

# The Influence Of Participative Leadership, Proactive Personality And Knowledge Sharing On Innovation Work Behavior In The Creative Industry

Krisanti Klaski Putri<sup>1\*</sup>, Rina Anindita<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Esa Unggul, Jakarta, Indonesia

\*Corresponding Author:

Email: [krisssss@esaunggul.ac.id](mailto:krisssss@esaunggul.ac.id)

---

## Abstract.

*The purpose of this research is to explore how Participative Leadership, Knowledge Sharing, and Proactive Personality influence Innovative Work Behavior in employees who are graduates from creative industries in Jakarta. The research was conducted on 154 respondents who met the research criteria, by distributing questionnaires online. The data processing method uses SEM PLS. The research results show that Participative Leadership has an influence on Knowledge Sharing. However, Participative Leadership has no effect on Innovative Work Behavior. Proactive Personality has an influence on Knowledge Sharing, Proactive Personality has an influence on Innovative Work Behavior, and Knowledge Sharing has a role that can influence Innovative Work Behavior in employees.*

**Keywords:** *Participative Leadership, Proactive Personality, Knowledge Sharing and Innovative Work Behaviour.*

---

## I. INTRODUCTION

The creative industry is currently in the midst of a significant change for the first time in the first ten years of the 21st century. The contribution that the creative industry made to the global economy is estimated to be around 3%, and it has generated approximately 29,5 million jobs in the world, positively impacting the local and regional economies. Several conducted studies have shown that this industry also has a crucial role in Indonesia's economy [1]. In this sector, innovation comes as the result of individual and/or joint creations, and the creative industry department includes visual communication design, graphic design, interior design, broadcasting, television and film, pure fine arts, product design, fashion design, photography, advertising, publishing, animation, multimedia, gaming technology, packaging technology, graphic technology, and many more. Furthermore, this industry has the potential to push us toward social inclusion and for individuals to form a sense of responsibility for self-growth and innovation for the good of organizations [2]. Creativity is a crucial component of innovative work behavior [3]. Innovative work behavior in the industry is the key factor in contributing positively to a business corporation and/or organization [4]. Leadership may trigger innovative work behavior [5]. Innovative work behavior and leadership styles are interconnected and the latter supports employees' endeavors to trigger innovation [6]. The participative leadership style which encourages consultations, discussions between co-workers, and urging employees to participate in decision making will foster an innovative environment. An innovative work environment will encourage employees to interact and share knowledge with one another [7]. Knowledge sharing occurs when the sharer relays information to their recipient [8]. Proactive employees will gather information, identify problems, and jump on the opportunity given to them if they want change [9] while an employee who is mostly reactive tends to merely wait for an opportunity in lieu of changing their environment.

Participative leadership shows a positive correlation with innovative work behavior, as it improves productivity by making strategic changes and improving a company's longevity and staying power [10]. Participation from all members of the organization is a form of united strength to avoid resistance coming from outside of the organization, creating a competitive edge to a company as it keeps the employees comfortable to stay working in said company. Participation and communication are found to have positive effects on fostering innovative behavior [11]. Knowledge sharing is the key to success in all stages of innovative work behavior for employees [12]. Frequently sharing knowledge between employees will improve innovative work behavior [7]. Managers can encourage knowledge sharing among culturally diverse co-workers by inspiring them to be more open-minded and motivated to attempt new ideas in order to improve their innovative work behavior [13]. Innovative work behavior hinges on knowledge sharing, where

employees share their knowledge and skills with their co-workers [14]. Proactive personality is proven to have significant positive effects on innovative work behavior [9]. Proactive employees tend to work in an environment with little substantial freedom, independence, and individual discretion in making decisions at work (low job autonomy), where proactivity may increase the likeliness of conflict among employees. The more a proactive person is being limited by rules and procedures, the more likely there is a possibility for new ideas to come about [15]. The key to innovative work behavior is a proactive personality [16]. Explorations of innovative work behavior have been done before.

Previously, few researchers have studied types of leadership related to the aforementioned variable, however, participative leadership in relation to innovative work behavior was studied from the point of view of normal day-to-day employees whereas this study specifically focused on innovative work behavior from the background of graduates from the creative industry majors, specifically ones with a minimum of 1-year work experience. The questions presented in the questionnaire are different according to the innovative. Work behavior variable and used the measurement provided by [17]. Previous studies have used the same variable, therefore it is concluded that the participative leadership, knowledge sharing, and proactive personality variables have not been studied in tandem or were conducted separately. The issue presented in this study is how participative leadership, knowledge sharing, and proactive personality can affect innovative work behavior for private sector employees working in Jakarta's creative industry. This research aims to explore and analyze how participative leadership, knowledge sharing, and proactive personality can affect innovative work behavior in employees who graduated from a creative industry major in the Jakarta area. Through this research, there is hope that this paper will be a good contribution to the Management major. The originality of this study in relation to how participative leadership, proactive personality, and knowledge-sharing variables affect innovative work behavior focuses mainly on their relation to employees in the creative industry. Therefore, the author is interested in "The Effect of Participative Leadership, Proactive Personality and Knowledge Sharing towards Innovative Work Behaviour in the Creative Industry" as the title of this study.

