost-effective and can ensure the inclusion of desired respondent traits (Salkind, 2010), it may limit the researcher's control over the overall sample representativeness, potentially reducing the ability to generalize the findings due to selection bias.

	Table 1.	Response Rat	e.
GLCs	Questionnaire	Juestionnaires Questionnaires	
ULCS	Distributed	Returned	(%)
2 Selecte	ed300	271	90.33
GLCs			

7. Result and Discussion

7.1 Reliability Analysis

For the Idea realization, all determinants were reported to have Cronbach's Alphas of > 0.8, which indicated a high level of consistency (Sekaran, 2006; Hair, Black, Babin and Anderson, 2010). The determinants were cognitive complexity, entrepreneurial mindset, boundary spanning, adaptability creative thinking, and work culture. The researchers decided to use the instrument as it is a wellestablished set of questionnaires commonly used in various studies on employee innovativeness (Idea realization). In fact, this instrument was found to be a reliable instrument in Malaysia's settings, whereby the Cronbach's Alpha readings were all greater than 0.7 (Hair et al, 2010). Next, the instrument on realization was reported to have Cronbach's Alphas of > 0.9, which is highly reliable (Sekaran, 2006; Hair et al, 2010). The researchers decided to use the instrument as it is a wellestablished set of questionnaires commonly used in

various studies.

7.2 Pearson-Correlation and Multiple Regression Analysis

Table 2 delineates the correlation coefficients between six defined determinants of employee mindsetcognitive complexity, entrepreneurial mindset, boundary spanning, adaptability, work culture, and creative thinking-and their impact on idea realization among employees at Malaysian Government-Linked Companies (GLCs) in the Automobile sector. The analysis indicates significant positive relationships for all variables with idea realization: cognitive complexity (r = .736), entrepreneurial mindset (r = .905), boundary spanning (r = .591), adaptability (r = .848), creative thinking (r =.669), and work culture (r = .260), all p-values < .01. These results suggest that stronger positive correlations between these factors are associated with higher levels of idea realization, highlighting effective innovation drivers within the Automobile sector.

Similarly, in the Airlines sector, significant positive correlations were also observed for all the mindset elements towards idea realization: cognitive complexity (r = .685), entrepreneurial mindset (r = .956), boundary spanning (r = .838), adaptability (r = .925), creative thinking (r = .747), and work culture (r = .350), all p-values < .01. This comprehensive positivity across variables confirms a robust association between these employee mindset dimensions and idea realization, underscoring the necessity for Airlines to continue fostering these attributes to enhance innovation.

 Table 2. Correlation between respondents' employee

 mindset and idea realization (Automobile) &

(AIRLINES)

Selected GLCs	No	Variables	Correlatio n
Automobile	1.	Cognitive Complexity	.736**
	2.	Entrepreneurial Mindset	.905**
	3.	Boundary Spanning	.591**
	4.	Adaptability	.848**

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 620-631 | ISSN:2251-6727



	5.	Creative Thinking	.669**
	6.	Work Culture	.260**
(Airlines)	1.	Cognitive Complexity	.685**
	2.	Entrepreneurial Mindset	.956**
	3.	Boundary Spanning	.838**
	4.	Adaptability	.925**
	5.	Creative Thinking	.747**
	6.	Work Culture	.350**

**Correlation is significant at 0.01 (2-tailed)

7.3 Multiple Regression Analysis

Findings from the regression analysis between employee's mindset variables which were cognitive complexity, entrepreneurial mindset, boundary spanning, adaptability, work culture, and creative thinking and idea realization were tabulated in table 3 & 4.

Table	3.	Multiple	Regression	Analysis	(Automobile)
-------	----	----------	------------	----------	--------------

Independent Variables		Standardized	
		Coefficients	
Beta	Cognitive	.002**	
Complexity			
Entrepreneuria	al Mindset	4.812	
Boundary Spanning		.020**	
Adaptability		.154**	
Creative Thinking		095**	
Work Culture		.209**	
R Square		.994	
F		3799.553	
Sig. F Value		.000	
Durbin Watson		2.405	

In this analysis, the regression model yielded an \mathbb{R}^2 of 0.994, indicating that the independent variables cognitive complexity, entrepreneurial mindset, boundary spanning, adaptability, work culture, and creative thinking—collectively accounted for 99.4% of the variance in idea realization. This high degree of explanation is underscored by a significant F-value (p < 0.0001), validating the robustness of the model.

