EcoProfit
EcoProfit: Sustainable and Environment Business
EcoProfit 2(1): 11-23
ISSN 3024-9872

Relationship between learning agility and innovative work behavior among undergraduate student of University of Indonesia

Yolla Chintya Pitaloka[1], Arum Etikariena[1]*
[1] *Department of Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, University of Indonesia, Jl. Margonda Raya, Depok 16424, Indonesia.*
*Correspondence: arum.etikariena@ui.ac.id

Received Date: May 24, 2024 Revised Date: July 30, 2024 Accepted Date: July 31, 2024

ABSTRACT
Background: Previous research has shown that university graduates in Indonesia face significant skill gap and behind from any country, spesifically among ASEAN countries, in term of innovation ability. Innovative ability can be developed for university students with the right variables. Thus, it might help student to focus on their self-development. **Method:** Quantitative and correlational research conducted to know how learning agility might related to innovative work behavior. Innovative Work Behavioral Scale developed by Janssen (2000) and Learning Agility Assessment Scale, developed and published by Gravett and Caldwell (2016), were used in study. Both scales were adapted and translated so they would fit with the undergraduates' context. **Findings:** In result, 539 of minimum Second year/3rd semester University Indonesia students were chosen. The statistics analysis technique used for hypothesis testing was Pearson's Correlation. The result showed that learning agility is positively correlated with the innovative work behavior, r(537) = 0,61, p < 0,001. **Conclusion:** After this study, the result might be used as one of the references for university to develop program where student could develop their learning agility and become more innovative. **Novelty/Originality of this study:** This study reveals a significant relationship between learning agility and innovative work behaviour among Indonesian students, providing new insights into developing innovation capabilities at the higher education level. The findings offer an empirical basis for universities to design programs that enhance graduate competitiveness in the ASEAN context.

KEYWORDS: correlational research; innovative work behavior; learning agility; undergraduate student

1. Introduction

The current process of globalization has led to a reduction in boundaries between countries and enables interactions to occur among individuals from various nations. This also impacts the increasing opportunities for every company to expand and recruit workforce in their target business countries. Furthermore, this phenomenon will escalate business competition among companies and the high demand for technology development to meet the needs of corporate expansion leads to the process of digitization (Anwar & Niode, 2017). This digitization process will alter products, working methods, and the skills required by a company in carrying out its business processes (Richardson & Bissel, 2017). One example of such change is in the skills required by companies. Until now, there have

Cite This Article:
Pitaloka, Y. C., & Etikariena, A. (2024). Relationship between learning agility and innovative work behavior among undergraduate student of University of Indonesia. *EcoProfit: Sustainable and Environment Business*, 2(1), 11-23. https://doi.org/10.61511/ecoprofit.v2i1.2024.839

been many types of jobs that require skills that previously did not exist, such as digital advertising analysis. Additionally, the ability to innovate also becomes a necessity to develop products that are suitable for current conditions. However, the development related to specific skill needs is unfortunately not matched with the readiness of potential resources.

In terms of innovation capabilities, Indonesia is still lagging behind compared to other countries such as Singapore and Malaysia. Issues related to the mismatch between university graduates' skills and industry needs also occur in several other. Another reason is the expectation of companies towards university graduates as potential resources to help companies compete and innovate (Martin et al., 2015). Innovation capability is important because it is related to performance at work, and universities are seen to have a role in producing innovative human resources (Herbst & Conradie, 2011; Kyrgidiou & Spyropoulou, 2012; Al-Hussein & Elbeltagi, 2014). After starting the adaptation process in the first year, which has led to low development in other areas such as mastery goal orientation, performance goal orientation, and academic efficacy (Suprayogi et al., 2019). After that, it is hoped that the role of universities in developing innovation capabilities can begin in the second year until graduation.

The concept of innovative work behavior was first discussed by Scott & Bruce (1994) as behavior focused on the implementation of ideas. Innovative work behavior begins from the initial stage of exploring ideas to the implementation or development of ideas for existing products (Scott & Bruce, 1994). This is different from the concept of creativity, which solely focuses on generating a new or original idea (Hennessey & Amabile, 2010). Another opinion suggests that creativity is one of the behaviors in innovation because an individual can also generate new ideas, and with support, these ideas can become applicable (Fleith et al., 2002).

In university settings, this behavior can be demonstrated when working on final assignments, drafting organizational work programs and event concepts in committees, and assisting business processes during internships. The diverse forms of innovative applications are closely tied to the role of the university. A supportive environment for students' innovative potential will greatly aid in preparing them for the complex, challenging, and competitive world of work (Alencar & Fleith, 2010; Jackson et al., 2007; Alencar et al., 2017). However, support for this potential is still lacking, as evidenced by the mismatch between industry needs and university graduates' capabilities as described earlier. This may be due to a lack of effort in optimizing the knowledge gained by students from their experiences (Alencar et al., 2017).