### **The Relation between Participative Leadership and Knowledge Sharing**

Participative leadership can improve the employees' involvement in making decisions by exchanging ideas and knowledge sharing [18]. Part of the decision-making process in companies involves the leader accepting opinions from their employees which comes from knowledge sharing among co-workers. Participative leadership affects knowledge sharing and that knowledge sharing has a vital role in the ability to filter and absorb employees' ideas which supports the results of the employees' innovative exploration. [19] The results of participative leadership includes affective commitment and knowledge sharing [20]

H1 : Participative Leadership has a Positive Impact on Knowledge Sharing

### **The Relation between Participative Leadership and Innovative Work Behaviour**

Participation from all members of the organization is a form of united strength to avoid resistance coming from outside of the organization, creating a competitive edge to a company as it keeps the employees comfortable to stay working in said company. Participation and communication are found to have positive effects on fostering innovative behavior [11]. Participative leadership extends responsibility toward employees by providing them with a role in making a decision [21]. Participative leadership shows a positive correlation with innovative work behavior, as it improves productivity by making strategic changes and improving a company's longevity and staying power [10]

H2 : Participative Leadership Has a Positive Impact on Innovative Work Behaviour

### **The Relation between Proactive Personality and Knowledge Sharing**

Knowledge Sharing is a proactive action. A person with a proactive personality will share knowledge and new ideas with others in order to gain new perspectives and be advised [22]. Employees with highly proactive personalities will participate in knowledge sharing among their teams. [23] A proactive personality has a positive impact on knowledge sharing [24]. Employees with influence in the organization and the work system will be available to share their knowledge as they feel a sense of responsibility to their organization and the effect of knowledge sharing is bolstered by the employees' heightened view of their

organization, supported by the continuous feedback between the employees and the organization [25]

H3 : Proactive personality has a positive impact on Knowledge sharing.

#### **The Relation between Proactive Personality and Innovative Work Behavior**

An employee with a proactive personality may be weighed down by the resources provided by a corporation and feel a sense of responsibility towards sustainable change and making strides in their work according to the organization's goals [26]. Employees with proactive personality and have a good relationship with their superiors have the advantage to gain trust and give good feedback, becoming more innovative in their work. Proactive personality and good feedback from superiors can bolster innovative work behavior[27]. Proactive personality is proven to have significant positive effects on innovative work behavior [9]. Proactive employees tend to work in an environment with little substantial freedom, independence, and individual discretion in making decisions at work (low job autonomy), where proactivity may increase the likeliness of conflict among employees. The more a proactive person is being limited by rules and procedures, the more likely there is a possibility for new ideas to come about [15] The key to innovative work behavior is a proactive personality [16].

H4 : Proactive personality has a positive impact on Innovative work behavior.

#### **The Relation between Knowledge Sharing and Innovative Work Behaviour**

Knowledge sharing is the key to success in all stages of innovative work behavior for employees. When employees are given the opportunity to freely share their knowledge, acquiring more from their co-workers, they are motivated to create, share, promote, and execute their innovative ideas. Knowledge sharing is the key to fostering innovative work behavior [12]. Frequently sharing knowledge between employees will improve innovative work behavior [7] Managers can encourage knowledge sharing among culturally diverse co-workers by inspiring them to be more open-minded and motivated to attempt new ideas in order to improve their innovative work behavior mereka [13] Innovative work behavior hinges on knowledge sharing, where employees share their knowledge and skills with their co-workers [14]

H5 : Knowledge sharing has a positive impact on innovative work behavior.

