

THE EFFECT OF PROACTIVE PERSONALITY ON WORK PRODUCTIVITY

Susan Novrini¹, Syaifuddin², Fajar Rezeki Ananda Lubis³

¹²³PUI Human Resources Management and Innovation Center, Universitas Prima
Indonesia

syaifuddin@unprimdn.ac.id

Received:10-06-2026

Revised: 25-06-2026

Approved: 06-07-2026

ABSTRACT

The productivity or decline in the quality of a company is often caused by various internal and external sectors of the institution itself. The decline in the quality of a company is inseparable from the role of leaders and employees who work in it. This is because the role of employees is very important in a company. This study examines the effect of proactive personality on work productivity at PT Perkebunan Nusantara III. The sample size was 292 respondents, selected using purposive sampling. Data analysis used Structural Equation Modeling - Partial Least Square (SEM PLS). The results showed that proactive personality directly affects work productivity with a T statistic of 4.618, greater than 1.96, with a p value of 0.000, less than 0.05. The magnitude of the influence of proactive personality on work productivity is 0.234, or 23.4%. Therefore, several practical implications are needed for company management, including the need to foster employee involvement and encourage employee initiative and proactivity.

Keywords: Proactive Personality, Work Productivity, employee roles, Plantation company

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the plantation sector has faced increasingly complex challenges. Climate change, commodity price uncertainty, the need for cost efficiency, the development of digital technology, and market demands for more modern governance are pushing plantation companies to rely not only on physical assets and land but also on the quality of their human resources. In this context, employees are no longer required to simply perform routine tasks but are also expected to be more adaptive, responsive to change, take initiative, and actively seek solutions to operational problems. These conditions make individual behavioral aspects, particularly proactive personality, relevant to study as a factor that can influence work productivity.

The Human Resources (HR) of PT Perkebunan Nusantara III (Persero) have worked hard and successfully to achieve the results mentioned above. Human resources play a crucial role in achieving business goals. However, employees often fail to utilize their full potential to achieve company goals. Companies should also encourage employees to be proactive. Proactivity means identifying opportunities (Horng et al., 2016). They can also find opportunities (Horng et al., 2016). Proactive employees are those who do not feel limited by

the constraints of their work environment and strive to create an ideal work environment (Wang *et al.*, 2017; Emur *et al.*, 2023)

A proactive personality describes an individual's tendency to take initiative, identify opportunities, create positive change, and actively act to improve work conditions rather than simply waiting for instructions or passively adapting to the environment. Employees with a proactive personality are generally quicker to respond to problems, more willing to propose improvements, more actively seek more efficient ways of working, and are better able to adapt to changes in work systems. In organizations undergoing transformation, this characteristic becomes crucial because productivity is determined not only by technical ability but also by employees' willingness to take initiative, adapt, and contribute beyond their formal duties.

Research on work productivity in the plantation sector generally still emphasizes organizational and managerial factors, such as work motivation, work environment, work discipline, training, career development, and leadership style. In the context of PT Perkebunan Nusantara III (PTPN III), several previous studies have shown that employee work productivity is influenced by variables such as work motivation and work environment, with work discipline as an intervening variable, training and career development, and leadership and motivational style. These findings confirm that work productivity in the plantation environment has indeed been widely studied, but the focus of these studies is still predominantly on external organizational factors and has not yet placed much emphasis on individual personality characteristics as the main determinant of work productivity.

Proactive employees significantly impact environmental companies worldwide. Proactive employees tend to be creative and identify opportunities that can benefit the company and their performance. Yang *et al.* (2019) found that a person's proactive nature can influence employee performance because employees with this trait tend to strive to find the best way to complete their tasks. Furthermore, this initiative behavior can have a positive impact on employees because companies assess employee behavior as a measure of their performance. Furthermore, this finding is supported by research conducted by Chen *et al.* (2018), which found that a proactive personality positively impacts employee performance. Based on the description above, the researcher will test the influence of proactive personality on the work productivity of Nusantara III Plantation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Proactive Personality

A person with a proactive personality tends to seize opportunities, dares to take action in the decision-making process, and is active in carrying out assigned tasks (Suryani, 2020; Zahra & Kee, 2022). A proactive personality means anticipating problems, meeting needs, and taking advantage of future opportunities. Proactive behavior occurs when someone is active in their work, especially when they adapt to their environment. Proactive people are usually opportunistic, take initiative, persevere, and dare to take action. Bateman & Crant (1993) said that a proactive personality is when someone has the ability to

influence environmental changes by finding opportunities, showing desire, and persisting until beneficial changes occur.

