Collaborative Climate and Proactive Performance: A Structural Equation Model with Implications for Intrapreneurial Behavior in the Banking Sector

Rosa Aurora Orellana Castillo[1]; Daniela Sarahí Varela Aguiriano[1]; Octavio Nahum Aguilar Montes[1]
[1]*Universidad Tecnológica de Honduras,* aurora.castillo@uth.hn, dsvarela@uth.hn, onaguilar@uth.hn

Abstract*– This study aimed to analyze the relationship between collaborative climate and proactive performance through a structural equation model (SEM). A quantitative, cross-sectional, correlational design was used with 63 employees of a single Honduran banking institution (eligible population: 105 employees), selected through non-probability convenience sampling. Data were collected using a self-developed 23-item Likert-type questionnaire (α = .926), reviewed before administration by three experts, and analyzed through exploratory factor analysis (Minimum Residual extraction, Oblimin rotation) followed by a structural equation model estimated by robust maximum likelihood on the same 63 cases. Results showed a two-factor structure with adequate factor loadings, acceptable fit indices (CFI = .956, TLI = .944, RMSEA = .067, SRMR = .078), and reliability, convergent validity (AVE > .50), and discriminant validity (HTMT = .418) indicators within recommended ranges in this sample. The estimated structural coefficient between collaborative climate and proactive performance was positive (β = .379) but did not reach statistical significance at α = .05 (p = .066); therefore, the results do not demonstrate a relationship between the two constructs. These findings provide preliminary psychometric evidence for the joint measurement of both constructs in this sample, and their possible implications for intrapreneurial behavior remain possibilities that require replication in larger, independent, and multi-institutional samples.

Keywords*-- collaborative climate, proactive performance, structural equation modeling, banking sector, psychometric validity.

I. Introduction

The study of organizational climate is grounded in a body of theory developed mainly since the mid-twentieth century. Likert [1] proposed that an organization's management systems determine the type of climate perceived by its members, distinguishing styles ranging from exploitative-authoritative to participative. Shortly thereafter, Litwin and Stringer [2] formalized the concept of organizational climate as the set of measurable properties of the work environment, perceived directly or indirectly by those who experience it, and capable of influencing their motivation and behavior. These early proposals constitute the foundation on which contemporary models of organizational climate have been developed, including scientific management theory, classical management theory, and human relations theory, currents that, according to a recent integrative review, remain relevant for explaining the design and functioning of present-day organizations [3]. However, none of these theories alone integrates all the factors that shape organizational dynamics, since each addresses different phenomena depending on the era and context in which it emerged [3].

In the literature published between 2020 and 2025, organizational climate has become established as a multidimensional construct in which leadership, organizational structure, and working relationships constitute its central axes, while emerging dimensions such as innovation, justice, and commitment broaden the traditional focus toward well-being, equity, and creativity [4]. Similarly, reviews on organizational culture identify innovation, teamwork, and results orientation as the most frequently studied dimensions [5], while research focused on specific sectors, such as construction, highlights occupational health and safety and working conditions as determining components of climate [6].

Proactive work performance, in turn, has been defined as a self-starting, future-oriented behavior that seeks to change work situations, job responsibilities, or oneself [7]. This behavior includes three core components: initiating better methods of work, generating ideas to improve task completion, and implementing changes in work completion efforts [8]. The most widely used scales to measure this construct are the one developed by Parker and Collins [9], which identifies four dimensions (taking charge, voice, individual innovation, and problem prevention), and the individual task proactivity scale, recognized as the most frequently used instrument in recent research [7]. These contemporary conceptualizations build on earlier theoretical developments, including Bateman and Crant's [10] proposal, which defined proactive disposition as the relatively stable tendency to change one's environment rather than passively adapting to it, and Frese and Fay's [11] concept of personal initiative, which describes a self-starting, goal-oriented behavioral pattern that persists in the face of obstacles and is considered a core component of contextual performance.