## **II. METHODS**

This research used the quantitative method and in order to gather data, a survey was conducted in the form of questionnaires made in Google Forms. All variables are measured using the Likert scale. This research contains two independent variables which are participative leadership and knowledge sharing, and two dependent variables which are proactive personality and innovative work behavior. The participative leadership variable is measured through the six items developed by [28] The knowledge sharing variable is measured through the eight items developed by [29]. The proactive personality variable is measured through the ten items developed by [30], previously taken from [31] The innovative work behavior variable is measured through the nine items of a scale (Janssen, 2000) taken from Scott & Bruce, 1994. In total, there are 33 questions for the sake of measurement. The first phase of processing data is testing its validity and reliability to check whether the right question is determined. The validity test is conducted using factor analysis with the SPSS version 26 software and by measuring through the Kaiser- Meyer-Olkin (KMO) scale. In the validity test, the KMO and MSA scores are above 0,5 indicating the suitable factor. The reliability test is conducted using Cronbach's Alpha measurement. The Cronbach's Alpha score is above 0,6, a close number to 1 which indicates the high level of reliability of the questions asked in the questionnaire (Hair et al., 2014).The validity test with factor analysis is processed through SPSS version 26 and is done two to three times, as all the variables form two to three components or groups.The participative leadership variable is examined through two factor analyses and of the six questions, five are valid and one invalid question is Participative Leadership (PL6). The reliability test shows its Cronbach's Alpha score of 0,852 which indicates a strong or favorable correlation.

A Cronbach's Alpha score above 0,6 and close to 1 for the questions asked in the questionnaire indicates a high level of reliability.The validity test for the knowledge sharing variable is done by conducting three factor analyses on eight questions, and the results show that six are valid while the two invalid

questions are Knowledge Sharing KS2 and Knowledge Sharing KS5. The reliability test shows its Cronbach's Alpha score of 0,801 which indicates a strong or favorable correlation. A Cronbach's Alpha score above 0,6 and close to 1 for the questions asked in the questionnaire indicates a high level of reliability. Knowledge Sharing KS2 and Knowledge Sharing KS5 are used as indicators. The validity test for the proactive personality variable is done by conducting three factor analyses on ten questions, and the results show that eight are valid while the two invalid questions are Proactive Personality PP4 and Proactive Personality PP6. The reliability test shows its Cronbach's Alpha score of 0,782 which indicates a strong or favorable correlation. A Cronbach's Alpha score above 0,6 and close to 1 for the questions asked in the questionnaire indicates a high level of reliability. The participative leadership variable is examined through three factor analyses and of the nine questions, seven are valid and two invalid questions are Innovative Work Behaviour IWB1 and Innovative Work Behaviour IWB2. The reliability test shows its Cronbach's Alpha score of 0,885 which indicates a strong or favorable correlation. A Cronbach's Alpha score above 0,6 and close to 1 for the questions asked in the questionnaire indicates a high level of reliability. Therefore, after pre-test analyses were conducted, 26 out of 33 questions were valid (usable) to be included in the questionnaire whereas 6 were invalid (unusable).

The population in this study are private sector employees who graduated from the creative industry majors, such as visual communication design, graphic design, interior design, broadcasting, television and film, pure fine arts, product design, fashion design, photography, advertising, publishing, animation, multimedia, gaming technology, packaging technology, and graphic technology who have all been in the industry for a year and are working in the area around Jakarta. The number of samples based on the Partial Least Squares-Structural Equations Modeling (PLS-SEM) method is 100 – 200 respondents or as much as five times the number of questions in the questionnaire (Fan et al., 2016). There are 26 questions total in the questionnaire, which means the study requires 154 respondents in the form of private sector employees in the creative industry. The data is collected by using a questionnaire, whereas data analysis is done by using descriptive statistics, outer model, and inner model using the SEM-PLS software. The measurement model on the indicators and the latent variables consists of construct validity testing which includes convergent validity testing, discriminant validity, and Average Variance Extracted (AVE). This stage of research starts with determining the convergent validity which is a measurement of reflexive indicator validity where variables are measured by overviewing the outerloading value of each indicator variable of this research. Validity and reliability tests can be done with outer model planning or model measurement. Indicators may be considered valid, if said indicators have a factor loading value of  $> 0,6$  (original sample value) and have P-values (probability) of  $< 0,05$ . Outer model evaluation has the construct reliability value of  $> 0,7$ . Meanwhile, in exploratory research, a value between 0,6 to 0,7 can still be considered valid or acceptable (Hair, Hult, Ringle, & Sarstedt, 2017).