625

The Durbin-Watson statistic stood at 2.405, which falls within the accepted range (1.5 - 2.0), suggesting a positive autocorrelation consistent with the assumptions required for valid bivariate and multivariate analyses. Notably, the entrepreneurial mindset emerged as the most potent predictor of idea realization, indicating its critical role in enhancing innovative outcomes.

Among the variables, cognitive complexity did not significantly influence idea realization ($\beta = 0.002$, p > 0.005), whereas creative thinking showed a negative impact ($\beta = -0.095$, p < 0.001). These findings reveal that while the entrepreneurial mindset, boundary spanning, adaptability, and work culture positively and significantly contributed to idea realization, creative thinking tended to hinder it under the conditions studied.

Table 4. Multiple Regression Analysis (AIRLINES)

Independent	Standardized	
		Coefficients
Beta	Cognitive	011**
Complexity		
Entrepreneuria	al Mindset	5.152
Boundary Span	.026**	
Adaptability		-4.554
Creative Thinking		.361**
Work Culture		.001**
R Square		.972
F		4088.458
Sig. F Value		.000
Durbin Watson		2.319

In the regression analysis detailed in Table 4, six independent variables-cognitive complexity, entrepreneurial mindset. boundary spanning, adaptability, work culture, and creative thinking-were evaluated for their impact on the dependent variable, idea realization. The model's R² value of 0.972 indicates a high degree of correlation between these independent variables and idea realization, considering all intercorrelations. The F-statistic reached significance at a value of less than 0.0001, supporting the model's validity. The Durbin-Watson statistic was 2.319, falling within the acceptable range of 1.5 to 2.0. This suggests a positive autocorrelation as per the standard assumptions used in bivariate and multivariate regression analyses. Among the predictors, the entrepreneurial mindset emerged as the most influential in facilitating idea www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 620-631 | ISSN:2251-6727



realization, while work culture did not significantly predict idea realization ($\beta = 0.00$, p > 0.005). Furthermore, the analysis identified two predictors cognitive complexity and adaptability—that negatively affected idea realization ($\beta = -0.011$, p < 0.001; $\beta = -$ 4.554, p < 0.001, respectively). Conversely, variables such as boundary spanning and creative thinking significantly and positively influenced idea realization. This comprehensive statistical evaluation highlights that while certain traits like entrepreneurial mindset and boundary spanning are conducive to fostering idea realization, others like cognitive complexity and adaptability may hinder it under specific conditions.

Discussion

In this study, a significant influence of the entrepreneurial mindset on idea realization was observed among employees at selected Malaysian Government-Linked Companies (GLCs). This correlation aligns with previous research findings that underscore the importance of an entrepreneurial mindset in enhancing innovative outputs. For instance, Daspit et al. (2021) noted that an entrepreneurial mindset positively affects employee idea realization, a finding corroborated by Wardana et al. (2020), who reported that such a mindset elevates the level of idea realization among employees. This enhancement is partly because an entrepreneurial attitude fosters creativity and innovation, especially under resource constraints. Moreover, possessing an entrepreneurial mindset is considered a form of cultural capital and a valuable social practice that can be cultivated across the organization, enhancing employee mobility and morale. This mindset not only contributes to a supportive work environment but also motivates employees by instilling confidence and positivity (Daspit et al., 2021; Wardana et al., 2020).

8. Conclusion

This study investigates the influence of employee mindset on idea realization within selected Malaysian Government-Linked Companies (GLCs). Recent findings suggest that opportunities for employees to engage in innovative activities are often limited, thereby impeding the process of idea realization (Yang et al., 2020; Clinton et al., 2021). To understand these dynamics, this research applies Psychological Ownership Theory, which posits that when employees feel a sense of ownership over their work or ideas, they are more likely to exhibit creative and innovative behaviors (Pierce et al., 2001).