According to Kristijanto (2019), a proactive personality is a person's belief that they have the ability to solve problems by using situational strengths when they encounter opportunities. Lukito (2020) defines a proactive personality as someone who strives to positively change the environment by facing challenges, improving circumstances, or trying new things. Based on the understanding above, it can be concluded that a proactive personality is when someone takes the initiative to contribute to changes in their environment, which can affect themselves and their environment through identifying opportunities

Work Productivity

According to Natsir (2019), the product produced by an individual or group during a specific time period in a work process is called work productivity. In this case, a product produced in a shorter time can be associated with a higher level of productivity, and vice versa. Unlike behavioral productivity, productivity is a mental attitude that continues to develop. Technically, productivity refers to how effectively and efficiently various resources are used. According to Wahyuningsih (2018), productivity is a measure of how productively a process produces output. It can also be defined as the ratio between input and output.

The level of efficiency in producing goods and services is also called productivity. Pajaitan (2018) states that the extent to which a process produces output using certain inputs is closely related to productivity. Productivity is defined as the ratio between input and output, focusing on the output produced by a process; typically, a combination can be used to produce a given level of output. According to Yulianisa et al. (2018), productivity is the ability to optimize available facilities and infrastructure by producing the best possible output.

RESEARCH METHOD

The type of research used in this study is associative research. According to Sugiyono (2019), associative research aims to determine the influence or relationship between two or more variables. The type of research used by the researcher in this study is quantitative research. The population in this study is the community, students, and alumni of PT Perkebunan Nusantara III employees. This study used a probability sampling method with simple random sampling. This sampling technique provides every member of the population with an equal opportunity to be selected as a research respondent. In this study, there are 57 indicators, so the number of research samples is 285-570 people. The data in this study consists of secondary data and primary data. Data collection in this study used a questionnaire given to selected respondents. All statement items in the questionnaire were measured using a 5-point Likert scale from lowest to highest. The sampling method at each university is based on a random method. The research analysis used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) PLS. The research hypothesis is that there is a significant influence of proactive personality on work productivity.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Variable Indicators

Proactive Personality

The results of the tabulation of respondents' answers to the proactive personality variable can be described as follows:

Table 1. Description of Proactive Personality Variable Indicators

No	Statement	Number and Percentage of Respondents' Answers					
		Don't agree		Neutral/Sufficient		Agree	
		Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
1	I always try to give my best in every task	23	7,88	28	9,59	241	82,53
2	If I believe in an idea, nothing will stop me from making it happen.	11	3,77	37	12,67	244	83,56
3	I am persistent and serious in implementing changes for a much better organization.	8	2,74	18	6,16	266	91,10
4	I will fight for my ideas to be implemented, even against others.	16	5,48	18	6,16	258	88,36
5	I am able to solve problems in new ways without destroying existing ones.	18	6,16	7	2,40	267	91,44
6	I am able to do various jobs outside of my main duties.	15	5,14	24	8,22	253	86,64
7	Everything I do, I always think will be useful in the future.	6	2,05	44	15,07	242	82,88
8	I am able to make changes in my work environment.	4	1,37	16	5,48	272	93,15
9	I am able to overcome obstacles in my work environment.	24	8,22	38	13,01	230	78,77
10	I can find new ways to solve problems.	21	7,19	14	4,79	257	88,01

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2025

The first statement states that I always strive to give my best in every task. 241 respondents, or 82.53%, agreed. 28 respondents, or 9.59%, were neutral/fair. 23 respondents, or 7.88%, disagreed. The second statement states that if I believe in an idea, nothing will prevent me from realizing it. 244 respondents, or 83.56%, agreed. 37 respondents, or 12.67%, were neutral/fair. 11 respondents, or 3.77%, disagreed.

Based on the respondents' responses to the third statement, which states that I am persistent and serious about implementing changes for a much better organization, 266 respondents, or 91.10%, agreed. 18 respondents, or 6.16%, were neutral/fair. 8 respondents, or 2.74%, disagreed. The fourth statement, which states that I will fight for my ideas, even against others, agreed. 258 respondents, or 88.36%, agreed. 18 respondents, or 6.16%, were neutral/fair. 16 respondents, or 5.48%, disagreed.

