ISSN 3123-6464 (Online)
JOMBINOV
Journal of Management and Business Innovation
Publisher

OPEN ACCESS
Journal of Management and Business Innovation (JOMBINOV)
https://v-learnov.com/index.php/jombinov
Volume 02
Number 01
March 2026
Page: 01 – 11
ISSN: 3123-6464 (Online)

Digital Work Resources and Innovative Work Behaviour in Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises: The Mediating Role of Digital Engagement

Haryadi Sumarsono[1]*, Rosyana Nashir[2], Taufiq Sugiarto[3]

[1,2,3,] Department of Management, Kahuripan University, Indonesia

Article History:

Received: 04 Jan 2026
Revised: 29 Jan 2026
Accepted: 04 Feb 2026

Corresponding Author:

Haryadi Sumarsono

Corresponding E-mail:

haryadis21@gmail.com

Abstract:

Research Aims:
This study investigates the relationship between digital work resources and innovative work behaviour in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), examining the mediating role of digital engagement.
Methodology:
Using a quantitative approach, data were collected from 60 SME owners and employees actively using digital technologies in East Java. Partial Least Squares–Structural Equation Modelling (PLS-SEM) was applied using SmartPLS and SPSS.
Theoretical Contribution/Originality:
The study reveals that digital work resources do not directly influence innovative work behaviour. Instead, digital engagement fully mediates this relationship, extending SME and digital work literature by emphasising engagement as a critical mechanism through which digital resources translate into innovation.
Practitioners/Policy Implications:
The findings highlight that investments in digital technologies must be accompanied by strategies that enhance digital engagement, such as capability development and participative digital practices, to foster innovation in SMEs.
Research Limitations/Implications:
The limited sample size and regional focus constrain generalisability. Future research should adopt broader samples, comparative settings, or longitudinal designs to further examine digital engagement dynamics in SMEs.

Keywords: Digital Work Resources, Digital Engagement, Innovative Work Behaviour, Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs), Digitalisation.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid advancement of digital technologies over recent decades has fundamentally transformed the ways in which organizations create value, including within the small and medium-sized enterprise (SME) sector, which serves as the backbone of many developing economies. Digitalization enables SMEs to enhance operational efficiency, expand market reach, and accelerate data-driven decision-making processes (Bresciani et al., 2021; OECD, 2020). Within the context of human resource management, digital technologies not only reshape work processes but also

ISSN 3123-6464 (Online)
JOMBINOV
Journal of Management and Business Innovation
Publisher

influence patterns of interaction, learning, and individual innovative behavior within organizations (Bondarouk & Brewster, 2016).

With the acceleration of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, the adoption of digital technologies has become an unavoidable strategic imperative. The World Economic Forum (2020) highlights that digital transformation has shifted the nature of traditional work toward roles requiring technological literacy, adaptability, and continuous innovation. For SMEs, this development presents a set of complex challenges. On the one hand, digitalization creates opportunities to enhance competitiveness and long-term business sustainability; on the other hand, constraints related to limited resources, low levels of workforce digital readiness, and persistent technological capability gaps often hinder the effective realization of digital benefits (Priyono et al., 2020; Rahayu & Day, 2017).

From the perspective of Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory, job resources are defined as aspects of work that support individuals in achieving work goals, mitigating the impact of job demands, and fostering motivation as well as personal development (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). As work environments become increasingly digitalized, the concept of job resources has expanded to incorporate technology-based resources. Digital job resources—such as digital communication systems, technology-enabled access to information, and digital training—are conceptualized as job resources that enhance individuals' capacity to adapt and perform effectively within digitalized work contexts (Van den Heuvel et al., 2020).

A growing body of empirical evidence from reputable international journals indicates that the availability of digital job resources contributes to enhanced work effectiveness and individual innovation potential (Matschke et al., 2021; Wang et al., 2022). However, research findings also suggest that the mere presence of digital technologies does not automatically stimulate innovative work behavior. Several studies emphasize that technological investments frequently fail to generate innovation when individuals are not actively engaged in their use (Vial, 2019; Nambisan et al., 2017). This pattern indicates that digital technologies are inherently enabling rather than deterministic, and that their impact is largely contingent upon users' psychological responses and behavioral engagement.