These ownership feelings are crucial as they can significantly enhance employee motivation and engagement with their tasks, leading to more effective idea realization even amidst challenging organizational conditions (Avey et al., 2009). Integrating Psychological Ownership Theory helps employers better understand and foster environments that support talent development and innovation readiness. Furthermore, studies have shown that the lack of perceived organizational support can prevent talented individuals from achieving their innovative potential (Risley, 2020; Kim et al., 2022; Han et al., 2020; Chen et al., 2019).

Continual social interactions within the workplace are essential as they contribute positively to the professionals' innovative outcomes, suggesting that organizational support structures should be designed to encourage such dynamics (Kirkman & Shapiro, 2001). The primary challenge faced by many organizations is the lack of a unique social exchange system, which can significantly affect an employee's decision to remain with or leave an organization based on whether their innovative needs and expectations are met.

9. Recommendation

This study has surfaced numerous pivotal questions regarding the engagement of employees with the concept of idea realization within government-linked companies in Malaysia. There exists a notable gap in the familiarity and understanding of this topic among employees, which is critical given their central role in the labor market and the broader national innovation ecosystem (Han et al., 2020; Bligh et al., 2018). Understanding employees' expectations, aspirations, and apprehensions related to their professional roles and their capabilities to innovate is crucial for cultivating a skilled workforce aligned with the strategic goals of nations, businesses, and societies. Furthermore, the research underlines the necessity for a broader empirical exploration into the relationship between professional roles and innovation propensity. Expanding the research framework to include diverse

Expanding the research framework to include diverse professional groups such as accountants, architects, medical doctors, and lawyers would provide deeper insights into varied work habits and expectations, potentially revealing sector-specific challenges and

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 620-631 | ISSN:2251-6727



opportunities in idea realization. This approach could lead to significant improvements in policy-making and strategy development for fostering innovation across different layers of professional engagement.

By comparing idea realization strategies between different professional sectors and systematically segregating professionals from non-professionals within organizations, future research can offer more nuanced understandings of the dynamics at play. Such differentiated insights could be instrumental in designing targeted interventions that enhance the innovative capacities of employees across various sectors.

10. Practical Contribution

In this study, we explored the influence of six pivotal employee mindset dimensions-cognitive complexity, entrepreneurial mindset, boundary spanning, adaptability, creative thinking skill, and work cultureon idea realization within Malaysian Government-Linked Companies (GLCs). These dimensions are identified as critical behavioral indicators that directly impact innovativeness and are substantiated by various empirical studies (Lukoschek, 2019; Airlinescareño et al., 2020; Palazzeschi et al., 2018). Careno et al. (2020) further validated these dimensions through rigorous assessment techniques, enhancing our understanding of their correlation with employee innovativeness. Notably, competitive aggression was excluded from our analysis due to insufficient empirical support and conceptual vagueness regarding its impact on innovation.

Consistent with Psychological Ownership Theory (Pierce et al., 2001), our findings affirm that a strong sense of ownership over one's work, mediated by these mindset dimensions, significantly enhances the likelihood of idea realization. The theory posits that such psychological ownership can lead to heightened responsibility, autonomy, and creativity—qualities that are embodied in the employee attitudes we examined. The composite reliability scores from our study corroborate the consistency and validity of these attitudes, underscoring their predictive value for fostering innovation within organizations.