The fifth statement, which states that I am able to solve problems in new ways without disrupting existing ones, agreed. 267 respondents, or 91.44%, agreed. 7 respondents, or 2.40%, were neutral/fair. 18 respondents, or 6.16%, disagreed. Regarding the sixth statement, which states that I am capable of

performing various tasks outside of my primary duties, 253 respondents, or 86.64%, agreed. 24 respondents, or 8.22%, were neutral/sufficient. 15 respondents, or 5.14%, disagreed.

The seventh statement states that everything I do, I always think will be useful in the future. 242 respondents, or 82.88, agreed. 44 respondents, or 15.07, were neutral/fair. 6 respondents, or 2.05, disagreed. The eighth statement states that I am capable of making changes in the work environment. 272 respondents, or 93.15, agreed. 16 respondents, or 5.48, were neutral/fair. 4 respondents, or 1.37, disagreed.

Based on the results of respondents' answers to the ninth statement, which states that I am capable of overcoming obstacles in the work environment, 230 respondents, or 78.77, agreed. 38 respondents, or 13.01, were neutral/fair. 24 respondents, or 8.22, disagreed. Finally, based on the results of respondents' answers to the tenth statement, which stated that I can find something or solve a problem in a new way, 257 respondents, or 88.01%, agreed. 14 respondents, or 4.79%, stated that they were neutral/fair. 21 respondents, or 7.19%, disagreed. Overall, it appears that the majority of respondents agreed with all of the statements in assessing proactive personality.

Work Productivity (Y)

The results of the tabulation of respondents' answers to the work productivity variable can be described as follows:

Table 3. Description of Work Productivity Variable Indicators

No	Statement	Number and Percentage of Respondents' Answers					
		Don't agree		Neutral/Sufficient		Agree	
		Σ	%	Σ	%	Σ	%
1	The work I do can be completed according to established work standards.	11	3,77	16	5,48	265	90,75
2	I consistently improve the quality of my work.	18	6,16	30	10,27	244	83,56
3	I work optimally to achieve activity goals and objectives.	10	3,42	13	4,45	269	92,12
4	The quantity of work I do meets the requirements.	3	1,03	37	12,67	252	86,30
5	I can complete my work within the allotted timeframe.	21	7,19	7	2,40	264	90,41
6	I am never late to the office.	19	6,51	29	9,93	244	83,56
7	I am able to effectively utilize available technology to complete my work.	19	6,51	33	11,30	240	82,19
8	I can effectively utilize available information to complete work.	14	4,79	34	11,64	244	83,56
9	I can work well even without supervision from a superior.	17	5,82	31	10,62	244	83,56
10	I never disappoint my superiors when given responsibility.	18	6,16	27	9,25	247	84,59

11	I can foster good cooperation with my coworkers.	18	6,16	29	9,93	245	83,90
12	I am willing to assist team members in completing work.	15	5,14	31	10,62	246	84,25
13	I can foster harmonious relationships with my superiors.	18	6,16	37	12,67	237	81,16
14	My work is completed according to established work standards.	20	6,85	33	11,30	239	81,85

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2025

The first statement states that the work I do can be completed according to the specified work standards. 265 respondents, or 90.75%, agreed. 16 respondents, or 5.48%, were neutral/sufficient. 11 respondents, or 3.77%, disagreed. The second statement states that I consistently improve the quality of my work. 244 respondents, or 83.56%, agreed. 30 respondents, or 10.27%, were neutral/sufficient. 18 respondents, or 6.16%, disagreed.

Based on the respondents' responses to the third statement, which states that I work optimally to achieve the goals and objectives of the activity, 269 respondents, or 92.12, agreed. 13 respondents, or 4.45, stated that I was neutral/sufficient. 10 respondents, or 3.42, disagreed. The fourth statement, which states that the quantity of work I do is in accordance with the specified requirements, was agreed with by 252 respondents, or 86.30. 37 respondents, or 12.67, stated that I was neutral/sufficient. 3 respondents, or 1.03, disagreed.

The fifth statement, which states that I can carry out my work within the specified timeframe, was agreed with by 264 respondents, or 90.41. Seven respondents, or 2.40, stated that I was neutral/sufficient. 21 respondents, or 7.19, disagreed. Regarding the sixth statement, which states that I am never late to the office, 244 respondents, or 83.56, agreed. 29 respondents, or 9.93, were neutral/fair. 19 respondents, or 6.51, disagreed.