The accumulated empirical evidence supports a positive relationship between organizational climate and job performance, although its magnitude varies across contexts. A comparative review between Latin America and Asia found that organizational climate positively influences job performance, with associations ranging from weak to strong depending on the analytical model used [12]. Similar results have been reported in Ghana, where the relationship varied between weak and moderate [12]; in Norway, where a moderate relationship was identified between organizational climate and creative performance [12]; and in Cyprus, where a strong relationship was found between organizational climate

and perceived organizational performance [12]. Along the same lines, a systematic review on internal communication, organizational climate, and job performance concluded that the work environment can enhance or limit productivity [13], that timely communication facilitates the achievement of institutional goals [13], and that identifying the factors that shape an adequate climate is essential for improving staff performance [13].

Several studies have examined the mechanisms that explain this relationship. From the perspective of social exchange theory and self-determination theory, it has been shown that high-performance work systems exert both direct and indirect effects on employee voice behavior through the psychological mechanism of psychological safety, a relationship that is in turn moderated by supportive leadership [14]. In a complementary sense, work-related reflection and psychological empowerment have been found to be substantially related to innovative behavior and job crafting, two forms of proactivity, whereas participative safety played only a minor role [15].

Of particular relevance to the present study, Obeng et al. [16] found, in a sample of 371 employees of power-generation companies in Ghana, that organizational commitment partially mediated the relationship between organizational climate and employee performance, which suggests that the link between climate and performance may operate through attitudinal mechanisms. It has likewise been documented that a learning-oriented organizational climate favors proactive behavior at work, while individual, work-related, leadership, and organizational factors together constitute the main antecedents of workplace proactivity [8]. Similarly, distributed and transformational leadership have been shown to foster a climate of trust, respect, and cooperation that motivates employees to display proactive behaviors [17].

The relationship between climate and performance is not uniform, but may be conditioned by moderating variables. For example, the effect of psychological safety climate on employee in-role performance has been found to depend on the level of collective accountability, such that under low collective accountability a stronger psychological safety climate is associated with lower performance, whereas under high collective accountability the relationship reverses [18]. In the financial sector, most employees have been found to perceive their organizational structure and interpersonal relationships favorably, underscoring the importance of adequately managing the determining factors of organizational climate [19].

In the banking sector specifically, perceived organizational support has been shown to significantly influence both employee commitment and performance, directly and indirectly, through a mediating attitudinal mechanism [20], and organizational climate has been found to be strongly correlated with job performance, particularly through dimensions such as communication and working conditions [21]. However, the strength of this relationship varies across productive sectors: a recent meta-analysis found an average transformed correlation coefficient of 0.63 between organizational climate and job satisfaction across different sectors, with a 95% confidence interval of 0.38 to 0.88 [22], while other studies have identified that the stressors affecting performance differ by sector, with emotional demands predominating in health and education and job insecurity and physical demands more characteristic of the technology and manufacturing sectors, respectively [23].

Not all findings report significant relationships. It has been documented, for instance, that organizational climate does not always significantly affect job satisfaction, suggesting that the latter may depend more on employees' intrinsic motivation than on the work environment [24]. Similarly, perceived organizational support has been reported not to moderate the relationship between organizational climate and organizational commitment, suggesting that, where the organizational climate is effective, organizational support does little to strengthen or weaken employee performance [16]. These contradictory findings highlight the need to continue exploring the mechanisms and conditions under which organizational climate does, or does not, influence different performance indicators.

The measurement of these constructs has been approached through various validated instruments. In the case of organizational climate, the IPAO and BSC stand out, validated in Latin America, along with the OCM, applied internationally; the IPAO in particular reports a reliability coefficient of 0.97, evaluated under item response theory [25]. In the field of behavioral health, the Organizational Social Context scale has been the most widely used measure of organizational culture and climate [26], while the Implementation Climate Scale has obtained the highest psychometric rating among the instruments reviewed [26].

To analyze these constructs simultaneously, structural equation modeling has become established as the reference statistical technique in this field, allowing joint evaluation of measurement validity and the relationships among latent variables [27]. Recent studies using partial least squares SEM have shown that organizational climate positively affects employee performance [27] and that work engagement acts as the most relevant mediating variable between intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, organizational climate, and job performance [28]. The psychometric quality of these models is usually assessed through Cronbach's alpha, composite reliability, average variance extracted (AVE), and the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT), with AVE values of .50 or higher and HTMT values below .85 or .90, depending on the conceptual similarity between the constructs assessed, considered adequate [29]. Consistently, it has been noted that composite reliability should exceed .6 and that all indicators of a latent variable should show factor loadings above .6 to ensure adequate convergent validity [30]. Regarding the required sample size, it has been established that this depends more on the effect size associated with each structural coefficient than on the overall complexity of the model [31], [32].