### III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

A The questionnaire is spread via social media accounts such as personal chats on Instagram, the alumni of creative media in state polytechnic group chat, and contacts with co-workers of the same alma mater, which are then filled by 154 respondents with a minimum of 1-year work experience in the creative industry (Attachment 5). Based on the data collected, women make up 60,5% of the respondents (93 women) and 39,5% percent of the respondents are men (61 men). The majority of respondents are around 23-27 years old, with a majority of 137 out of 154 respondents born in 1997-2001 (88,96%). The rest are older, with 7 respondents born in 1980-1985 (4,55%), 4 born in 1986-1990 (2,60%), and 6 born in 1991-1996 (3,90%). The majority of respondents have worked in their companies for 1 year, 75 (48,7%) out of 154 respondents. The rest have worked longer, 57 respondents (37%) have worked for 1-3 years, 5 respondents (3,3%) have worked for 4-6 years, and 17 respondents (11%) have worked for over 6 years. The respondents' profiles are based on their jobs in the creative industry, where 43 respondents (27,92%) work in Fashion Design and accounted for the majority of the respondents, 17 respondents (11,04%) work in Graphic Design, 6 respondents (3,90%) work in Interior Design, 10 respondents (6,49%) work in Television, 20 respondents (12,99%) work in Product Design, 17 respondents (11,04%) work in Advertising, 12 respondents (7,79%)

work in Architecture, 6 respondents (3,90%) work in Gaming Technology, 4 respondents (2,60%) work in Photography, 5 respondents (3,25%) work in Animation, 2 respondents (1,30%) work in Publishing, 8 respondents (5,19%) work in Visual Communication Design, and 4 respondents (2,60%) work in Music with various job positions.

The overall job positions of respondents include Festival Director, Social Media Officer, Designer, Wardrobe Officer, Manager, Supervisor, Fashion Designer, and Project Staff. The respondents' profiles based on their education and the department they graduated from, where 55 respondents (35,7%) graduated from the Fashion Design department and accounted for the majority of the respondents, 4 respondents (2,6%) graduated from the Photography department, 4 respondents (2,6%) from Advertising department, 3 respondents (1,9%) from Publishing department, 4 respondents (2,6%) from Animation department, 12 respondents (7,8%) from Gaming Technology department, 2 respondents (1,3%) from Multimedia department, and 11 respondents (7,1%) from Architecture department. Respondents who graduated from Politeknik Negeri Media Kreatif Jakarta (Polimedia) accounted for the majority of respondents at 51,30% (79 respondents), Esa Unggul University at 10,39% (16 respondents), Trisakti University at 7,79% (12 respondents), Gunadarma University at 6,49% (10 respondents), Universitas Negeri Jakarta at 5,84% (9 respondents), Institut Teknologi Bandung at 2,60% (4 respondents), Universitas Indonesia at 2,60% (4 respondents), and Universitas Telkom at 1,95% (3 respondents). The measurement model on the indicators and the latent variables consists of construct validity testing which includes convergent validity testing, discriminant validity, and Average Variance Extracted (AVE) (Attachment 7). This stage of research starts with determining the convergent validity which is a measurement of reflexive indicator validity wherein variables are measured by overviewing the outerloading value of each indicator variable of this research. Validity and reliability tests can be done with outer model planning or model measurement. Indicators may be considered valid, if said indicators have a factor loading value of  $> 0,6$  (original sample value) and have P-values (probability) of  $< 0,05$ .

This aligns with J. Hair et al., (2017)'s statement wherein outer model evaluation has the construct reliability value of  $> 0,7$ . Meanwhile, in exploratory research, a value between 0,6 to 0,7 can still be considered valid or acceptable. All questions pertaining to participative leadership have values over 0,7 which indicates that all 5 questions regarding participative leadership are valid. The questions for the innovative work behavior variable have values over 0,7 which indicates that all 7 questions regarding innovative work behavior are valid to measure the innovative work behavior variable. The question for the knowledge sharing variable number X21 "Every day, I initiated sharing my expertise in my work with my co-workers" shows a value under 0,7 (attached) meaning it is almost invalid but is in the number 0,668 close to 0,7 and if examined using Cronbach's Alpha which has the value of 0,875 shows a high value, hence why the question is kept. The question for the proactive personality variable number X34 "There is nothing more interesting than seeing my ideas coming to life" shows a value under 0,7 (attached) meaning it is almost invalid but is in the number 0,634 close to 0,7 and if examined using Cronbach's Alpha which has the value of 0,896 shows a high value, hence why the question is kept. The measurement of discriminant validity, wherein reflexive indicators can be seen in the cross loading between the indicators and their constructs. The measurement of discriminant validity is conducted by comparing the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) to every construct by connecting one construct with another in a model. Discriminant validity in a model is considered adequate if the AVE values on each construct are greater than the connection between the other constructs.