The seventh statement, which states that I am able to use existing technology effectively to complete my work, 240 respondents, or 82.19, agreed. 33 respondents, or 11.30, neutral/fair. 19 respondents, or 6.51, disagreed. The eighth statement, which states that I am able to use existing information effectively to complete my work, 244 respondents, or 83.56, agreed. 34 respondents, or 11.64, neutral/fair. 14 respondents, or 4.79, disagreed.

Based on the results of respondents' responses regarding the ninth statement, which states that I can work well even without supervision from a superior, 244 respondents, or 83.56, agreed. 31 respondents, or 10.62, were neutral/fair. 17 respondents, or 5.82, disagreed. Regarding the tenth statement, which states that I never disappoint my superiors when given responsibility, 247 respondents, or 84.59, agreed. 27 respondents, or 9.25, neutral/fair. 18 respondents, or 6.16, disagreed.

The eleventh statement, which states that I can foster good cooperation with my coworkers, 245 respondents, or 83.90, agreed. 29 respondents, or 9.93, were neutral/fair. 18 respondents, or 6.16%, disagreed. Regarding the twelfth statement, 246 respondents, or 84.25%, agreed. 31 respondents, or 10.62%, were neutral/sufficient. 15 respondents, or 5.14%, disagreed.

Based on the results of respondents' answers related to the thirteenth statement stating that I can build a harmonious relationship with my superiors, 237 respondents stated that they agreed, or 81.16%. Respondents who stated that they were neutral/sufficient were 37 people, or 12.67%. Respondents who stated that they disagreed were 18 people, or 6.16%. Finally, based on the results of respondents' answers related to the fourteenth statement stating that the work I do can be completed according to the specified work standards, 239 respondents stated that they agreed, or 81.85%. Respondents who stated that they were neutral/sufficient were 33 people, or 11.30%. Respondents who stated that they disagreed were 20 people, or 6.85%. In general, it can be seen that the respondents' answers were dominated by agreeing with all of the statements in assessing work productivity.

SEM-PLS Testing

In SEM-PLS, testing will be carried out in 2 (two) ways, namely outer model testing and inner model testing.

Outer Model Testing

a. Convergent Validity Testing

A loading factor value greater than 0.7 indicates a good factor value for an instrument measuring its construct variable. The second convergent validity test is performed by examining the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) value for the construct variable. An AVE value greater than 0.5 indicates a good AVE value for the construct variable. The results of this convergent validity test are explained as follows:

Table 4. Results of Convergent Validity Testing of the Loading Factor and AVE Approaches

Instrument Variabel			Convergent Validity Test Results	
Variables	Questionnaire Statement	Code	Loading Factor	Average Variance Extracted
Proactive Personality (X)	If I believe in an idea, nothing will stop me from making it happen.	X32	0,776	0,606
	I am persistent and serious in implementing changes for a much better organization.	X33	0,793	
	I will fight for my ideas, even against others.	X34	0,714	
	I am able to solve problems in new ways without disrupting existing ones.	X35	0,796	
	I am able to do various tasks outside of my main duties.	X36	0,836	
	Everything I do, I always think will be useful in the future.	X37	0,764	

	I am able to make changes in the work environment.	X38	0,759	
	I am able to overcome obstacles in the work environment.	X39	0,821	
	I can find something or solve a problem in a new way.	X310	0,742	
Work Productivity (Y)	The work I do can be completed according to established work standards.	Y1	0,728	0,631
	I consistently improve the quality of my work.	Y2	0,834	
	I work optimally to achieve activity goals and objectives.	Y3	0,770	
	The quantity of work I did was as specified.	Y4	0,818	
	I was able to complete my work within the specified timeframe.	Y5	0,817	

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2025

Table 4 clearly shows that the factor loading value for each instrument on the construct variable is greater than 0.7. Therefore, it can be concluded that the convergent validity test using the loading factor approach has been met. In other words, the construct variable instruments in this study are valid. The Average Variance Extracted value for all construct variables in this study is greater than 0.5 (AVE > 0.5). Therefore, it can be concluded that all construct variable instruments used in this study meet the criteria for convergent validity testing.