Despite the growing volume of research on organizational climate and job performance, important gaps remain in the

literature. The need has been noted for longitudinal designs that could clarify the temporal relationships between organizational factors and proactive behavior [33], as well as for the development of culturally sensitive instruments that more accurately capture proactive behaviors across different organizational contexts [34]. Proactive performance, understood as self-starting, improvement-oriented behavior, is also conceptually related to the individual-level foundations of intrapreneurship within established organizations [10], [11]; examining the organizational conditions that may be associated with it, such as collaborative climate, is therefore of potential interest beyond individual performance management. In this context, the present study aims to analyze, through a structural equation model, the relationship between collaborative climate and proactive performance in a Honduran banking institution, contributing exploratory empirical evidence from a context that has received little attention in this literature.

II. Methods

A. Study Design

A quantitative, cross-sectional, non-experimental study with a correlational scope was conducted, in which a structural equation model (SEM) was used to evaluate a measurement and structural model linking collaborative climate and proactive performance. This design allowed the measurement model and the structural relationship between both constructs to be evaluated simultaneously, based on the measurement of both variables at a single point in time, without experimental manipulation. Consistent with this cross-sectional, non-probabilistic design, the results are interpreted in terms of structural association between constructs rather than causality.

B. Study Context

The study was conducted at a Honduran banking institution. Data collection took place between November and December 2025.

C. Participants

The eligible population consisted of 105 employees. Participants were selected through non-probability convenience sampling, yielding a final sample of 63 employees, equivalent to 60.0% of the eligible population, all of whom completed the measurement instrument in full, with no missing data recorded in any of the cases analyzed.

The sample was predominantly composed of employees in age-group category 2 (61.9%), followed by category 3 (22.2%), category 1 (9.5%), and category 4 (6.3%). Regarding educational attainment, 61.9% fell into category 2, 25.4% into category 3, and 12.7% into category 1. Regarding length of service at the institution, 42.9% of participants fell into category 2, 30.2% into category 4, 17.5% into category 3, and 9.5% into category 1. The age, educational attainment, and length-of-service categories correspond to the ordinal coding used in the data collection instrument; a summary of these sociodemographic characteristics is presented in Table I.

D. Sample Size Considerations

The sample size was not determined through an a priori statistical power analysis. It was determined by the accessible population: of the 105 eligible employees of the institution, 63 participated through non-probability convenience sampling (60.0% of the eligible population). Because the model was estimated through robust maximum likelihood within a covariance-based SEM framework, heuristics developed for partial least squares SEM, such as the 10-times rule, are not used in this study as evidence of sample adequacy.

Accordingly, $n = 63$ is treated as a constraint of the study. A sample of this size limits the precision of the parameter estimates and the capacity to detect the structural relationship between the two latent variables, particularly if the population effect is of small or moderate magnitude. This limitation is taken into account when interpreting the results and is discussed explicitly in Section IV.

E. Variables

Two latent variables were assessed. The first, proactive performance, was measured through six observed indicators (Item13, Item15, Item16, Item17, Item18, and Item21). The second, collaborative climate, was measured through five observed indicators (Item02, Item03, Item05, Item06, and Item14). Both constructs were operationalized as continuous latent variables within the structural equation model, estimated from the corresponding item scores.

F. Measurement Instrument

Data were obtained through a self-developed questionnaire, initially composed of 23 items (Item01 through Item23), in addition to three sociodemographic variables (age, educational attainment, and length of service). Responses were recorded using a five-point Likert-type scale.

Item content was developed to operationalize the two theoretical dimensions established in the literature reviewed in the Introduction: proactive performance items were drafted to reflect the self-starting, future-oriented behaviors described by Griffin et al. [35] and by Bateman and Crant [10], including initiating improved work methods, generating ideas, and implementing changes in task completion, while collaborative climate items were drafted to reflect the measurable, motivation-relevant properties of the work environment described by Litwin and Stringer [2], including cooperation, mutual support, and interpersonal relationships among coworkers. This conceptual mapping between item content and the constructs' theoretical definitions provided the basis for the instrument's content coherence prior to data collection.