The opportunity to reflect on and further apply acquired skills has not been maximized, thus they cannot be utilized to assist in the innovation process. The behavior of learning and applying acquired knowledge to be used in other situations is termed learning agility. Learning agility is defined as an individual's ability to learn new knowledge, apply existing knowledge, and adapt existing knowledge for use in new situations (Gravett & Caldwell, 2016). With learning agility, individuals are better able to understand new situations and identify areas for improvement, development, or address them appropriately. This ability is considered essential to optimize when aiming for innovation. Because there is a role for knowledge and skills acquired from previous experiences that help identify what needs innovative input (DeRue et al., 2012; Bennett & Limoine, 2014).

Based on the exposition regarding the research findings on learning agility and its correlations with various factors and impacts, as evidenced by prior studies, it is known that learning agility directly influences how individuals are engaged with their work and affects their job performance. Additionally, there are studies concerning learning agility and its influence on performance (De Meuse et al., 2010; Mitchinson & Morris, 2014), which may potentially relate to one form of individual performance assessment, namely innovation. Finally, behaviors associated with learning agility such as openness to experience, readiness to change, and learning ability can enhance innovative capabilities in students (Alencar et al., 2017). With several research findings highlighting university students as individuals

with potential for innovation in various fields and the presence of learning agility factors that can still be developed for innovative capabilities, this research is therefore crucial.

Based on the explanation of learning agility and its behavioral characteristics, it can be understood that learning agility has an influence on performance (DeMeuse et al., 2010; Mitchinson & Morris, 2014) and has the potential to be a factor in the emergence of innovative behavior. If innovative behavior can be optimized in the university environment, it will better prepare students for post-graduation and the workforce. With this research, it can be determined whether there is a relationship between learning agility and innovative work behavior in students.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Innovative work behavior

Innovative work behavior is defined as a gradual process of innovation carried out by individuals to generate, introduce, promote, and implement ideas related to processes, products, or procedures that are developed and relevant to the needs of individuals, organizations, or communities (Kanter, 1988; West & Farr, 1989; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Janssen, 2000). Based on this definition, innovative work behavior starts with generating an idea. In the idea generation phase, individuals exhibit behaviors that help identify issues or inconsistencies in the situation. If the individuals involved have sufficient knowledge and skills, they can better understand and explain the shortcomings of the situation they face.

External factors such as a supportive environment, knowledge-sharing activities with other individuals, and a team's ability to reflect on the product development process play a role in innovative behavior. These factors will be more effective if supported by motivated, proactive, knowledgeable individuals who are capable of reflective behavior, which is crucial for the initial stages of innovation (Patterson et al., 2009; Farnese & Livi, 2016; Plotnikova et al., 2016; Windiarsih & Etikariena, 2017).

2.2 Innovative work behavior factors

The concept of innovative behavior in the workplace has been studied for several years. Throughout these studies, various findings influencing individuals' innovative behavior in the workplace have been discovered. Factors affecting innovative behavior in the workplace are divided into internal factors (personality, autonomy to create new things, commitment, work experience, etc.) and external factors (organizational agility, social resources, job design, etc.).

Patterson et al. (2009) divided the factors influencing innovative behavior into internal and external factors. These internal factors consist of several aspects that can influence innovative behavior such as cognition, knowledge, motivation, personality, behavior, emotions and moods, and developmental factors (Patterson et al., 2009). Cognitive factors such as intelligence play an important role in innovative behavior. However, high intelligence alone is not sufficient to demonstrate innovative behavior. Other factors are needed to assist, such as knowledge factors. Knowledge factors are crucial for individuals in an organization to innovate because they need to understand the tasks and demands of the tasks given before they can innovate. Additionally, there is the motivation factor, which is essential for eliciting individual innovative behavior. Knowledge factors can only emerge when individuals have experiences to draw upon and learn from. Through these experiences, individuals can enhance their potential to innovate (Koellinger, 2008; Plotnikova et al., 2016).

In external factors, several concepts are mentioned such as organizational agility, social sources, job design, and organizational resources (Patterson et al., 2009). Organizational agility is the ability of a company to simultaneously explore and exploit potential. Organizations with organizational agility strive to enrich jobs, share vision and culture, trust each other, maintain discipline, and have flexible leaders. Job design and

organizational resources play a role in enhancing innovation capabilities when applied to organizations with diverse member characteristics and complex business processes. This is based on research by Patterson et al. (2009) which observed that both factors are applied in the previously described conditions.