Within this context, digital engagement emerges as a key construct for explaining how individuals interact with digital technologies in their work activities. Digital engagement reflects a cognitive, emotional, and behavioral state characterized by enthusiasm, involvement, and active participation in the use of digital technologies (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Saks, 2019). Prior research suggests that individuals with higher levels of digital engagement tend to be more proactive in learning, knowledge sharing, and in exploring as well as implementing new ideas (Li et al., 2021; Molino et al., 2020). Accordingly, digital engagement functions as a critical psychological mechanism that bridges the relationship between digital job resources and innovative work behavior.

Despite the growing body of literature on digitalization and innovative work behavior, several significant research gaps remain. First, much of the existing research has examined the direct effects of digital technologies on performance or innovation, with limited attention to the mediating mechanisms that explain how digital technologies influence individual behavior (Vial, 2019). Second, applications of JD-R theory have predominantly focused on large organizations and

ISSN 3123-6464 (Online)
JOMBINOV
Journal of Management and Business Innovation
Publisher

formal sectors, while studies centered on SMEs—particularly in developing country contexts—remain relatively scarce (Demerouti & Bakker, 2011; Priyono et al., 2020). Third, empirical research that explicitly positions digital engagement as a mediating variable between digital job resources and innovative work behavior is still limited, despite recent literature emphasizing the central role of engagement in successful digital transformation (Molino et al., 2020; Van Zoonen et al., 2021). Finally, empirical evidence from Indonesian SMEs remains underrepresented, especially in East Java, a province characterized by a substantial SME contribution to the economy and heterogeneous levels of digital readiness (Rahayu & Day, 2017).

Studies published in international journals consistently indicate that technology-based job resources exert a positive influence on work engagement and innovative work behavior (Bakker et al., 2014; Wang et al., 2022). Meanwhile, evidence from national-level studies confirms that SME digitalization contributes to improved performance and competitiveness; however, its effects on individual innovative work behavior are often indirect and shaped by psychological factors such as engagement and digital readiness (Suryanto et al., 2021; Wibowo & Handayani, 2022). This inconsistency in empirical findings underscores the need for a more comprehensive research model capable of elucidating the interrelationships among digital job resources, digital engagement, and innovative work behavior.

Building on the aforementioned theoretical foundations and empirical evidence, this study develops a conceptual framework that positions digital engagement as a mediating variable in the relationship between digital job resources and innovative work behavior. Specifically, this study aims to examine the effect of digital job resources on innovative work behavior, the effect of digital job resources on digital engagement, and the mediating role of digital engagement in this relationship within SMEs in East Java. This study is expected to make a theoretical contribution by extending the application of JD-R theory to the context of digital transformation and SMEs, while also offering practical implications for business practitioners and policymakers in designing digitally oriented human resource development strategies that foster sustainable innovation.

METHODS

This study adopts a quantitative approach with a survey-based research design to examine the causal relationships among digital job resources, digital engagement, and innovative work behavior. A quantitative approach is appropriate as it enables objective hypothesis testing through statistical analysis and is well suited for evaluating conceptual models involving latent variables (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Hair et al., 2022). The survey design is considered particularly effective for capturing individuals' perceptions and experiences related to the use of digital technologies within the SME work context (Fowler, 2014).

The study population comprises SME owners and employees in East Java Province who have adopted digital technologies in their business activities. The selection of the SME context is justified by the strategic role of this sector in the economy, as well as the heterogeneous nature of digital technology adoption among SMEs (Rahayu & Day, 2017; Priyono et al., 2020). A purposive sampling technique was employed, whereby respondents were selected based on predefined criteria relevant to the research objectives, specifically their experience in using digital technologies in daily work activities (Etikan et al., 2016).

ISSN 3123-6464 (Online)
JOMBINOV
Journal of Management and Business Innovation
Publisher

A total of 60 respondents participated in the study. This sample size is considered adequate for analysis using Partial Least Squares–Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM), given that this method is relatively robust to small sample sizes and is particularly suitable for predictive research and the testing of complex models (Hair et al., 2019; Sarstedt et al., 2021). Moreover, PLS-SEM has been widely recommended in management and information systems research involving SMEs and digital technologies (Ringle et al., 2020).

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire developed with a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree"), which is commonly employed to quantitatively measure respondents' perceptions and attitudes (Likert, 1932; Joshi et al., 2015). Digital job resources were measured through two primary dimensions—digital communication and digital training—reflecting the availability and technological support that facilitate work activities (Van den Heuvel et al., 2020). Digital engagement was assessed based on respondents' levels of enthusiasm, involvement, and active participation in the use of digital technologies, consistent with the conceptualization of engagement in technology-enabled work environments (Schaufeli et al., 2002; Molino et al., 2020). Innovative work behavior was measured using four dimensions—idea exploration, idea generation, idea promotion, and idea implementation—representing the stages of the individual innovation process as proposed by Janssen (2000).