Before its administration, the questionnaire was reviewed by three experts: two specialists in human resources and one specialist in research methodology. This expert review is the content-validity procedure documented for the instrument prior to data collection; no pilot test or quantitative content-validity index is reported for this stage.

The reliability of the complete instrument, assessed through Cronbach's alpha, was .926 in the present sample.

G. Data Collection Procedure

The survey was self-administered through the Google Forms platform. Before responding to the questionnaire, all participants received information about the voluntary nature of their participation and the confidential handling of the information.

No incomplete questionnaires or missing data were recorded; therefore, all 63 cases received were included in the statistical analysis.

H. Bias Control

To reduce potential sources of information bias and social desirability bias, participation was entirely voluntary, and the confidentiality of the data provided by employees was guaranteed. In addition, the electronic administration of the questionnaire standardized the data collection procedure and reduced researcher influence during the response process.

I. Statistical Analysis

Data were processed using Jamovi software, version 2.7, running on R version 4.5.

First, the internal consistency of the complete instrument was assessed using Cronbach's alpha. Second, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted using the Minimum Residual extraction method and Oblimin rotation, to identify the underlying factor structure and remove items with inadequate factor loadings.

Subsequently, a structural equation model (SEM) was specified and estimated using maximum likelihood (ML) with robust (Huber-White) standard errors and the Yuan-Bentler scaled test statistic, using the SEMLj module [36], based on the lavaan package [37] in R. The model jointly evaluated the measurement model of both latent variables and the structural relationship between them.

The EFA and the subsequent SEM were conducted on the same 63 cases; no independent subsample was available. Because item retention was decided on the same data used to estimate the final model, the loadings and fit indices may capitalize on chance characteristics of this sample and may therefore be optimistic. The SEM is consequently interpreted as an evaluation of the retained structure within this sample, not as an independent confirmation or external validation of that structure.

Model fit was assessed using χ^2, degrees of freedom, p-value, CFI, TLI, IFI, RMSEA (with its 95% confidence interval), and SRMR. Reliability and convergent validity of the constructs were assessed using Cronbach's alpha, McDonald's omega, and average variance extracted (AVE), calculated with the semTools package [38]. Discriminant validity was assessed using the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT). A statistical significance level of $\alpha = .05$ was used.

J. Ethical Considerations

The study was approved by an institutional ethics committee prior to the start of the research.

Employee participation was strictly voluntary and anonymous. Informed consent was obtained electronically: after being informed of the study's purpose, the voluntary nature of participation, and the confidential handling of the data, each employee's decision to access and complete the online questionnaire constituted their consent to participate. Confidentiality of the information provided was guaranteed at all times, and the data were used exclusively for academic purposes.

III. Results

A. Sociodemographic Characteristics

Table I summarizes the sociodemographic composition of the sample (N = 63).

TABLE I
SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE

Variable	Category	n	%
Age group	1	6	9.5
Age group	2	39	61.9
Age group	3	14	22.2
Age group	4	4	6.3
Education	1	8	12.7
Education	2	39	61.9
Education	3	16	25.4
Tenure	1	6	9.5
Tenure	2	27	42.9
Tenure	3	11	17.5
Tenure	4	19	30.2

Note. Categories correspond to the ordinal coding used in the data collection instrument.

B. Internal Consistency of the Instrument

The internal consistency of the instrument was assessed using Cronbach's alpha, yielding a value of .926 for the full scale (Table II).

TABLE II
CRONBACH'S ALPHA OF THE SCALE

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
Full instrument	0.926

Note. N = 63.

C. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA)

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted using the Minimum Residual extraction method and Oblimin rotation. The retained solution grouped the items into two factors. Table III presents the final factor loadings and uniqueness values of the retained items, once items that did not reach an adequate factor-grouping criterion were removed.