Furthermore, there is the factor of social sources which relates to innovative behavior in the form of group cooperation, leadership style, and social networks. Some characteristics found to be associated with innovative behavior are groups that have diversity in opinions, developments, and climate within the group. Diversity in backgrounds and perspectives of members as well as differences in opinions and the presence of minority views within the group influence innovative behavior. Members of the group who have knowledge and skills as well as orientations in different disciplines or professional backgrounds are found to have better innovation capabilities and implementation (Patterson et al., 2009).

2.3 The impact of innovative work behavior and learning agility

Several studies have found that innovative work behavior has various impacts both individually and organizationally. This is evidenced by research from DiLiello & Houghton (2016), which explains that individual innovation capability is one of the factors contributing to innovation at the organizational level. Likewise, individual work behavior, supported by organizational conditions that provide opportunities for innovation, can improve performance at the organizational level. In addition, there is an influence that innovative work behavior has on individuals, such as providing input for new product development, improving service quality in the hospitality business, and also influencing consumer choice and satisfaction.

Learning agility was first defined by Lombardo & Eichinger (2000) as an individual's ability to learn from new situations and utilize all their resources, such as competencies, knowledge, and environment, to solve problems or meet demands in a new setting. This ability is demonstrated by how individuals leverage resources gained from previous experiences to complete tasks (DeMeuse, 2010). The main factors of learning agility are divided into four categories: people agility, results agility, mental agility, and change agility (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2000; DeMeuse, 2010). These characteristics reflect an individual's behavior in demonstrating learning agility by utilizing these four factors. To enhance learning agility, the presence of a supportive mentor and an organization that provides various resources, such as training and feedback at the end of the training period, is crucial. This will help individuals understand how to further enhance their experiences by planning activities that will assist them (Mueller-Hanson et al., 2005; DeMeuse, 2010).

The definition by Lombardo (2000) was further developed by DeRue et al. (2012), correcting the definitions provided by Lombardo & Eichinger (2000) and de Meuse (2010), by focusing on learning agility solely in terms of learning speed and general learning ability. DeRue (2012) asserted that agility emphasizes speed (the ability to quickly understand something) and flexibility (the ability to develop various ideas or perspectives in different situations) in experiential learning processes. It can be concluded that the definition of learning agility is the ability to understand and direct attention to several ideation processes in various types of situations as quickly as possible and/or simultaneously across multiple experiences. The description of the definition by DeRue (2012) was reiterated by de Meuse (2012), emphasizing that this definition limits the application of the concept of learning agility by overlooking individual attributes that can actually influence the use of learning agility in complex situations. Therefore, the definition reverted to by de Meuse (2010) was chosen as the basis for the development of the measurement tool by Gravett and Caldwell (2016). The definition by de Meuse (2010) was selected for this study because it can provide an explanation of the application of this ability in complex situations based on each dimension of behavior within learning agility.

2.4 Factors that influence learning agility

The concept of learning agility was first introduced as an ability that, when maximized by an organization, would result in individuals characterized by good performance. This ability is evident in behaviors such as experimenting, self-reflection, continuous improvement, connecting various experiences from one situation to another, and mindfulness (De Meuse, 2017). Over the years, several studies have identified factors that support the emergence of learning agility which are categorized into two factors: personal factors such as the presence and support of others, learning from results, experiences that encourage individuals to develop, organizational culture, and experiences in making changes. In addition, there are personal factors such as seeking experience, building relationships, personal values and character, and utilizing skills and knowledge.

In its development, there are various other factors that influence learning agility, such as adaptability, work performance, defensive behavior, goal orientation, metacognition, and openness to experience as personal factors (Harrison, 2019). Adaptability and work performance are very important in dealing with uncertain and rapidly changing situations, so individuals with high learning agility also tend to have good adaptability in carrying out tasks. Conversely, defensive behavior in individuals can hinder the learning process and reduce learning agility, because defensiveness is often characterized by rejection of input from others, lack of self-awareness, responsibility, trust, and reflection on one's own abilities. Goal orientation describes how individuals view new, challenging experiences as opportunities to learn and improve skills. In addition, metacognition, which is a cognitive ability that helps individuals meet job demands, allows a person to plan, monitor, and evaluate the results of their thinking before, during, and after the learning process. Finally, openness to experience encourages individuals to continue to be curious and actively seek new experiences, perspectives, and ideas as part of their learning process.