A valid AVE value is  $> 0,5$ ; and the discriminant validity value is  $> 0,6$  (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). AVE value is used to identify the homogeneity of all variables in a study judging from the average variance of each variable. In this study, the AVE value and discriminant validity of all variables are qualified and considered valid. The AVE value of the innovative work behavior variable is 0,664; the discriminant validity value is 0,815. The AVE value of the knowledge-sharing variable is 0,618; the discriminant validity value is 0,786. The AVE value of the participative leadership variable is 0,710; the discriminant validity value is 0,843. The AVE value of the proactive personality variable is 0,581; the discriminant validity value is 0,762. The analysis of the construct reliability test on research variables with the internal consistency method. The results from the reliability test are used to determine if the indicators of the variables in the

research are adequate constructs of a latent variable. Variables are considered reliable if Cronbach's Alpha and composite reliability constructs have a value of  $> 0,6$  (Leguina, 2015). The reliability test on the variables of this research is considered reliable as the data provided by Cronbach's Alpha and composite reliability have the value of  $> 0,7$ .

The innovative work behavior variable has Cronbach's Alpha value of 0,914 with a composite reliability value of 0,932. The knowledge-sharing variable has Cronbach's Alpha value of 0,875 with a composite reliability value of 0,906. The participative leadership variable has Cronbach's Alpha value of 0,897 with a composite reliability value of 0,924. The proactive personality variable has Cronbach's Alpha value of 0,896 with a composite reliability value of 0,917. The endogenous variable consists of two variables, which are innovative work behavior and knowledge sharing. The R-square value of the innovative work behavior is 0,672 meaning the variables participative leadership, proactive personality, and knowledge sharing affect the innovative work behavior variable by 67,2%. The knowledge sharing variable's value of 0,588 indicates that the variables participative leadership and proactive personality affect the knowledge sharing variable by 58,8%. The inner model measurement is conducted by examining path coefficients used to determine the relation between variables and if the hypothesis studied is heading in a positive or negative direction. The results of the path coefficients test reveal that the participative leadership variable has a t-statistics value of 4,901 and a p-value of 0,000 for the knowledge sharing variable. The participative leadership variable has a t-statistics value of 0,769 and a p-value of 0,442 for the innovative work behavior variable. The proactive personality variable has a t-statistics value of 8,196 and a p-value of 0,000 for the knowledge sharing variable. The proactive personality variable has a t-statistics value of 7,352 and a p-value of 0,000 for the innovative work behavior variable. The knowledge sharing variable has a t-statistics value of 3,777 and a p-value of 0,000 for the innovative work behavior variable.

**Table 1.** Hypothesis Results

Hypothesis	t-Statistics	p-Values
H1	4,901	0,000
H2	0,769	0,442
H3	8,196	0,000
H4	7,352	0,000
H5	3,777	0,000

Source: own elaboration in SmartPLS 3.

An organization's capability to foster a competitive edge in the creative industry may improve employees' skills [31] The results above suggest that the majority of the respondents are women between the ages of 23 – 27 years old born between the years 1997 – 2001. The majority of respondents have worked for their companies for 1 year in the creative industry, a good number of them working in the fashion industry specifically. This research has shown that participative leadership has positive effects on knowledge sharing. A leader who respects the opinions of their employees will encourage them to share knowledge with one another. Participative leadership motivates employees to participate in the process of decision-making that will lead the trajectory of their work life, which in turn makes employees feel supported and motivated to feel a sense of responsibility in their contribution, when employees are included in making decisions and solving problems they will inevitably share knowledge in solving various issues in the workplace. [20] stated that the effects of participative leadership include affective commitment and knowledge sharing. Participative leadership does not directly affect innovative work behavior. This indicates that leaders who encourage their employees to participate in the decision-making process that will affect their work life do not directly push for innovation in the creative industry. In this study alone, 48,7% of respondents have at least a year of work experience.

They believe that if they are not given the freedom to make decisions without direct orders from their bosses, new challenges, and the chance to think outside the box, they will not be motivated to be innovative in their work [32]. This contradicts previous studies on the matter, such as the study conducted by [10] which stated that participative leadership shows a positive correlation with innovative work behavior, as it is said to improve work performance through the results of innovative work behavior with strategic

changes and improving the company's durability. Participative leadership has a positive correlation with innovative work behavior [21] Proactive personality, however, greatly affects knowledge sharing. This indicates that employees who are able to finish their work no matter the circumstances will make their co-workers want to share their knowledge in the workplace. Proactive personality can better see endless possibilities, show initiative, and act on reparative actions [33] Knowledge sharing is a proactive action [22]. A person with a proactive personality will share knowledge and new ideas with others in order to gain new perspectives and be advised.