Data analysis was conducted using Partial Least Squares–Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) with the assistance of SmartPLS software to evaluate both the measurement model (outer model) and the structural model (inner model). The outer model was assessed through tests of convergent validity, discriminant validity, and construct reliability, while the inner model evaluation focused on path coefficients, coefficients of determination (R^2), and the significance of relationships among latent variables (Hair et al., 2019; Henseler et al., 2015). In addition, descriptive statistical analysis was employed to describe respondent characteristics and response distributions, which were processed using SPSS software (Field, 2018).

RESULT

Respondent Profile

With regard to sample size considerations, it is generally recommended that the number of observations should be at least five times the number of variables under investigation (Hair et al., 2022). As reported in Table 1, 52% of the respondents were male, while 48% were female.

Table 1. Respondent Profile

No	Demographic Variables	Classification	Number of respondents (n)	Presentation
1	Gender	Male	31	52%
		Female	29	48%
2	Age	20-29 Years	6	10%
		30-39 Years	34	57%
		40-49 Years	13	22%
		50-59 Years	7	11%
3	Last Education	High school / Equivalent	1	2%
		D3	6	10%

ISSN 3123-6464 (Online)
JOMBINOV
Journal of Management and Business Innovation
Publisher

No	Demographic Variables	Classification	Number of respondents (n)	Presentation
		S1	47	78&
		S2	6	10%

Source: Primer Data, 2025

Convergent Validity

The validity of the measurement items for each indicator—reflecting the extent to which they adequately represent the underlying construct—is commonly assessed through their outer loading values.

Table 2. Convergent Validity Result

Variabel	Item Statement	Outer Loading	Description
Digital Job Resources	DJR.1.1	0,767	Valid
	DJR.1.2	0,783	Valid
	DJR.1.3	0,842	Valid
	DJR.1.4	0,861	Valid
	DJR.2.1	0,769	Valid
	DJR.2.2	0,773	Valid
	DJR.2.3	0,729	Valid
	DJR.2.4	0,769	Valid
	DJR.2.5	0,714	Valid
Innovative Work Behavior	IWB.1.1	0,635	Valid
	IWB.1.2	0,744	Valid
	IWB.1.3	0,663	Valid
	IWB.2.1	0,761	Valid
	IWB.2.2	0,754	Valid
	IWB.3.1	0,766	Valid
	IWB.3.2	0,772	Valid
	IWB.3.3	0,821	Valid
	IWB.4.1	0,786	Valid
	IWB.4.2	0,753	Valid
Digital Engagement	DE.1.1	0,621	Valid
	DE.1.2	0,833	Valid
	DE.1.3	0,761	Valid
	DE.1.4	0,790	Valid
	DE.1.5	0,812	Valid
	DE.1.6	0,766	Valid

Source: Primer Data, 2025

In this study, indicators with outer loading values between 0.50 and 0.60 are considered acceptable, particularly in exploratory research contexts and when constructs are measured using a relatively limited number of indicators, ranging from three to seven items. As reported in the table, all measurement items exhibit outer loading values above the minimum threshold of 0.50, suggesting that each indicator demonstrates an adequate level of convergent validity and can therefore be retained for further analysis.

Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity was examined to ensure that each indicator more strongly represents its intended latent construct than other constructs in the model. This assessment was conducted

ISSN 3123-6464 (Online)
JOMBINOV
Journal of Management and Business Innovation
Publisher

using cross-loading values and the square root of the Average Variance Extracted (AVE), as reported in Table 3.

Table 3. Discriminant Validity Result

Variable	Mean	AVE	DE	DJR	IWB
DE	3,80	0,561	0,749		
DJR	3,91	0,604	0,646	0,777	
IWB	3,91	0,513	0,725	0,590	0,717

Source: Primer Data, 2025

The measurement model is considered to demonstrate adequate discriminant validity when the Average Variance Extracted (AVE) exceeds the recommended threshold of 0.50 and when the square root of the AVE for each construct is greater than its correlations with other constructs. The results indicate that the discriminant validity values for all constructs exceed their respective inter-construct correlations, and that all AVE values are above the 0.50 threshold. Accordingly, these findings provide support for the adequacy of discriminant validity in the measurement (outer) model.