TABLE III
EXPLORATORY FACTOR ANALYSIS LOADINGS

Item	Factor	Loading	Uniq.
Item13	Proactive Perf.	0.597	0.568
Item15	Proactive Perf.	0.552	0.560
Item16	Proactive Perf.	0.830	0.393
Item17	Proactive Perf.	0.820	0.385
Item18	Proactive Perf.	0.808	0.322
Item21	Proactive Perf.	0.590	0.580
Item02	Collab. Climate	0.789	0.454
Item03	Collab. Climate	0.729	0.428
Item05	Collab. Climate	0.745	0.429
Item06	Collab. Climate	0.572	0.641
Item14	Collab. Climate	0.591	0.604

Note. Extraction method: Minimum Residual; rotation: Oblimin.

D. Measurement Model (SEM)

Fig. 1 presents the final structural equation model, comprising two latent variables (Collaborative Climate and Proactive Performance), their respective indicators, and the estimated structural relationship between both constructs. The model was estimated on the same 63 cases used in the EFA.



Fig. 1. Final structural equation model.

E. Model Fit

Model fit indices are presented in Table IV.

TABLE IV
STRUCTURAL MODEL FIT INDICES

χ^2	df	p	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
55.0	43	.103	0.956	0.944	0.067	0.078

Note. Classical (unscaled) fit indices. RMSEA 95% CI [.000, .114]; IFI = 0.958.

F. Standardized Factor Loadings

Table V presents the standardized factor loadings of the indicators on their respective latent variables.

TABLE V
STANDARDIZED FACTOR LOADINGS OF THE MEASUREMENT MODEL

Latent Var.	Ind.	β	z	p
Proactive Perf.	Item13	0.693	—	—
Proactive Perf.	Item15	0.630	4.50	<.001
Proactive Perf.	Item16	0.722	5.37	<.001
Proactive Perf.	Item17	0.801	4.60	<.001
Proactive Perf.	Item18	0.794	5.48	<.001
Proactive Perf.	Item21	0.642	4.31	<.001
Collab. Climate	Item02	0.719	—	—
Collab. Climate	Item03	0.737	5.52	<.001
Collab. Climate	Item05	0.890	7.74	<.001
Collab. Climate	Item06	0.555	3.99	<.001
Collab. Climate	Item14	0.637	4.51	<.001

Note. Item13 and Item02 were fixed as reference indicators (unstandardized loading = 1.00) to identify the scale of each latent variable; their standardized loadings derive from that constraint and have no associated standard error or p-value. For the remaining indicators, z values correspond to the unstandardized estimates.

G. Reliability and Convergent Validity

Composite reliability and convergent validity indicators are presented in Table VI.

TABLE VI
RELIABILITY AND CONVERGENT VALIDITY OF THE LATENT VARIABLES

Latent Variable	Alpha	Omega	AVE
Proactive Performance	0.858	0.858	0.501
Collaborative Climate	0.830	0.837	0.513

H. Discriminant Validity

Discriminant validity was assessed using the heterotrait-monotrait ratio (HTMT), presented in Table VII.

TABLE VII
HETEROTRAIT-MONOTRAIT RATIO (HTMT)

	Proactive Perf.	Collab. Climate
Proactive Perf.	1.000	0.418
Collab. Climate	0.418	1.000

I. Structural Relationships

The estimated structural relationship between the latent variables is presented in Table VIII. The standardized coefficient was positive (β = .379), but it did not reach statistical significance at α = .05 (p = .066).

TABLE VIII
STRUCTURAL RELATIONSHIP ESTIMATE

Relationship	β	SE	z	p	R^2
Proactive Perf. ← Collab. Climate	0.379	0.141	1.84	.066	0.143

Note. β = standardized coefficient; SE and z correspond to the unstandardized estimate, as reported in the SEMLj parameter table. R^2 corresponds to the endogenous variable Proactive Performance.

IV. DISCUSSION

This study aimed to analyze the relationship between collaborative climate and proactive performance using a structural equation model. In the present sample, the instrument showed high internal consistency (α = .926), and the measurement model showed composite reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity indicators within the ranges recommended in the structural equation modeling literature [29], [30]. Because these indicators were obtained in a single convenience sample of 63 employees, and because the EFA and the SEM were estimated on the same cases, they constitute initial psychometric evidence for this sample rather than evidence of a validated instrument.