[23] Employees with highly proactive personalities will participate in knowledge sharing among their teams. Proactive personality has a positive impact on knowledge sharing[24]. Employees with influence in the organization and the work system will be available to share their knowledge as they feel a sense of responsibility to their organization and the effect of knowledge sharing is bolstered by the employees' heightened view of their organization, supported by the continuous feedback between the employees and the organization [25] A proactive personality has a positive impact on innovative work behavior. This indicates that an employee with a proactive personality who is able to finish their work regardless of the circumstances will change innovative ideas into solutions in their workplace in the creative industry. An employee with a proactive personality will have the initiative to keep finding better ways to do their work, will thrive in finding new opportunities and proactively search for ways to improve lives based on the information they obtained, and will explore their environment to enhance the potential to encourage innovation in the organization. Proactive personality is proven to have significant positive effects on innovative work behavior [9]. Proactive employees tend to work in an environment with little substantial freedom, independence, and individual discretion in making decisions at work (low job autonomy), where proactivity may increase the likeliness of conflict among employees[34]. The more a proactive person is being limited by rules and procedures, the more likely there is a possibility for new ideas to come about.

The key to innovative work behavior is a proactive personality [16] Knowledge sharing greatly impacts innovative work behavior. This indicates that when an employee shares the knowledge that they acquired, their co-workers will find a solution from said knowledge which can lead to a new innovative idea. Knowledge sharing can be used as a tool to aide co-workers and a collaboration tool to solve problems [35] Innovative work behavior prioritizes inter-organization communication, providing an opportunity for employees to take the initiative to conceptualize products and services for a company. Frequent knowledge sharing can improve innovative work behavior[7]. Knowledge sharing among a set of culturally diverse employees will force them to be more open-minded and motivate them to attempt new ideas in order to improve their innovative work behavior[13]. Innovative work behavior hinges on knowledge sharing, which consists of employees sharing their knowledge and skills [14] The knowledge-sharing variable indirectly affects the participative leadership and proactive personality variables in relation to the innovative work behavior variable. The more often knowledge sharing occurs in the creative industry where input from your peers is crucial, the more impact it has on the innovative work behavior variable. Indirect effect to figure out the exogenous variable with the most and least effect on the endogenous variable and/or knowing if the intervening variable has an effect as a mediating variable [36].

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, a company with adequate participative leadership by the leader will improve knowledge sharing among employees. However, participative leadership has no real effect on innovative work behavior among employees in the creative industry of Jakarta. Meanwhile, a proactive personality may increase knowledge sharing and increase innovative work behavior among employees who are in the creative industry of Jakarta. Knowledge sharing among co-workers may encourage innovative work behavior among employees. Thus, the results of this study may be used as a reference for the next study to analyze and identify other factors that may affect improvements in employees' innovative work behavior, as participative leadership in this study is found to not have any significant effect on employees' innovative work behavior, therefore, this study can be used as the model for newer and better explorative research. The aim of this research is to provide a better understanding of the effects of participative leadership and proactive

personality towards knowledge sharing and innovative work behavior in relation to the creative industry of Jakarta. The creative industry has the potential to be massively improved on a larger scale as it produces works that are tangible as well as services that are intangible.

The aforementioned industry includes the creation of things, production, the distribution of services with cultural and economic values attached to them, and market goals. The creative services industry offers services that may increase capacity and new ideas to bolster the production of tangible products and reach the goals set by organizations in the creative industry [37]. The implications set in the creative services industry is to foster partnerships in order to integrate employees' capabilities and ability to find new ideas for the company. A leader must actively participate in finding effective ways to maintain frequent knowledge sharing. In order to spur employees' initiative in sharing their knowledge and skills with their co-workers every day, collaboration projects can be done to foster knowledge sharing among employees. Moreover, weekly brainstorming sessions, monthly workshops, or a briefing every morning may increase communication between co-workers in the creative industry to solve problems by sharing information regarding work or general news. Organizing awards programs as a form of appreciation towards employees' innovative ideas may motivate the creative industry to create new ideas for the company and increase innovative work behavior. Workplaces in the creative industry can be used to observe improvements in their employees by providing training and evaluating the work ethics of each employee to achieve the goal of the organizations they are in.