Resampling Bootstraping

The results of the direct effects analysis are summarized in Table 4.

Table 4. Direct Effect Testing Results

Relationship Between Variables	Original Sample	t-statistics	p-values	Description
Digital job resources towards innovative work behavior	0,210	1,764	0,081	Hypotheses 1 (H1) Rejected
Digital job resources towards digital engagement	0,646	5,505	0,000	Hypotheses 2 (H2) Accepted
Digital Engagement towards Innovative Work Behavior	0,589	5,168	0,001	Hypotheses 3 (H3) Accepted

Source: Primer Data, 2025

The results reported in the table indicate that digital job resources exhibit a positive path coefficient of 0.210 in relation to innovative work behavior, with a t-value of 1.764 ($p = 0.081$). However, this effect does not reach conventional levels of statistical significance. Accordingly, Hypothesis 1, which proposed a direct positive effect of digital job resources on innovative work behavior, is not supported.

In contrast, the relationship between digital job resources and digital engagement shows a positive and statistically significant path coefficient of 0.646, with a t-value of 5.505 ($p < 0.001$). Therefore, Hypothesis 2 is supported, indicating that digital job resources significantly enhance digital engagement.

ISSN 3123-6464 (Online)
JOMBINOV
Journal of Management and Business Innovation
Publisher

Furthermore, digital engagement demonstrates a positive and significant effect on innovative work behavior, with a path coefficient of 0.589, a t-value of 5.168, and a p-value of 0.001. Consequently, Hypothesis 3 is supported, confirming that higher levels of digital engagement are associated with increased innovative work behavior.

Indirect Effect

Table 5. Indirect Effect Testing Results

Relationship Between Variables	Original Sample	t-statistics	p-values	Description
Digital job resources towards innovative work behavior	0,381	3,514	0,001	Hypotheses 1 (H1) Accepted

Source: Primer Data, 2025

As shown in the table above, the indirect effect of digital job resources on innovative work behavior through digital engagement is positive and statistically significant, with a path coefficient of 0.381, a t-value of 3.514, and a p-value of 0.001. This finding indicates that digital job resources positively influence innovative work behavior via digital engagement.

DISCUSION

Based on the statistical analysis, the findings indicate that digital job resources do not exert a significant direct effect on innovative work behavior. This result is consistent with prior studies suggesting that the availability of digital technologies and digital-based training does not necessarily translate into the immediate emergence of individual innovative behavior in the workplace (Vial, 2019; Molino et al., 2020). Other studies further emphasize that the use of digital technologies that is largely routine and administratively oriented tends to yield limited innovation outcomes, particularly when such use is not accompanied by psychological mechanisms that stimulate the exploration of new ideas (Nambisan et al., 2017).

These findings suggest that employees within the East Java Distribution Unit of the Indonesian state-owned electricity provider actively utilize digital training and digital communication tools in their daily work activities. Although the descriptive results indicate that digital job resources are perceived positively and are used intensively, these resources alone are insufficient to directly foster higher levels of innovative work behavior. This reinforces the view that technology use that is predominantly instrumental in nature does not necessarily contribute to individual innovation processes (Ferneley & Sobreperez, 2006; Wang et al., 2022).

Within the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theoretical framework, job resources such as digital communication and digital training function as supportive factors that can enhance employee motivation and work performance (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). However, several studies emphasize that when digital technologies are primarily utilized to achieve operational efficiency, without providing opportunities for reflective learning and experimentation, their impact on innovative work behavior remains limited (van den Heuvel et al., 2020; Matschke et al., 2021). Accordingly, digital job resources require specific psychological conditions in order to effectively contribute to innovation outcomes.

ISSN 3123-6464 (Online)
JOMBINOV
Journal of Management and Business Innovation
Publisher

Furthermore, the results of this study indicate that digital job resources have a positive effect on digital engagement. This finding is consistent with prior research demonstrating that the availability of digital technologies, communication systems, and technology-based training significantly enhances employees' engagement with digital tools in the workplace (Molino et al., 2020; Van Zoonen et al., 2021). Studies conducted in organizational contexts within developing countries similarly suggest that organizational digital support serves as a key predictor of technology-related work engagement (Priyono et al., 2020; Wibowo & Handayani, 2022).