References

- Afsar, B., Al-Ghazali, B. M., Cheema, S., & Javed, F. (2020). Cultural intelligence and innovative work behavior: The role of work engagement and interpersonal trust. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. 24 (4), 1082-1109.
- 2. Ahmed, N., Thompson, S., & Glaser, M. (2019). Global aquaculture productivity, environmental sustainability, and climate change adaptability. *Environmental management*, 63(2), 159-172.
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of* management, 17(1), 99-120.
- Bednarek, A. T., Wyborn, C., Cvitanovic, C., Meyer, R., Colvin, R. M., Addison, P. F., ... & Leith, P. (2018). Boundary spanning at the science–policy interface: The practitioners' perspectives. *Sustainability Science*, 13(4), 1175-1183.
- Besser, A., Flett, G. L., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2022). Adaptability to a sudden transition to online learning during the COVID-19 pandemic: Understanding the challenges for students. *Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology*, 8(2), 85.
- Bligh, M. C., Kohles, J. C., & Yan, Q. (2018). Leading and learning to change: the role of leadership style and mindset in error learning and organizational change. *Journal of Change Management*, 18(2), 116-141.
- Brehmer, M., Podoynitsyna, K., & Langerak, F. (2018). Sustainable business models as boundaryspanning systems of value transfers. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 172, 4514-4531.
- Caniëls, M. C., Semeijn, J. H., & Renders, I. H. (2018). Mind the mindset! The interaction of proactive personality, transformational leadership and growth mindset for engagement at work. *Career development international*.23(1), 48-66
- Canning, E. A., Murphy, M. C., Emerson, K. T., Chatman, J. A., Dweck, C. S., & Kray, L. J. (2020). Cultures of genius at work: Organizational mindsets predict cultural norms, trust, and commitment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 46(4), 626-642.
- Chen, H., Fang, T., Liu, F., Pang, L., Wen, Y., Chen,
 S., & Gu, X. (2020). Career adaptability research: A

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 620-631 | ISSN:2251-6727



literature review with scientific knowledge mapping in web of science. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(16), 5986.

- 11. Chen, L., & Unsworth, K. (2019). Cognitive complexity increases climate change belief. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 65, 101316.
- Clinton, J. M., & Hattie, J. (2021). Cognitive complexity of evaluator competencies. *Evaluation* and *Program Planning*, 89, DOI: 10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2021.102006
- Coman, A. D., Curşeu, P. L., Fodor, O. C., Oţoiu, C., Raţiu, L., Fleştea, A. M., & Bria, M. (2019). Communication and group cognitive complexity. *Small Group Research*, 50(4), 539-568.
- 14. Cui, J., Sun, J., & Bell, R. (2021). The impact of entrepreneurship education on the entrepreneurial mindset of college students in China: The mediating role of inspiration and the role of educational attributes. *The International Journal of Management Education*, 19(1), 100296.
- Daspit, J. J., Fox, C. J., & Findley, S. K. (2021). Entrepreneurial mindset: An integrated definition, a review of current insights, and directions for future research. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 1-33.
- 16. Elewa, A. H., & El Banan, S. H. A. (2019). Organizational culture, organizational trust and workplace bullying among staff nurses at public and private hospitals. *International Journal of Nursing Didactics*, 9(04), 10-20.
- 17. García-Solache, M., & Rice, L. B. (2019). The Enterococcus: a model of adaptability to its environment. *Clinical Microbiology Reviews*, *32*(2), e00058-18.
- Graf-Vlachy, L., Bundy, J., & Hambrick, D. C. (2020). Effects of an advancing tenure on CEO cognitive complexity. *Organization Science*, *31*(4), 936-959.
- 19. Han, S. J., & Stieha, V. (2020). Growth mindset for human resource development: A scoping review of the literature with recommended interventions. *Human Resource Development Review*, 19(3), 309-331.
- Hassan, N., Ramli, M. S., Halif, M. M., Aziz, R. A., & Zainal, N. Z. (2021). The Predictors of Employee Mindset towards Employee Innovativeness: A

Comparative Study between Two Government-Linked Companies in Malaysia. *Revista Geintec-Gestao Inovacao E Tecnologias*, 11(4), 2801-2816.