Furthermore, there are situational factors in the environment that also influence learning agility, such as the complexity and difficulty level of new situations, the presence of support such as mentors and development facilities also affect learning agility. This is because having abundant resources and supportive mentors reduces individuals' fear of learning, making them more willing to tackle more complex problems that require higher skills. Additionally, institutions or organizations are required to support and provide an environment that helps develop agile individuals. This support can take the form of training programs at the outset of individual involvement (Mueller-Hanson et al., 2005; De Meuse, 2010).

3. Methods

In this study, the method used is a quantitative correlational research method to examine the relationship between variables (Gravetter & Forzano, 2011). The sampling technique employed is convenience sampling, where samples are taken from acquaintances who are willing to be respondents, using an online questionnaire via Google Forms. The characteristics of the respondents in this study are active students who have completed two years of study or are entering their third semester. After data collection, 539 respondents were obtained from three fields of study at the University of Indonesia.

The research instruments used were the measures of innovative work behavior developed by Janssen (2000) and learning agility developed by Caldwell and published by Gravett & Caldwell (2016). These instruments were in the form of self-reports. To adapt to the context of research in Indonesian universities, both instruments underwent a back-translation process and were tested for contextual relevance with 10 students from the University of Indonesia. After pilot testing and analyzing the data using Cronbach's Alpha method, an alpha value of .893 was obtained. According to Kaplan & Sacuzzo (2009), this instrument has good reliability, meeting the requirement of an alpha value > 0.70. Furthermore, after performing a validity test using the internal consistency method for each item, it was found that each item had an r-value > 0.20. Items have good construct validity

and discrimination if the r-value > .20. For the learning agility measure, a reliability test yielded an alpha value of 0.901, indicating that the instrument has good reliability. However, in the internal validity test, there were three items that did not meet the minimum validity value. The three items are items with a negative (reverse) pattern. According to Podsakoff et al. (2003), reversed items are less effective as a method to reduce method bias, so the researchers chose to revise the wording of these three items to positive statements.

After conducting a pilot test, the research team compiled the questionnaire into Google Forms. With the combination of all measurement instruments, the total number of items was 84. There is a risk of common method bias due to the large number of items, where respondents might provide responses without thoroughly reading the statements first (Huang et al., 2015). To detect this, the research team included an Instructed Response Item (IRI) among the questionnaire statements. In this study, one IRI was included with the instruction: "For this statement, please select answer number six (strongly agree)," so any response other than this choice would be considered invalid. After assembling the questionnaire, it was distributed to respondents who met the specified characteristics.

4. Results and Discussion

Regarding the main objective of the study, which is to examine the relationship between learning agility and innovative work behavior, statistical analysis using Pearson Correlation was conducted. It was found that among the 539 respondents, learning agility ($M = 111.35$, $SD = 13.56$) significantly correlated with innovative work behavior ($M = 36.38$, $SD = 8.48$), $r(537) = 0.61$, $p < 0.001$. After processing the data, the descriptive results were obtained as shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Description of demographic data of research respondents (N = 539)

Demographic Data	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Female	354	65,7
Male	185	34,3
Experience (Internships, Organizations, Committees, etc.)		
Yes	436	80,9
No	103	19,1
Field of Study		
Health	122	22,6
Science	189	35,1
Technology Social and Humanities	228	42,3

Based on Table 1, it can be seen that the respondents were predominantly female, with 354 individuals (65.7%), and the majority had prior experience, totaling 436 individuals (80.9%). The largest field of study among respondents was Social Sciences and Humanities, with 228 individuals (42.3%). To examine the differences in innovative work behavior and learning agility among the respondents, they were categorized into high and low groups. The results of this categorization are shown in Table 2.

Table 2. High low classification of respondents' innovative work behavior and learning agility

	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Frequency
Innovative Work Behavior	High	272	50,5
	Low	267	49,5
Learning Agility	High	272	50,5
	Low	267	49,5

Based on the classification in Table 2, it can be seen that 50.5% of respondents in both variables already demonstrate high levels of innovative work behavior and learning agility. Meanwhile, the results of the difference analysis using One Way ANOVA and independent

sample t-test to examine the differences in innovative work behavior and learning agility are shown in Table 3. Based on Table 3, it was found that demographic characteristics based on experience and field of study produced significant differences in the total average scores for the variables of innovative work behavior and learning agility. The results of this analysis indicate that, in general, students who demonstrate high innovative work behavior and learning agility are predominantly those with experience and/or from the field of Social Sciences and Humanities.