b. Reliability Testing of Research Instruments

The Cronbach Alpha test measures the lower limit of a construct's reliability, while the Composite Reliability test measures its actual value. A Cronbach Alpha and Composite Reliability test with a rule of thumb value greater than 0.7 is considered acceptable, indicating that the instrument consistently measures the construct. The results of the Cronbach Alpha and Composite Reliability tests are presented in the following table:

Table 5. Cronbach Alpha and Composite Reliability Test

Construct Variables	Reliability Testing		Conclusion
	Cronbach Alpha	Composite Reliability	
Proactive Personality	0,918	0,933	Reliable
Work Productivity	0,853	0,895	Reliable

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2025

Table 5 shows Cronbach's Alpha and Composite Reliability values that are greater than the rule-of-thumb values, thus concluding that each construct variable in this study has good reliability.

Inner Model Testing

Testing the Coefficient of Determination

Structural model evaluation is performed by analyzing the coefficient of determination (R^2). The R^2 value is determined by the construct of the endogenous variable or the variable being influenced. According to Chin (1998), R^2 values are categorized into three categories: 0.67 (strong), 0.33 (moderate), and 0.19 (weak). The R^2 values can be seen in Table 6.

Table 6. Results of the Determination Coefficient Test

Variable Laten	<i>R-Square</i> (R^2)	<i>R-Square Adjusted</i>
Work Productivity (Y)	0,895	0,893

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2025

The R^2 value is in the strong category. The R^2 value indicates that proactive personality explains 89.5% of the variation in work productivity, with the remainder explained by other independent variables not included in this research model.

Goodness of Model Testing

The results of the model fit test can be seen in the following table:

Table 7. Model Fit Results Based on Standardized Root Mean Square (SRMR)

Measurement Instruments			Measurement Criteria (SRMR<0,08)		Conclusion
			Count	Standard	
Standarized Square	Root	Mean	0,067	0,080	Fit Model

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2025

Table 7 shows the results of the model fit test, where the SRMR value is less than 0.08. This indicates that this research model meets the model fit test assumptions. Therefore, this study can analyze the results further.

Hypothesis Testing Analysis

Testing the Direct and Indirect Influence Hypothesis can be seen in the following table 8:

Table 8. Results of Direct Effect Hypothesis Testing

Direct Influence of Construct Variables	Big Influence (O)	T Statistik	P Values	Conclusion
Proactive Personality → Work Productivity	0,234	4,618	0,000	Ha accepted

Source: Processed Primary Data, 2025

The test results revealed a significant direct effect of proactive personality on work productivity. This conclusion was reached by examining the T-statistic of 4.618, greater than 1.96, with a p-value of 0.000, less than 0.05. The magnitude of the effect of proactive personality on work productivity was 0.234, or 23.4%. In other words, the higher the employee's proactive personality, the higher their work productivity. In general, the results of this study align with various previous studies that place proactive personality as an important antecedent for positive work behavior and outcomes. Research by Anugrahito and Muafi (2020)

found that proactive personality positively influences employee performance, both directly and through work engagement as a mediating variable. These findings suggest that proactive individuals tend to have higher work engagement, ultimately resulting in better work performance (Jannah et al., 2023). Although the dependent variable in this study was employee performance, not work productivity, the direction of the relationship still supports this study's findings, namely that proactive character is a psychological asset that drives higher work outcomes.

DISCUSSION

The research results show that a proactive personality has a positive and significant effect on work productivity. In other words, people who are proactive those who tend to take initiative, anticipate problems, and make positive changes in their workplace will be more productive. According to Bandura (1986), people who have high self-confidence and tend to act independently tend to be more productive in achieving work productivity. A crucial personal resource for improving performance is a proactive personality. Proactive individuals tend not to face work challenges passively; instead, they actively seek out problems and adapt constructively, ultimately resulting in better outcomes.

The findings of this study are also supported by a study by Jannah et al. (2023), which showed that a proactive personality positively influences job performance, both directly and indirectly through psychological capital. The study confirmed that proactive employees tend to be more optimistic, resilient, confident, and have better psychological capacity to complete tasks, thus impacting improved work performance. These results are relevant to the current research because work productivity is essentially a manifestation of effective and efficient work results. This means that when a proactive personality drives work performance, it theoretically also has the potential to increase work productivity, especially in jobs that require initiative and quick responses, such as in the plantation sector.