The two-dimensional factor structure obtained through exploratory factor analysis, with factor loadings ranging from .552 to .830, is consistent with the conceptual distinction between collaborative climate and proactive performance as related yet distinguishable constructs. Litwin and Stringer [2] conceived organizational climate as a set of measurable properties of the work environment that shape employees' motivation and behavior, while proactive performance has been conceptualized as a self-starting behavior oriented toward changing working conditions [7]; the present factor structure is consistent with that conceptual boundary. The discriminant validity observed between both constructs in this sample (HTMT = .418, below the conservative threshold of .85 suggested in the literature [29]) further indicates that the

two variables do not appear to represent the same phenomenon measured redundantly.

The structural model's fit indices (CFI = .956, TLI = .944, RMSEA = .067, SRMR = .078) fall within the ranges generally considered acceptable for structural equation models and are comparable to the fit levels reported in previous SEM studies of organizational constructs [27], [28]. This suggests that the two-factor specification offers a reasonable representation of the association structure present in these data. However, because the retained items were selected through an EFA conducted on the same cases, these indices may be optimistic owing to capitalization on chance, and the structure requires replication in an independent sample.

Regarding the structural relationship between both constructs, the estimated standardized coefficient was positive ($\beta = .379$), but it did not reach statistical significance at $\alpha = .05$ ($p = .066$). Consequently, the results do not demonstrate a relationship between collaborative climate and proactive performance: at the conventional significance level, the absence of an association in the population cannot be ruled out, and, given the cross-sectional, correlational design, no causal or practical effect can be inferred. Descriptively, the point estimate falls within the heterogeneous range reported in previous studies, which extends from weak associations in Ghana [12] to moderate ones in Norway [12] and strong ones in Cyprus [12] and in the Latin American banking sector [21], in a literature already characterized by considerable variation across contexts [22]; given that the coefficient was not significant and was estimated with limited precision, this comparison is only descriptive.

Two non-mutually exclusive considerations may help to understand why the coefficient did not reach statistical significance. The first is statistical: with $n = 63$, the precision of the estimates and the capacity to detect a coefficient of this magnitude at the conventional significance level are limited, and the wide confidence interval obtained for RMSEA (95% CI [.000, .114]) is consistent with that limited precision. The probability of detecting a population effect depends chiefly on the size of the sample relative to the magnitude of the effect, rather than on the complexity of the model as such.

The second consideration is organizational and remains speculative, since it was not tested in this study. In banking institutions, collaboration among employees is often shaped by formal procedures, compliance requirements, and hierarchical reporting lines rather than emerging spontaneously from peer interaction; where cooperative behavior is largely procedurally mandated, variance in perceived collaborative climate across employees of the same institution may be compressed, which could attenuate the detectable covariation between climate and proactive behavior. A single-institution sample restricts the range of organizational conditions represented in the data, which works in the same direction. Read together with Obeng et al. [16], who found that the relationship between organizational climate and employee performance was partially mediated by organizational commitment, it is possible that climate alone is an incomplete explanation: mechanisms such as psychological safety [14] or work-related reflection [15], neither of which was measured here, have been shown elsewhere to carry explanatory weight, and their omission from the present model could contribute to the non-significant coefficient obtained.

With respect to intrapreneurship, proactive performance shares conceptual features with the individual-level foundations of intrapreneurial behavior [10], [11]. However, because the structural coefficient was not statistically significant, the present results do not allow conclusions about whether fostering a collaborative climate would increase proactive or intrapreneurial behavior. This possible link should be treated as a hypothesis for future research rather than as a basis for organizational recommendations.

A. Study Limitations

The present study has several limitations that should be considered when interpreting its results. First, the cross-sectional, correlational design precludes establishing temporal precedence or any type of causal relationship between collaborative climate and proactive performance; the coefficients obtained should be understood exclusively as measures of structural association between the constructs at a specific point in time.

Second, the sample consisted of 63 employees from a single banking institution, selected through non-probability convenience sampling. This characteristic limits the generalizability of the findings to other organizations, to the Honduran banking sector as a whole, and to other productive sectors or geographic contexts, particularly considering that the literature has documented appreciable variations in the magnitude of the relationship between organizational climate and performance depending on the sector analyzed [23], [22].