Table 3. Description of innovative work behavior and learning agility based on demographic data

Demographic Data			Frequency	Mean	Significance	Description
Innovative Work Beavior	Experience	Present	436	36.74	t = -2.050	Significant
		Absent	103	34.84	p = 0.041	
	Field of Study	Health	122	35.08	F = 2.916	Significant
		Science and technology	189	36.10	p = 0.055	
		Social sciences and humanities	228	37.31		
Learning Agility	Experience	Present	436	36.74	t = -3.479	Significant
		Absent	103	34.84	p = 0.041	
	Field of Study	Health	122	35.08	F = 3.222	Significant
		Science and technology	189	36.10	p = 0.041	
		Social sciences and humanities	228	37.31		

Based on the analysis conducted in this study, it is concluded that learning agility has a significant relationship with innovative work behavior. This result addresses the research question regarding the existence of a relationship between learning agility and innovative work behavior and supports the research hypothesis that there is indeed a relationship between learning agility and innovative work behavior.

This is consistent with research indicating that individuals with high learning agility tend to adapt and perform well in diverse, dynamic, and change-prone environments (Connolly & Viswesvaran, 2002; Dai et al., 2013). Individuals with learning agility also tend to learn from previous experiences, thereby enhancing or rectifying deficiencies from prior experiences when faced with similar situations, leading to better performance (Dai et al., 2013). This aligns with the requirement for individuals to initiate the innovation process at its early stage, idea generation, which necessitates exploratory behavior in knowledge, skills, and experiences to identify problems or situations that can be addressed through innovation. However, it can be observed that the comparison between those with high and low scores on both variables is nearly equal in number. This could be attributed to the predominance of respondents from STEM and Health sciences fields, who tend to have lower scores compared to respondents from Social Sciences and Humanities.

The focus of research on learning agility has been on its role as an ability observed in individuals with potential for managerial and executive positions, as well as those with high job performance (Lombardo & Eichinger, 2000; Dries et al., 2012; Yadav & Dixit, 2017; de Meuse, 2017; de Meuse, 2019). In other studies, it has been explained that individuals with learning agility also demonstrate better abilities and competencies compared to those with lower learning agility (Dries et al., 2012). Moreover, individuals with high learning agility tend to produce better results in leadership positions due to their ability to adapt, willingness to enhance and update skills, and their capacity to learn from experiences necessary for leading an organization and navigating through change (de Meuse, 2017). These findings are also consistent with research indicating that an individual's performance in an organization can be seen through their innovative abilities and work outcomes (Leong & Rusli, 2014). Therefore, learning agility plays a role in individuals' efforts to exhibit innovative behavior within their organizations.

Within the university context, students of the University of Indonesia have demonstrated their ability to adapt various solutions to solve problems in different situations, as described above. This can be related to one of the purposes of establishing the University of Indonesia itself, which is to prepare students to become intelligent graduates capable of applying, developing, enriching, and advancing knowledge, technology, and culture (University of Indonesia). This objective is reflected in the provision of facilities and opportunities for every student to develop their potential to the fullest. Moreover, students also have the opportunity to gain academic or non-academic experiences. This supports the effective utilization of learning agility through various self-development opportunities available. A university environment that supports the development of skills and competencies will greatly benefit students after graduation when they enter their desired industries or pursue careers aligned with their abilities.

With the characteristics of students from the 2016 - 2019 cohort who exhibit behavior focused on achieving maximum results in everything they do, it influences individuals' ability to innovate. This is because, in order to produce optimal outcomes, individuals will seek various methods and alternatives during the process of completing tasks. Such behavior falls within the initial stage of innovation, which involves exploring various situations and striving to contribute to enhancing or changing those situations for the benefit of the organization (Cho et al., 2018; Rodriguez et al., 2019).

Furthermore, learning agility also involves behaviors in interacting with individuals of various characteristics, and individuals with learning agility can utilize this ability to enhance their own capabilities (Gravett & Caldwell, 2016). These findings can be explained by the demands to deliver the best results in every given task, improve competitiveness, or accomplish tasks satisfactorily. University of Indonesia students are often confronted with challenging situations that require them to deal with individuals of diverse characteristics. Moreover, as students become increasingly exposed to various individuals through social media and participation in various activities, their perception of each individual widens, and they become more open to differences, influencing their communication styles and conflict resolution methods (Swisher et al., 2013). This is also related to the current focus of University of Indonesia students on achievement and positioning themselves in high-ranking positions within organizations that require strong skills in managing activities involving many people. This is supported by research on student behavior in universities in the United States, which indicates that the more experiences individuals have in various types of events, the better their ability to deal with people of diverse characteristics (Yadav & Dixit, 2017).