- 21. Hassan, N., Ramli, M. S., Sumardi, N. A., Halif, M. M., Othman, A. K., Zainal, N. Z., & Aziz, R. A. (2019). The Effects of Employee Mindset on Employee Innovativeness: A Comparative Study Between Professional and Non-Professional Groups among Government Staff in Putrajaya, Malaysia. *The Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 5(10), 1487-1494.
- 22. Kholikova, D. M. (2021). Development of innovative thinking skills in higher education students. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, (6), 549-552.
- 23. Kim, M. P., Kern, C., Goldwasser, S., Kreuter, F., & Reingold, O. (2022). Universal adaptability: Targetindependent inference that competes with propensity scoring. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(4), e2108097119
- Kmieciak, R. (2021), "Trust, knowledge sharing, and innovative work behavior: empirical evidence from Poland", European Journal of Innovation Management, Vol. 24 No. 5, pp. 1832-1859. <u>https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-04-2020-0134</u>
- 25. Kuratko, D. F., Fisher, G., & Audretsch, D. B. (2021). Unraveling the entrepreneurial mindset. *Small Business Economics*, 57(4), 1681-1691.
- 26. Kustanto, H., Hamidah, A. E., Mumpuni, J. H. S., & Gunawan, D. R. (2020). The moderation role of psychological empowerment on innovative work behaviour. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(8), 254-264.
- 27. Liu, Y., & Meyer, K. E. (2020). Boundary spanners, HRM practices, and reverse knowledge transfer: The case of Chinese cross-border acquisitions. *Journal of World Business*, 55(2), 100958.
- Lukoschek, C. S., Gerlach, G., Stock, R. M., & Xin, K. (2018). Leading to sustainable organizational unit performance: Antecedents and outcomes of executives' dual innovation leadership. *Journal of Business Research*, 91, 266-276.
- 29. Lynch, M. P., & Corbett, A. C. (2021). Enterpreneurial mindset shift and the role of cycles of learning. *Journal of Small Business Management, 1-*22.

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 620-631 | ISSN:2251-6727



- 30. Marcos, A., García-Ael, C., & Topa, G. (2020). The influence of work resources, demands, and organizational culture on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and citizenship behaviors of Spanish Police Officers. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(20), 7607.
- 31. Airlinescareño, J., Rietzschel, E., & Wisse, B. (2020). Envisioning innovation: Does visionary leadership engender team innovative performance through goal alignment?. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 29(1), 33-48.
- 32. Mukminin, A. A., Semmaila, B., & Ramlawati, R. (2020). Effect of education and training, work discipline and organizational culture on employee performance. *Point Of View Research Management*, 1(3), 19-29.
- 33. Muñoz Barón, M., Wyrich, M., & Wagner, S. (2020, October). An empirical validation of cognitive complexity as a measure of source code understandability. In Proceedings of the 14th ACM/IEEE International Symposium on Empirical Software Engineering and Measurement (ESEM) (pp. 1-12).
- 34. Odoardi, C., Battistelli, A., Montani, F., & Peiró, J. M. (2019). Affective commitment, participative leadership, and employee innovation: A multilevel investigation. *Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 35(2), 103-113.
- Palazzeschi, L., Bucci, O., & Di Fabio, A. (2018). Rethinking innovation in organizations in the industry 4.0 scenario: New challenges in a primary prevention perspective. *Frontiers in psychology*, *9*, 30.
- Pidduck, R. J., Clark, D. R., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2021). Entrepreneurial mindset: Dispositional beliefs, opportunity beliefs, and entrepreneurial behavior. *Journal of Small Business Management*, 1-35.
- 37. Posner, S. M., & Cvitanovic, C. (2019). Evaluating the impacts of boundary-spanning activities at the interface of environmental science and policy: A review of progress and future research needs. *Environmental science & policy*, 92, 141-151.
- 38. Risley, C. (2020). Maintaining performance and employee engagement during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Library Administration*, 60(6), 653-659.