Third, the sample size was determined by the accessible population rather than by an a priori power analysis. With $n = 63$, the precision of the estimates and the capacity to detect the structural relationship were limited, which may have contributed to the main structural coefficient not reaching statistical significance.

Fourth, the EFA used to retain items and the SEM used to evaluate the resulting structure were estimated on the same 63 cases. This procedure entails a risk of capitalization on chance, so the loadings and fit indices may be optimistic. The two-factor structure has not been cross-validated and should be replicated in an independent sample.

Fifth, information was collected through a self-developed, self-administered questionnaire, completed anonymously and voluntarily via an electronic platform. Although these conditions favor response honesty, the presence of social desirability or common method variance bias cannot be entirely ruled out, given that both latent variables were reported by the same source using the same instrument.

Finally, although the instrument was reviewed by three experts before its administration, it was designed specifically for this study and has no prior validation history in previous research; therefore, its psychometric properties, although adequate in the present sample, have not yet been tested in other populations or organizational contexts.

B. Future Research

Future research should employ longitudinal designs that allow examination of the temporal stability of the relationship between collaborative climate and proactive performance [33], as well as larger samples drawn from multiple organizations, with sample sizes planned in advance for covariance-based SEM, to assess whether the association observed here is replicated and generalizes across institutions and sectors. The two-factor structure should be tested through confirmatory factor analysis in independent samples. It would also be pertinent to incorporate mediating and moderating variables identified in previous studies, such as psychological safety [14], collective accountability [18], or work-related reflection [15], in order to clarify the mechanisms that may link collaborative climate with workplace proactivity. Finally, it is suggested that the instrument be evaluated in other populations, and that culturally sensitive scales be developed for the Central American context [34].

V. Conclusions

This study set out to analyze, through a structural equation model, the relationship between collaborative climate and proactive performance among 63 employees of a single Honduran banking institution, selected through convenience sampling. In this sample, the retained two-factor measurement model showed acceptable reliability, convergent validity, discriminant validity, and fit indicators. The estimated structural coefficient was positive ($\beta = .379$) but did not reach statistical significance at $\alpha = .05$ ($p = .066$); therefore, the study does not demonstrate a relationship, a causal effect, or a practical effect of collaborative climate on proactive performance.

The contribution of the study is exploratory. It provides initial evidence from a Central American banking context, an instrument whose two-factor structure can be tested in independent samples, and a point estimate that future studies may take into account when planning their samples. Because the EFA and the SEM were conducted on the same cases and the data come from a single institution, the psychometric results should not be interpreted as external validation of the instrument, nor should the findings be generalized to the banking sector.

Regarding intrapreneurship, the proposition that a collaborative climate could favor the self-starting, improvement-oriented behavior associated with intrapreneurial activity remains a possibility that requires further research, preferably with larger and multi-institutional samples, confirmatory designs, and longitudinal data, before organizational recommendations can be formulated.

References

[1] R. Likert, The Human Organization: Its Management and Value. New York, NY, USA: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

[2] G. H. Litwin and R. A. Stringer, Motivation and Organizational Climate. Boston, MA, USA: Division of Research, Harvard Business School, 1968.

[3] A. L. Iglesias Armenteros, J. M. Torres Esperón, and Y. Mora Pérez, "Referentes teóricos que sustentan el clima organizacional: revisión integrativa," Medisur, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 562–569, 2019.

[4] C. L. Restrepo Jiménez, H. Muñoz Hernández, C. Zapata Molina, and K. J. Restrepo Londoño, "Clima organizacional como factor determinante del desempeño empresarial: revisión sistemática sobre componentes fundamentales," Revista Venezolana de Gerencia, vol. 30, no. 14, pp. 1428–1446, 2025, doi: 10.52080/rvgluz.30.especial14.35.

[5] A. Tadesse Bogale and K. Lemi Debela, "Organizational culture: A systematic review," Cogent Business & Management, vol. 11, 2024, doi: 10.1080/23311975.2024.2340129.

[6] M. I. Puente Riofrío, S. J. Mostacero Llerena, and G. G. Uquillas Granizo, "Organizational climate in construction companies: A systematic review," Administrative Sciences, vol. 14, no. 51, pp. 1–26, 2024, doi: 10.3390/admsci14030051.