Employees who can bravely introduce new creative concepts to the workplace in an organized manner and are given a chance to prove themselves will see an increase in the innovative work behavior of their workplace. Employees with participative leadership and a proactive personality may improve the knowledge sharing present in a creative industry company. Participative leadership can be done by encouraging team members to speak their minds and using feedback from employees to make impactful decisions to achieve company goals. Increasing employees' emotional attachment towards their company by paying attention to their comfort when working in the company, which may lead to them being able to voice their opinions and ideas is a form of attempt to engage in participative leadership. Employees with a proactive personality will do whatever it takes to finish their work and believe in their own capabilities, no matter the circumstances.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Tri Ratnawati and S. Darmanto, "The Effect of Organizational Capability, Market Orientation, and IT Adoption on Creative Industry Business Performance," *Pacific Asia Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, vol. 16, no. 1, pp. 103–118, 2024, doi: 10.17705/1pais.16106.
- [2] M. Klein, P. Gutowski, L. Gerlitz, and E. Gutowska, "Creative and culture industry in baltic sea region condition and future," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, vol. 13, no. 8, Apr. 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13084239.
- [3] M. A. West, "Sparkling Fountains or Stagnant Ponds: An Integrative Model of Creativity and Innovation Implementation in Work Groups," 2002.
- [4] H. T. Tri, V. T. Nga, and J. Sipko, "Predicting overall staffs' creativity and innovative work behavior in banking," *Management and Marketing*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 188–202, Jun. 2019, doi: 10.2478/mmcks-2019-0013.
- [5] M. K. Anser *et al.*, "How to unleash innovative work behavior of SMEs' workers through knowledge sharing? Accessing functional flexibility as a mediator," *European Journal of Innovation Management*, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 233–248, Jan. 2022, doi: 10.1108/EJIM-11-2019-0332.
- [6] P. Jain, "Spiritual leadership and innovative work behavior: the mediated relationship of interpersonal trust and knowledge sharing in the hospitality sector of India," *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 1–17, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.1108/LODJ-03-2022-0128.
- [7] Z. Xu and S. Suntrayuth, "Innovative work behavior in high-tech enterprises: Chain intermediary effect of psychological safety and knowledge sharing," *Front Psychol*, vol. 13, Oct. 2022, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1017121.
- [8] L. Razmerita, K. Kirchner, and P. Nielsen, "What factors influence knowledge sharing in organizations? A social dilemma perspective of social media communication," *Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol. 20, no. 6, pp. 1225–1246, 2016, doi: 10.1108/JKM-03-2016-0112.

- [9] W. Li, S. A. Gill, Y. Wang, M. A. Safdar, and M. R. Sheikh, "Proactive Personality and Innovative Work Behavior: Through the Juxtapose of Schumpeter's Theory of Innovation and Broaden-And-Build Theory," *Front Psychol*, vol. 13, Jun. 2022, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.927458.
- [10] G. Alarifi and N. A. Adam, "The Role of Participatory Leadership and Employee Innovative Behavior on SMEs' Endurance," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, vol. 15, no. 3, Feb. 2023, doi: 10.3390/su15032740.
- [11] W. Sung and C. Kim, "A study on the effect of change management on organizational innovation: Focusing on the mediating effect of members' innovative behavior," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 1–26, Feb. 2021, doi: 10.3390/su13042079.
- [12] T. Akram, S. Lei, M. J. Haider, and S. T. Hussain, "The impact of organizational justice on employee innovative work behavior: Mediating role of knowledge sharing," *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 117–129, Apr. 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.jik.2019.10.001.
- [13] S. Chen, M. Bian, T. K. Nguyen, and C.-H. Chang, "From curiosity to innovativeness: the mediating mechanisms of cultural intelligence and knowledge sharing behaviour," *European Journal of Innovation Management*, Aug. 2022, doi: 10.1108/EJIM-01-2022-0055.
- [14] M. Yasir, A. Majid, Z. Yousaf, A. A. Nassani, and M. Haffar, "An integrative framework of innovative work behavior for employees in SMEs linking knowledge sharing, functional flexibility and psychological empowerment," *European Journal of Innovation Management*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 289–308, Mar. 2023, doi: 10.1108/EJIM-02-2021-0091.
- [15] D. Rezky, F. Gumilang, and S. Sunaryo, "PROACTIVE PERSONALITY AND INNOVATIVE BEHAVIOR: ROLE OF TASK CONFLICT AND WORK AUTONOMY (STUDY ON STATE CIVIL PERSONNEL IN THE CITY GOVERNMENT OF SURABAYA)," *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, vol. 5, no. 07, p. 2021, [Online]. Available: www.ijebmr.com
- [16] I. Ullah, R. M. Hameed, and A. Mahmood, "The impact of proactive personality and psychological capital on innovative work behavior: evidence from software houses of Pakistan," *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 2023, doi: 10.1108/EJIM-01-2022-0022.
- [17] O. Janssen, "Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour," *J Occup Organ Psychol*, vol. 73, no. 3, pp. 287–302, 2000, doi: 10.1348/096317900167038.
- [18] Y. Y. Chang, C. Y. Chang, C. W. Chen, Y. C. K. Chen, and S. Y. Chang, "Firm-level participative leadership and individual-level employee ambidexterity: A multilevel moderated mediation analysis," *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 561–582, Jul. 2019, doi: 10.1108/LODJ-08-2018-0308.
- [19] Y. Y. Chang, I. Hodgkinson, P. Hughes, and C. Y. Chang, "The mediation between participative leadership and employee exploratory innovation: Examining intermediate knowledge mechanisms," *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 334–355, May 2019, doi: 10.1108/LODJ-07-2018-0245.
- [20] Hendryadi, Suratna, Suryani, and B. Purwanto, "Bureaucratic culture, empowering leadership, affective commitment, and knowledge sharing behavior in Indonesian government public services," *Cogent Business and Management*, vol. 6, no. 1, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1080/23311975.2019.1680099.
- [21] S. J. Sauer, "Taking the reins: The effects of new leader status and leadership style on team performance," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 96, no. 3, pp. 574–587, May 2011, doi: 10.1037/a0022741.
- [22] X. Zhang and J. Y. Jiang, "With whom shall I share my knowledge? A recipient perspective of knowledge sharing," *Journal of Knowledge Management*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 277–295, Apr. 2015.
- [23] X. Zhong, Q. Peng, and T. Wang, "Leader reward omission and employee knowledge sharing: the moderating role of proactive personality and perceived organizational unfairness," *Baltic Journal of Management*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 546–562, Jun. 2022, doi: 10.1108/BJM-02-2022-0045.
- [24] A. H. Y. Hon, C. P. Y. Fung, and D. L. Senbeto, "Willingness to share or not to share? Understanding the motivation mechanism of knowledge sharing for hospitality workforce," *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 77–96, 2022, doi: 10.1080/19368623.2021.1935384.
- [25] J. Seo, "Why Does the Impact of Psychological Empowerment Increase Employees' Knowledge-Sharing Intention? A Moderated Mediation Model of Belonging and Perceived Organizational Support," *Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 13, no. 5, May 2023, doi: 10.3390/bs13050387.
- [26] W. Jiang and Q. Gu, "A moderated mediation examination of proactive personality on employee creativity: A person-environment fit perspective," *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 393–410, May 2015, doi: 10.1108/JOCM-05-2014-0088.
- [27] M. A. Zuberi and A. Khattak, "Impact of proactive personality and leader member exchange on innovative work behavior: a job design perspective," *International Journal of Innovation Science*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 664–683, Nov. 2021, doi: 10.1108/IJIS-11-2020-0251.