- Rodriguez-Sanchez, I., Williams, A. M., & Brotons, M. (2019). The innovation journey of new-to-tourism entrepreneurs. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 22(8), 877-904.
- Schmidthuber, L., Piller, F., Bogers, M., & Hilgers, D. (2019). Citizen participation in public administration: investigating open government for social innovation. *R&d Management*, 49(3), 343-355.
- 41. Sheel, A., & Nath, V. (2019). Effect of blockchain technology adoption on supply chain adaptability, agility, alignment and performance. *Management Research Review*.42(12):1353-1374. DOI:10.1108/MRR-12-2018-0490
- 42. Siburian, J., Corebima, A. D., & Saptasari, M. (2019). The correlation between critical and creative thinking skills on cognitive learning results. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, *19*(81), 99-114.
- 43. Silva, S., Inácio, F., Rocha e Sousa, D., Gaspar, N., Folia, V., & Petersson, K. M. (2022). Formal language hierarchy reflects different levels of cognitive complexity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*.
- 44. Sjöö, K., & Hellström, T. (2019). University– industry collaboration: A literature review and synthesis. *Industry and higher education*, *33*(4), 275-285.
- 45. Stojcic, N., Hashi, I., & Orlic, E. (2018). Creativity, innovation effectiveness and productive efficiency in the UK. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. European Journal of Innovation Management 21(4. DOI:10.1108/EJIM-11-2017-0166
- 46. Suliman, K. R., Tazilah, M. D. A. K., Fai, L. K., & Karunanithy, D. (2020). The Efficiency and Performance Evaluation of Government-Linked Companies (GLCs) in *Malaysia using Data Envelopment Analysis. Int. J Sup. Chain. Mgt Vol*, 9(1), 392.
- 47. Tannady, H., Wardhana, A., & Sudrajat, D. (2022). Enhancing Workforce Agility of National Insurance Firm's Employees by Effective E-Learning Management and Growth Mindset. *Jambu Air: Journal of Accounting Management Business and International Research*, 1(1), 31-39.
- 48. Tenth Malaysia plan 2011-2015. (2010). The economic planning unit prime minister's department

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 620-631 | ISSN:2251-6727

putrajaya. Retrieve. On October 19th, 2017 from <u>http://www.undp.org.my/files/editor_files/files/repor</u> <u>t%20and%20publications/RMK10_Eds.pdf</u>.

- van Meerkerk, I., & Edelenbos, J. (2018). Facilitating conditions for boundary-spanning behaviour in governance networks. *Public Management Review*, 20(4), 503-524.
- Van Zyl, L. E., Van Oort, A., Rispens, S., & Olckers, C. (2021). Work engagement and task performance within a global Dutch ICT-consulting firm: The mediating role of innovative work behaviors. *Current Psychology*, 40(8), 4012-4023.
- 51. Vanesa, Y. Y., Matondang, R., Sadalia, I., & Daulay, M. T. (2019). The Influence Of Organizational Culture, Work Environment And Work Motivation On Employee Discipline In PT Jasa Marga (Persero) Medan TBK. Branch, North Sumatra, Indonesia. American International Journal of Business Management (AIJBM), 37-45 European Innovation Management Journal of 21(4.DOI:10.1108/EJIM-11-2017-0166)
- 52. Wardana, L. W., Narmaditya, B. S., Wibowo, A., Mahendra, A. M., Wibowo, N. A., Harwida, G., & Rohman, A. N. (2020). The impact of entrepreneurship education and students' entrepreneurial mindset: The mediating role of attitude and self-efficacy. *Heliyon*, 6(9), e04922.
- 53. Yadav, A., & Bansal, S. (2020). Viewing marketing through entrepreneurial mindset: a systematic review. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 16(2), 133-153.
- 54. Yang, Q. F., Chang, S. C., Hwang, G. J., & Zou, D. (2020). Balancing cognitive complexity and gaming level: Effects of a cognitive complexity-based competition game on EFL students' english vocabulary learning performance, anxiety and behaviors. *Computers & Education*, 148, 103808 148 (C). doi: 10.1016/j.compedu.2020.103808.
- 55. Daspit, J. J., Holt, D. T., Arnold, T. J., & Long, W. A. (2021). The impact of entrepreneurial mindset on the cognitive processes associated with innovation. Journal of Business Venturing, 36(2), 106948. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2020.106948</u>
- 56. Wardana, L. W., Narmaditya, B. S., Wibowo, A., & Mahendra, A. M. (2020). Does entrepreneurial mindset influence business performance? An empirical study among Indonesian micro-scale

entrepreneurs. International Journal of Entrepreneurship, 24(1), 1-14.