Furthermore, the analysis of demographic data with the research variables revealed significant differences in the mean total scores of students with experience in various activities and those from the social sciences and humanities cluster in both learning agility and innovative work behavior variables. Experience yielded higher average scores in innovative work behavior as it enhances individuals' self-confidence in completing assigned tasks and motivates them to further develop their abilities after learning from their experiences (Cho et al., 2018). This aligns with findings by Etikariena (2018), indicating that innovative behavior includes initiatives to showcase and prove oneself. With increased experiences and ongoing opportunities to correct mistakes and learn from past experiences, which are behaviors associated with learning agility, the courage to express oneself, especially regarding ideas beneficial to the organization, becomes more apparent (de Meuse, 2019). Additionally, the number of students with experience is supported by a growing awareness of the importance of gaining experience to prepare for entering the workforce. This is corroborated by research by Bocsi et al. (2017), stating that engaging in voluntary activities such as organizing events, joining local communities, or other activities, especially those related to technological developments, can enhance the knowledge and competencies needed for their careers after graduation. Despite the variety of experiences possessed by students, this is not supported by the data from the related research on learning agility, which indicates a large number of students with low scores. This suggests a lack of effort in developing the potential of learning agility. Therefore, the experiences

already gained by students would be more beneficial and assist in developing their abilities if there were programs facilitating them, such as actively involving and recognizing students' experiences in the academic process by offering opportunities to become research assistants or participating in programs developed by the university or faculty (Bocsi et al., 2017).

Based on the comparison of average scores, it was found that participants from the social sciences and humanities cluster had higher scores compared to the other two clusters. The difference in scores can be explained by observing that most social sciences and humanities clusters have rapid and dynamic developments in both knowledge and industries related to their fields. The highly dynamic environment and the demand for competitiveness necessitate high levels of innovation capability. This aligns with explanations stating that learning agility is highly essential for individuals working in dynamic industries, requiring rapid learning abilities, high strategic skills, and adaptability to rapidly changing situations in their work environment (Swisher, 2013), thus maximizing the utilization of knowledge and experiences to innovate as needed.

These findings are also consistent with research indicating that STEM graduates tend to have lower scores in innovation compared to humanities graduates due to the procedural academic environment and work processes that offer limited opportunities for innovation (Tsang, 2017). Another factor is the mismatch between the curriculum provided and the current industry needs, resulting in competition disadvantage against graduates from other universities capable of meeting the demands of STEM graduates or engineers in providing innovation for jobs requiring their expertise. Furthermore, there's minimal development in STEM knowledge, thereby limiting opportunities for students to learn the differences in each existing scientific approach (Petriella, 2017).

5. Conclusions

Based on the research procedures and discussion outcomes, there are still limitations in this study. Therefore, recommendations for future research are both methodological and practical. Methodologically, this study only tests the presence of a relationship between learning agility and innovative work behavior. The research cannot be used to explain the ability of learning agility to predict innovative work behavior. Hence, in future studies, regression analysis techniques could be employed to elucidate the relationship between learning agility and innovative work behavior. Additionally, this research could take on a longitudinal form, observing the programs or activities in which students participate to compare which activities play the most significant role in the development of learning agility and innovative work behavior.

Furthermore, regarding practical recommendations, the university administration could consider adding facilities or areas that provide opportunities for students from all faculties to develop solutions seen from various academic disciplines to enhance learning agility and innovation skills among every student. Additionally, student organizations could develop work programs in the form of annual academic competitions or collaborative projects with teams comprising not only students from one faculty but also several faculties from various fields of study, thus providing opportunities for every student to apply their knowledge in various project formats.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to extend sincere appreciation to the IASSSF team for their invaluable support and assistance throughout the research and writing process. Their guidance, feedback, and resources have been instrumental in shaping this work and ensuring its completion. We are grateful for their dedication and commitment to advancing scholarly endeavors.

Author Contribution
All authors contributed equally to the research, drafting, and revision of the manuscript. All have approved the final version for submission.

Funding
This research received no external funding.

Ethical Review Board Statement
Not available.

Informed Consent Statement
Not available.

Data Availability Statement
Not available.

Conflicts of Interest
The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References
Al-Hussein S., & Elbeltagi, I. (2014). Transformational leadership and innovation: A comparison study between Iraq's public and private higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 41*(1), 159–181. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2014.927848

Alencar, E. M. L. S., & Fleith, D. S. (2010). Creativity in higher education: Inhibiting factors. *Avaliação, 15*(2), 201-206. https://doi.org/10.1590/S1414-40772010000200011

Alencar, E. M. L. S., Fleith, D. S., & Pereira, N. (2017). Creativity in higher education: Challenges and facilitating factors. *Temas Em Psicologia, 25*(2), 553–561. https://doi.org/10.9788/tp2017.2-09

Anwar, R., & Niode, S. H. M. (2017). *The effects of learning organization towards employees' innovative behavior mediated by work engagement (A study in Indonesia).* In 2017 International Conference on Organizational Innovation (ICOI 2017). Atlantis Press.