- [28] J. Arnold and F. Drasgow, "The empowering leadership questionnaire: The construction and validation of a new scale for measuring leader behaviors Bifactor predictive models and their applications View project," *Article in Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 2000, doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(200005)21:33.0.CO;2.
- [29] L. Lu, K. Leung, and P. T. Koch, "Managerial Knowledge Sharing: The Role of Individual, Interpersonal, and Organizational Factors," 2006.
- [30] S. E. Seibert, J. M. Grant, and M. L. Kraimer, "Proactive personality and career success," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 84, no. 3, pp. 416–426, Jun. 1999, doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.84.3.416.
- [31] T. S. Bateman and J. M. Crant, "The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates," 1993.
- [32] M. N. Nabi and M. M. Akter, "Participative leadership effects on followers' radical creativity: role of creative process engagement and supervisor support for creativity," *Evidence-based HRM*, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 801–819, Nov. 2023, doi: 10.1108/EBHRM-11-2021-0239.
- [33] J. M. Grant, "The Proactive Personality Scale and Objective Job Performance Among Real Estate Agents," 1995.
- [34] D. Rezky, F. Gumilang, and S. Sunaryo, "PROACTIVE PERSONALITY AND INNOVATIVE BEHAVIOR: ROLE OF TASK CONFLICT AND WORK AUTONOMY (STUDY ON STATE CIVIL PERSONNEL IN THE CITY GOVERNMENT OF SURAKARTA)," *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Research*, vol. 5, no. 07, pp. 332–350, 2021, [Online]. Available: [www.ijebmr.com](http://www.ijebmr.com)
- [35] J. N. Cummings, "Work Groups, Structural Diversity, and Knowledge Sharing in a Global Organization," 2004, *INFORMS Inst.for Operations Res.and the Management Sciences*. doi: 10.1287/mnsc.1030.0134.
- [36] M. Darwin and K. Umam, "Analisis Indirect Effect pada Structural Equation Modeling," *NUCLEUS*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 50–57, Nov. 2020, doi: 10.37010/nuc.v1i2.160.
- [37] E. L. Ghazi and M. Goede, "Creative industries: a case study of Isfahan, Iran," *Int J Soc Econ*, vol. 46, no. 2, pp. 271–287, Jan. 2019, doi: 10.1108/IJSE-09-2017-0409.