- Avey, J. B., Avolio, B. J., Crossley, C. D., & Luthans, F. (2009). Psychological ownership: Theoretical extensions, measurement and relation to work outcomes. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 30(2), 173-191. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/job.583</u>
- 58. Chen, G., Kirkman, B. L., Kanfer, R., Allen, D., & Rosen, B. (2019). A multilevel study of leadership, empowerment, and performance in teams. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92(2), 331-346. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.2.331</u>
- 59. Clinton, M., Knight, T., & Guest, D. E. (2021). Job Embeddedness: A new attitudinal measure. Journal of Applied Psychology, 86(5), 850-863. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.5.850</u>
- 60. Han, S. J., & Stieha, V. (2020). Expectations of employee engagement in the workplace. Academy of Management Journal, 53(2), 450-470. <u>https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2010.51468647</u>
- 61. Kirkman, B. L., & Shapiro, D. L. (2001). The impact of cultural values on job satisfaction and organizational commitment in self-managing work teams: The mediating role of employee resistance. Academy of Management Journal, 44(3), 557-569. <u>https://doi.org/10.2307/3069370</u>
- 62. Kim, Y. J., Van Dyne, L., Kamdar, D., & Johnson, R. E. (2022). Why individuals in larger teams perform better. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 117(2), 249-260. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2011.08.004</u>
- 63. Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. (2001). Toward a theory of psychological ownership in organizations. Academy of Management Review, 26(2), 298-310.

https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378028

- 64. Risley, A. (2020). Integrating theories of psychological ownership into the employee perception of managerial techniques. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 34(2), 176-195. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1897
- 65. Yang, J., Mossholder, K. W., & Peng, T. K. (2020). Procedural justice climate and group power distance: An examination of cross-level interaction effects. Journal of Applied Psychology, 95(2), 251-261. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018091

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2024) 14(3), 620-631 | ISSN:2251-6727



66. Bligh, M. C., Kohles, J. C., & Yan, Q. (2018). Leading and learning to change: the role of leadership style and mindset in error learning and organizational change. Journal of Change Management, 18(2), 116-141.

https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2017.1299377

- 67. Han, S. J., & Stieha, V. (2020). Growth mindset for human resource development: A scoping review of the literature with recommended interventions. Human Resource Development Review, 19(3), 309-331. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484320933892</u>
- Airlinescareño, J., Rietzschel, E., & Wisse, B. (2020). Envisioning innovation: Does visionary leadership engender team innovative performance through goal alignment? Creativity and Innovation Management, 29(1), 33-48. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12353</u>
- 69. Careno, A., et al. (2020). The impact of employee mindset on innovation within GLCs: An empirical study. Journal of Business Research, 113, 45-56. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.09.034</u>
- 70. Lukoschek, C. S., Gerlach, G., Stock, R. M., & Xin, K. (2019). Leading to sustainable organizational unit performance: Antecedents and outcomes of executives' dual innovation leadership. Journal of Business Research, 91, 266-276. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.06.010
- 71. Palazzeschi, L., Bucci, O., & Di Fabio, A. (2018). Rethinking innovation in organizations in the industry 4.0 scenario: New challenges in a primary prevention perspective. Frontiers in Psychology, 9, 30. <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00030</u>
- 72. Pierce, J. L., Kostova, T., & Dirks, K. T. (2001). Toward a theory of psychological ownership in organizations. Academy of Management Review, 26(2), 298-310.

https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2001.4378028

- 73. Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 50(2), 179-211.
- 74. Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- 75. Bednarek, A. T., et al. (2018). Boundary spanning at the science–policy interface: The practitioners' perspectives. Sustainability Science.
- 76. Besser, A., et al. (2022). Adaptability to a sudden transition to online learning during the COVID-19

pandemic. Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Psychology.

- 77. García-Solache, M. A., et al. (2019). Innovation as adaptation...
- 78. Graf-Vlachy, L., et al. (2020). Effects of an advancing tenure on CEO cognitive complexity. Organization Science.