Crant (1995) conducted research showing that proactive personality is positively correlated with various performance indicators. This is because proactive people tend to be more enthusiastic and responsible in completing the tasks assigned to them. Thomas et al. (2010) stated that proactive personality can show work results in various organizational contexts. According to Jiang et al. (2014), a proactive attitude not only improves direct performance but also creates a better relationship between job demands and successful task completion. The results of this study indicate that a proactive personality is crucial in the dynamic and complex modern work environment. Therefore, not only can systems and processes be used to increase work productivity, but also the quality of individual employees can be improved.

This finding is important for a more critical reading of the current research. The influence of proactive personality on work productivity may not always be direct, but may operate through specific behavioral mechanisms, such as how employees structure their work, build job resources, expand challenges, or adapt work methods to be more efficient (Heryanto & Tambun, 2026; Liang, 2026). In other words, the results of this study do indicate a direct influence of proactive

personality on work productivity, but previous studies suggest that the relationship could potentially become more complex if mediating variables such as job crafting, work engagement, or psychological capital are included.

Rahmadin et al. (2025) research at PTPN IV Regional III Kebun Air Molek-I showed that work motivation and work environment had a positive and significant effect on work productivity, both directly and through work discipline as an intervening variable. Meanwhile, Nurwidyanti and Yudha's (2024) research found that motivation, discipline, and work environment had a significant effect on employee performance at PTPN IV Regional III Kebun Sei Galuh. Another study at PTPN IV Regional 1 also showed that work discipline, work environment, and work stress had an effect on employee performance. These overall findings indicate that productivity and performance studies at PTPN IV have focused more on organizational and situational factors, such as motivation, discipline, work environment, and work stress (Urbini et al., 2024).

Thus, when compared critically with previous studies, the results of this study demonstrate three main points. First, this study confirms previous findings that proactive personality is positively related to work outcomes, as seen in studies on performance and job performance (Sembiring et al., 2025; Yu et al., 2022). Second, this study expands the literature by positioning work productivity rather than just performance as the primary outcome of proactive personality. Third, this study complements studies at PTPN III, which have predominantly focused on organizational factors, by presenting evidence that individual factors, such as proactive personality, are also important determinants of work productivity. Therefore, this study's contribution lies not only in examining the relationships between variables, but also in confirming that managing work productivity in the plantation sector requires considering the interaction between individual characteristics and the organizational context simultaneously.

CONCLUSION

Based on the research results, it was concluded that proactive personality has a positive and significant influence on work productivity. This shows that the higher the proactive personality of employees, the higher their work productivity. Employees who have a proactive personality will have a clear spirit and vision so that the company can progress further and in accordance with what is the main goal. This is because by having a proactive personality, employees will be more productive in carrying out their roles. However, this study is limited to only two variables, therefore further research is needed to test whether there are other variables that have a greater influence on improving quality at PT Perkebunan Nusantara III. This study focuses only on one independent variable, namely proactive personality, in explaining work productivity. However, employee productivity in plantation companies is likely also influenced by various other factors, both individual and organizational, such as work motivation, work discipline, work environment, leadership, training, compensation, workload, and organizational culture. Therefore, this research model is not fully able to explain all the factors that influence employee work productivity.