Furthermore, engagement in digital work environments is strongly influenced by the extent to which organizations provide technologies that are relevant, user-friendly, and aligned with employees' work needs (Saks, 2019; Wang et al., 2022). Employees within the East Java Main Distribution Unit of the Indonesian state-owned electricity provider reported that the available digital technologies and training programs help enhance communication quality and improve task execution effectiveness. This finding is consistent with a core assumption of JD-R theory, which posits that the effective utilization of job resources strengthens employee engagement by supporting the achievement of work-related goals (Bakker et al., 2014).

The results of this study further confirm that digital engagement exerts a positive effect on innovative work behavior. This finding is supported by empirical research indicating that high levels of engagement in the use of digital technologies encourage employees to be more active in knowledge sharing, critical thinking, and the implementation of new ideas (Li et al., 2021; Van Zoonen et al., 2021). Digital engagement fosters a sense of connectedness between employees, their work, and the technologies they use, thereby reinforcing individuals' innovative capacity.

The high level of digital engagement among employees of the East Java Distribution Unit of the Indonesian state-owned electricity provider appears to be closely associated with the effectiveness of digital communication and the perceived relevance of digital training, even though such training is not delivered on a regular basis. This finding suggests that digital engagement is not determined solely by the frequency of training initiatives, but rather by employees' perceptions of the usefulness, ease of use, and practical effectiveness of digital technologies in supporting their daily work activities (Venkatesh et al., 2012; Molino et al., 2020).

Although no significant direct effect was found between digital job resources and innovative work behavior, this relationship becomes significant when employees exhibit high levels of digital engagement. This finding reinforces the view that digital engagement serves as a critical mechanism through which digital job resources are translated into more creative and innovative work outcomes (Van den Heuvel et al., 2020; Li et al., 2021).

Prior research has also emphasized that employee engagement with digital technologies enhances innovation potential, particularly in organizations that provide digital resources in a strategic and adequate manner (Koroglu & Ozmen, 2022; Wang et al., 2022). Within the context of the East Java Main Distribution Unit of the Indonesian state-owned electricity provider, these findings further underscore the critical mediating role of digital engagement in the relationship between digital job resources and innovative work behavior.

Overall, the findings of this study are consistent with Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) theory, which posits that job resources foster innovation only insofar as they first succeed in enhancing employee engagement (Bakker & Demerouti, 2017). Accordingly, digital engagement

ISSN 3123-6464 (Online)
JOMBINOV
Journal of Management and Business Innovation
Publisher

should be viewed not merely as an outcome of the availability of digital job resources, but as a pivotal mechanism that channels the use of digital technologies toward more creative and innovative work behavior.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that digital job resources do not have a direct effect on innovative work behavior among SMEs in East Java. However, digital job resources exert a positive influence on digital engagement, and digital engagement, in turn, has a positive effect on innovative work behavior. Moreover, digital engagement serves as a significant mediating variable in the relationship between digital job resources and innovative work behavior.

From a practical perspective, these findings highlight the importance for SME owners and managers not only to invest in digital technologies but also to actively foster digital engagement through continuous training initiatives and work environments that support the creative use of digital tools. For future research, it is recommended to extend the scope of investigation to broader contexts and to incorporate additional variables, such as organizational culture or digital leadership, to further enrich understanding of digital innovation processes in SMEs.

LIMITATION

This study has several limitations that should be acknowledged. First, the sample size is relatively modest, comprising 60 SME owners and employees in East Java. Although this size is acceptable for PLS-SEM analysis, it may limit the generalizability of the findings to SMEs operating in different regions, industries, or stages of digital maturity.

Second, the study relies on self-reported survey data, which may be subject to common method bias and social desirability effects. As a result, respondents' perceptions may not fully reflect their actual levels of digital engagement or innovative work behavior.

Third, the cross-sectional research design restricts the ability to capture temporal changes in digital engagement and innovation. Given the dynamic nature of digital transformation in SMEs, the relationships observed in this study should be interpreted as indicative rather than causal over time.

Finally, the research model focuses on a limited set of variables—digital job resources, digital engagement, and innovative work behavior. While theoretically grounded, this scope does not capture the full complexity of innovation processes within SMEs.

Building on these limitations, future research could extend this study in several ways that are particularly relevant to the JSBED readership. First, studies employing larger and more diverse SME samples across regions, sectors, and levels of digital readiness would enhance the robustness and external validity of the findings.