Bocsi, V., Fényes, H., & Markos, V. (2017). Motives of volunteering and values of work among higher education students. *Citizenship, Social and Economics Education, 16*(2), 117–131. https://doi.org/10.1177/2047173417717061

Bennett, N., & Limoine, J. (2014). What VUCA really means for you. *Harvard Business Review, 92*(1/2). https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2389563

Cho, M., Bonn, M., & Han, S. (2018). Generation Z's sustainable volunteering: Motivations, attitudes and job performance. *Sustainability, 10*(5), 1400. https://doi.org/10.3390/su10051400

Connolly, J. A., & Viswesvaran, C. (2002). *Assessing the construct validity of a measure of learning agility.* Annual Conference of the Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Toronto. https://digitalcommons.fiu.edu/dissertations/AAI3013189/

Dai, G., De Meuse, K. P., & Tang, K. Y. (2013). The role of learning agility in executive career success: The results of two field studies. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 25*(2), 108–131. https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2013-43683-001

Das, K. K., & Ara, A. (2014). Leadership in VUCA world: A case of Lenovo. *International Journal of Current Research, 6*(4), 6410-6419. https://www.journalcra.com/article/leadership-vuca-world-case-lenovo

De Meuse, K. P., Dai, G., & Hallenbeck, G. S. (2010). Learning agility: A construct whose time has come. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 62*(2), 119–130. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019988

De Meuse, K. P., Dai, G., Hallenbeck, G., & Tang, K. (2008). *Global talent management: Using learning agility to identify high potentials around the world*. Korn/Ferry International.

De Meuse, K. P. D. (2017). Learning agility: Its evolution as a psychological construct and its empirical relationship to leader success. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 69*(4), 267–295. https://doi.org/10.1037/cpb0000100

De Meuse, K. (2019). A meta-analysis of the relationship between learning agility and leader success. *Journal of Organizational Psychology, 19*(1). https://doi.org/10.33423/jop.v19i1.1088

DeRue, D. S., Ashford, S. J., & Myers, C. G. (2012). Learning agility: In search of conceptual clarity and theoretical grounding. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology, 5*(3), 258-279. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1754-9434.2012.01444.x

Dries, N., Vantilborgh, T., & Pepermans, R. (2012). The role of learning agility and career variety in the identification and development of high potential employees. *Personnel Review*. https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481211212977

Etikariena, A. (2018). Perbedaan perilaku kerja inovatif berdasarkan karakteristik individu karyawan. *Jurnal Psikologi, 17*(2), 107-118. https://doi.org/10.14710/jp.17.2.107-118

Farnese, M. L., & Livi, S. (2016). How reflexivity enhances organizational innovativeness: The mediation role of team support for innovation and individual commitment. *Knowledge Management Research & Practice, 14*(4), 525–536. https://doi.org/10.1057/kmrp.2015.13

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A.-G. (2009). Statistical power analyses using G*Power 3.1: Tests for correlation and regression analyses. *Behavior Research Methods, 41*, 1149-1160.

Fleith, D. de S., Renzulli, J. S., & Westberg, K. L. (2002). Effects of a creativity training program on divergent thinking abilities and self-concept in monolingual and bilingual classrooms. *Creativity Research Journal, 14*(3-4), 373–386. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15326934crj1434_8

Gravett, L. S., & Caldwell, S. A. (2016). *Learning agility: The impact on recruitment and retention*. Springer.

Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2011). *Essentials of statistics for the behavioural sciences*. Thomson, Wadsworth.

Harrison, G. (2019). *Business accelerators as learning environments: A mixed methods investigation*. Wellington.

Hennessey, B. A., & Amabile, T. M. (2010). Creativity. *Annual Review of Psychology, 61*, 569 – 598. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.093008.100416

Herbst, T., & Conradie, P. (2011). Leadership effectiveness in higher education: Managerial self-perceptions versus perceptions of others. *Journal of Industrial Psychology, 37*(1), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v37i1.867

Huang, J. L., Liu, M., & Bowling, N. A. (2015). Insufficient effort responding: Examining an insidious confound in survey data. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 100*(3), 828–845. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038510

Jackson, N., Oliver, M., Shaw, M., & Wisdom, J. (2007). *Developing creativity in higher education*. Routledge.

Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*(3), 287-302. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317900167038

Kanter, R. M. (1988). Three tiers for innovation research. *Communication Research, 15*(5), 509–523. https://doi.org/10.1177/009365088015005001

Kaplan, R. M., & Saccuzzo, D. P. (2005). *Psychological testing principles, application and issue (6th ed.).* Wadsworth.