REFERENCES

- Anugrahito, D., & Muafi. (2020). Pengaruh proactive personality, core self-evaluation terhadap kinerja karyawan dimediasi work engagement. *JBTI: Jurnal Bisnis: Teori dan Implementasi*, 11(3).
<https://doi.org/10.18196/jbti.v11i3.10331>
- Bateman, T. S. & Crant, J. M., 1993. The Proactive Component of Organizational Behavior: A Measure and Correlation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Volume 14, pp. 103-118
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Chen, Y., Ning, R., Yang, T., Feng, S., & Yang, C. (2018). Is Transformatioal Leadership Always Good for Employee Task Performance? Examining Curvilinear and Moderated Relationships. *School of Economics and Management, Yanshan University*, 28.
- Crant, J. M. (1995). The proactive personality scale and objective job performance among real estate agents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(4), 532-537.
- Emur, A. P., Mufidawati, H., Andryadi, M. F., Pusparini, E. S., & Rachmawati, R. (2023). The Role of Psychological Capital on the Effect of High-Performance Work System and Proactive Personality on Job Performance. *Jurnal Manajemen Teori Dan Terapan*, 16(3).
- Horng, J. S., Tsai, C. Y., Yang, T. C., Liu, C. H., & Hu, D. C. (2016). Exploring the relationship between proactive personality, work environment and employee creativity among tourism and hospitality employees. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 54, 25-34.
- Heryanto, H., & Tambun, S. (2026). The effect of person-job fit, leadership traits, and proactive personality on work productivity with growth mindset as a moderation in manufacturing companies in Tangerang City. *Primanomics: Jurnal Ekonomi & Bisnis*, 24(2), 224-237.
<https://doi.org/10.31253/pe.v24i2.4630>
- Jiang, K., Lepak, D. P., Hu, J., & Baer, J. C. (2014). How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(6), 1264-1294.
- Jannah, N., dkk. (2023). The role of psychological capital on the effect of high-performance work system and proactive personality on job performance. *Jurnal Manajemen Teori dan Terapan*, 16(3).
<https://doi.org/10.20473/jmtt.v16i3.46808>.
- Kristijanto, F. A. (2019). Pengaruh Lingkungan Keluarga, Efikasi Diri, dan Motivasi Terhadap Niat Berwirausaha pada Mahasiswa Universitas Kristen Petra Surabaya. *Agora*, 7(2), 287206.
- Lukito, C. D. R. (2020). Proactive personality determination towards career success through leader member exchange. *Journal of Management Science*, 8, 265-275.
- Liang, R. (2026). Meta-analysis of proactive personality on employees' subjective career success: The mediating role of job performance and employee proactive behavior. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 17.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2026.1806615>

- Nurwidyanti, F., & Yudha, F. (2024). The influence of motivation, discipline and work environment on the performance of Afdeling 1 PTPN IV Regional III Kebun Sei Galuh employees. *PPIMAN Pusat Publikasi Ilmu Manajemen*, 2(3), 241–252. <https://doi.org/10.59603/ppiman.v2i3.491>
- Natsir, U. D. (2019). The Effect of Compensation on Employee Work Productivity at CV Mote Water Filterindo in Makassar City. *Economix*, 6(2).
- Rahmadin, K., Nurlasera, & Wulandari, H. (2025). Pengaruh motivasi kerja dan lingkungan kerja terhadap produktivitas kerja karyawan dengan disiplin kerja sebagai variabel intervening pada PT. Perkebunan Nusantara IV Regional III Kebun Air Molek-I. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Ilmu Sosial (JEIS)*, 4(1), 148–158.
- Sugiyono. 2019. *Management Research Methods*. Bandung, ID: Alfabeta.
- Suryani, I. (2020). The Influence of Proactive Personality on Performance Mediated by Work Engagement in Teachers at SMA 10 Fajar Harapan Banda Aceh. 5(1), 152–166.
- Sembiring, N. H. B., Balqis, V. M., Stevano, V., Ginting, K. E. N., & Yunita, M. (2025). Pengaruh disiplin kerja, lingkungan kerja, dan stress kerja terhadap kinerja karyawan pada PTPN IV Regional 1. *Journal of Economic, Business and Accounting (COSTING)*.
- Thomas, G. F., Zolin, R., & Hartman, J. L. (2010). The central role of communication in developing trust and organizational justice. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 30(2), 185–205.
- Urbini, F., Caracuzzo, E., Bakker, A. B., & Callea, A. (2024). Does proactive personality foster playful work design? A survey study on implications for flow and task performance. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 33(8), 2881–2898. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-05-2024-4539>
- Wahyuningsih, S. (2018). The Influence of the Work Environment on Work Productivity. *Warta Dharmawangsa*, (57).
- Wang, Z., Jing, Z., Candice, L. T., Jia, Y., & Christiane, S. (2017). Explaining benefits of employee proactive personality: The role of engagement, team proactivity composition and perceived organizational support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 101(1), 90–103.
- Yang, L., Zhou, Efficacy and acceptability of psychological interventions for social anxiety disorder in children and adolescents: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 28(1), 79–89.
- Yu, H., Yan, C., Dong, Z., Hou, Y., & Guan, X. (2022). Influence of proactive personality and career calling on employees' job performance: A moderated mediation model based on job crafting. *South African Journal of Business Management*, 53(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajbm.v53i1.2533>
- Zahra, M., & Kee, D. M. H. (2022). Influence of proactive personality on job performance of bank employees in Pakistan: Work engagement as a mediator. *International Journal of Management Studies*, 29(1), 51–74. <https://doi.org/10.32890/ijms2022.29.1.3>