Second, longitudinal research designs are recommended to examine how digital engagement and innovative work behavior evolve over time as SMEs progress through different stages of digital transformation.

Third, future studies may incorporate additional contextual and organizational variables, such as organizational culture, digital leadership, owner–manager characteristics, government support, and digital literacy, to develop more comprehensive models of innovation in SMEs.

Finally, comparative studies between SMEs and larger firms, or between SMEs in developed and developing economies, would provide valuable insights into how digital job resources and engagement mechanisms operate across different organizational contexts.

REFERENCES

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands–Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 22*(3), 309–328.

Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2017). Job demands–resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 22*(3), 273–285.

Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E., & Sanz-Vergel, A. I. (2014). Burnout and work engagement: The JD–R approach. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 1*(1), 389–411.

Bondarouk, T., & Brewster, C. (2016). Conceptualising the future of HRM and technology research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 27*(21), 2652–2671.

Bresciani, S., Ferraris, A., & Del Giudice, M. (2021). The management of organizational ambidexterity through alliances in a new context of analysis: Internet of Things (IoT) smart city projects. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 136*, 331–338.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2011). The Job Demands–Resources model: Challenges for future research. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology, 37*(2), 1–9.

Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics, 5*(1), 1–4.

Ferneley, E. H., & Sobreperez, P. (2006). Resist, comply or workaround? An examination of different facets of user engagement with information systems. *European Journal of Information Systems, 15*(4), 345–356.

Field, A. (2018). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Fowler, F. J. (2014). *Survey research methods* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2019). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A primer on partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM)* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Henseler, J., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2015). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 43*(1), 115–135.

Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort–reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 73*(3), 287–302.

Joshi, A., Kale, S., Chandel, S., & Pal, D. K. (2015). Likert scale: Explored and explained. *British Journal of Applied Science & Technology, 7*(4), 396–403.

Koroglu, B. A., & Ozmen, O. (2022). The mediating role of employee digital engagement in the relationship between digital resources and innovative work behavior. *Journal of Business Research, 139*, 1–12.

Li, M., Wang, Z., & Liu, S. (2021). Digital engagement and employee innovative behavior: The role of digital competence. *Journal of Business Research, 124*, 88–99.

Li, X., Sandino, T., & Wang, J. (2021). Digital engagement and innovative work behavior: The role of knowledge sharing. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 173*, 121102.

Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology, 22*(140), 1–55.

Matschke, C., Moskaliuk, J., & Cress, U. (2021). The impact of digital collaboration tools on innovative work behavior. *Computers in Human Behavior, 118*, 106672.

Molino, M., Cortese, C. G., & Ghislieri, C. (2020). Technology acceptance and digital wellbeing: A Job Demands–Resources perspective. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(14), 5168.

Nambisan, S., Lyytinen, K., Majchrzak, A., & Song, M. (2017). Digital innovation management: Reinventing innovation management research in a digital world. *MIS Quarterly, 41*(1), 223–238.

OECD. (2020). *OECD digital economy outlook 2020*. OECD Publishing.

Priyono, A., Moin, A., & Putri, V. N. A. O. (2020). Identifying digital transformation paths in the business model of SMEs during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity, 6*(4), 104.

Rahayu, R., & Day, J. (2017). E-commerce adoption by SMEs in developing countries: Evidence from Indonesia. *Eurasian Business Review, 7*(1), 25–41.

Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., Mitchell, R., & Gudergan, S. P. (2020). Partial least squares structural equation modeling in HRM research. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 31*(12), 1617–1643.

Saks, A. M. (2019). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement revisited. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance, 6*(1), 19–38.

Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two-sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 3*(1), 71–92.

Van den Heuvel, M., Demerouti, E., & Peeters, M. C. W. (2020). The job crafting intervention: Effects on job resources, self-efficacy, and affective well-being. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 93*(3), 511–532.

Van Zoonen, W., Verhoeven, J. W. M., & Elving, W. J. L. (2021). Understanding work engagement and innovative behavior in the digital workplace. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 36*(4), 1–15.

Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 28*(2), 118–144.

Wang, B., Liu, Y., Qian, J., & Parker, S. K. (2022). Achieving effective remote working during the COVID-19 pandemic: A work design perspective. *Applied Psychology, 71*(1), 16–59.

Wibowo, A., & Handayani, R. (2022). Digital capability and SME performance: Evidence from Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen dan Kewirausahaan, 24*(2), 85–97.