Koellinger, P. (2008). Why are some entrepreneurs more innovative than others? *Small Business Economics, 31*(1), 21–37. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-008-9107-0

Kyrgidou, L. P., & Spyropoulou, S. (2012). Drivers and performance outcomes of innovativeness: An empirical study. *British Journal of Management, 24*(3), 281–298. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2011.00803.x

Leong, C. T., & Rasli, A. (2014). The relationship between innovative work behavior on work role performance: An empirical study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 129*, 592-600. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.717

Lombardo, M. M., & Eichinger, R. W. (2000). High potentials as high learners. *Human Resource Management, 39*(4), 321-329. https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-050X(200024)39:4%3C321::AID-HRM4%3E3.0.CO;2-1

Mack, O., Khare, A., Kramer, A., & Burgatz, T. (2016). *Perspectives on a VUCA world*. In Managing in a VUCA World.

Martín, P., Potočnik, K., & Fras, A. B. (2015). Determinants of students' innovation in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 42*(7), 1229–1243. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1087993

Mitchinson, A., & Morris, R. (2014). *Learning about learning agility.* White paper, 1-20. Center for Creative Leadership. https://cclinnovation.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/learningagility.pdf

Mueller-Hanson, R. A., White, S. S., Dorsey, D. W., & Pulakos, E. D. (2005). *Training adaptable leaders: Lessons from research and practice (Research Report 1844).* Personnel Decisions Research Institutes.

Petriella, Y. (2017, April 26). *Skilled workforce: Indonesia has shortage of engineers*. https://www.pwc.com/id/en/media-centre/infrastructure-news/infrastructure-news---archive/april-2017/skilled-workforce--indonesia-has-shortage-of-engineers.html

Plotnikova, M., Romero, I., & Martínez-Román, J. A. (2016). Process innovation in small businesses: The self-employed as entrepreneurs. *Small Business Economics, 47*(4), 939–954. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-016-9743-8

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(5), 879–903. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879

Richardson, L., & Bissell, D. (2019). Geographies of digital skill. *Geoforum, 99*, 278–286. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.09.014

Rodriguez, M., Boyer, S., Fleming, D., & Cohen, S. (2019). Managing the next generation of sales, Gen Z/Millennial cusp: An exploration of grit, entrepreneurship, and loyalty. *Journal of Business-to-Business Marketing,* 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1080/1051712x.2019.1565136

Suprayogi, M. N., Ratriana, L., & Wulandari, A. P. J. (2019). The interplay of academic efficacy and goal orientation toward academic achievement. *Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 1175*(1), 012132. IOP Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/1175/1/012132

Swisher, V. (2013). Learning agility: the "X" factor in identifying and developing future leaders. *Industrial and Commercial Training, 45*(3), 139-142. https://doi.org/10.1108/00197851311320540

Swisher, V. V., Hallenbeck, G. S., Orr, E. J., Eichinger, R. W., Lombardo, M. M., & Capretta, C. C. (2013). *FYI for learning agility: A must-have resource for high potential development.* Korn Ferry.

Tsang, T. L. (2017). A quantitative analysis examining differences between US humanities and STEM students' propensity toward innovation. *Journal of Further and Higher Education, 1–17*. https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877x.2017.1357069

Universitas Indonesia. (2018, April). *Visi dan misi.* https://www.ui.ac.id/tentang-ui/visi-misi.html

Windiarsih, R., & Etikariena, A. (2017). Hubungan antara kepribadian proaktif dan perilaku kerja inovatif di BUMN X. *Jurnal Psikogenesis, 5*(2), 123-134. https://doi.org/10.24854/jps.v5i2.501

Yadav, N., & Dixit, S. (2017). A conceptual model of learning agility and authentic leadership development: Moderating effects of learning goal orientation and organizational culture. *Journal of Human Values, 23*(1), 40–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/0971685816673487

Biographies of Authors

Yolla Chintya Pitaloka, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Psychology , Universitas Indonesia, Jl. Margonda Raya, Depok 16424, Indonesia.

- Email: yolla.chintya@ui.ac.id
- ORCID: N/A
- Web of Science ResearcherID: N/A
- Scopus Author ID: N/A
- Homepage: N/A

Arum Etikariena, Department of Psychology, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Indonesia, Jl. Margonda Raya, Depok 16424, Indonesia.

- Email: arum.etikariena@ui.ac.id
- ORCID: 0000-0001-8881-046X
- Web of Science ResearcherID: -
- Scopus Author ID: 57205209871
- Homepage: https://sinta.kemdikbud.go.id/affiliations/profile/430