[7] P. A. Satwika, F. Suhariadi, and Samian, "Exploring proactive work behavior: A scoping review of research trends and theories," Cogent Business & Management, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 1–23, 2025, doi: 10.1080/23311975.2025.2465904.

[8] A. Setia Pratama, A. Rizki Sridadi, A. Eliyana, R. D. Anggraini, and N. L. Mohd Kamil, "A systematic review of proactive work behavior: Future research recommendation," The Journal of Behavioral Science, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 136–151, 2023.

[9] S. K. Parker and C. G. Collins, "Taking stock: Integrating and differentiating multiple proactive behaviors," Journal of Management, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 633–662, 2010, doi: 10.1177/0149206308321554.

[10] T. S. Bateman and J. M. Crant, "The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates," Journal of Organizational Behavior, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 103–118, 1993, doi: 10.1002/job.4030140202.

[11] M. Frese and D. Fay, "Personal initiative: An active performance concept for work in the 21st century," Research in Organizational Behavior, vol. 23, pp. 133–187, 2001, doi: 10.1016/S0191-3085(01)23005-6.

[12] L. E. Murillo Núñez, "Efecto del clima organizacional institucional en el desempeño laboral: una revisión," Investigación & Desarrollo, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 338–371, 2026, doi: 10.14482/indes.34.01.698.520.

[13] M. E. Angeles Cabrera, J. Chambi Rosa, J. A. Quispe Acosta, and D. Y. Ulloa De la Cruz, "Comunicación interna, clima organizacional y desempeño laboral en las organizaciones: una revisión sistemática," Revista INVECOM, vol. 1, pp. 1–8, 2025, doi: 10.5281/zenodo.18055080.

[14] J. Abdul Jabbar, S. Haider, and M. Usman Qureshi, "Moderated mediation between high performance work systems (HPWS) and employee voice behavior: The role of psychological safety and supportive leadership," Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, vol. 39, no. 3, pp. 145–156, 2023, doi: 10.5093/jwop2023a15.

[15] G. Messmann, "Fostering proactive behaviour: The role of work-related reflection, psychological empowerment, and participative safety for innovative behaviour and job crafting," International Journal of Training and Development, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 99–116, 2023, doi: 10.1111/ijtd.12286.

[16] A. F. Obeng, P. E. Quansah, E. Cobbinah, and S. A. Danso, "Organizational climate and employee performance: Examining the mediating role of organizational commitment and moderating role of perceived organizational support," International Journal of Human Resource Studies, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 238–262, 2020, doi: 10.5296/ijhrs.v10i3.17395.

[17] P. Arya Satwika and F. Suhariadi, "Newcomer proactive work behavior: A scoping review," in Proc. ICPS 2023, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 234–242, 2023, doi: 10.31098/bmss.v3i3.668.

[18] L. Eldor, M. Hodor, and P. Cappelli, "The limits of psychological safety: Nonlinear relationships with performance," Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, vol. 177, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2023.104255.

[19] A. Huamán Cuy, "Clima organizacional y desempeño laboral en una Caja Municipal," INNOVA Research Journal, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 174–188, 2023, doi: 10.33890/innova.v8.n2.2023.2276.

[20] R. Susanty, L. Prasetyo, A. Adityo, and A. Budi Prasetya, "Testing a JD-R based SEM model of person-organization fit, person-job fit, and perceived organizational support toward employee performance: The mediating role of engagement in Jakarta's banking sector," Jurnal Konseling dan Pendidikan, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 122–130, 2025, doi: 10.29210/1153000.

[21]M. F. Arriola Peña, "Clima organizacional y desempeño laboral en trabajadores del área de banca de negocios de una entidad financiera en Trujillo," Undergraduate thesis, Universidad Privada del Norte, Trujillo, Peru, 2021.
[22]L. A. Geraldo Campos and K. L. Haro Zea, "Is there a relationship between organisational climate and job satisfaction? A view from a systematic review and meta-analysis," World Review of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 23–53, 2025, doi: 10.1504/WREMSD.2025.10073100.
[23]H. Kaur and A. Haque, "The impact of occupational stress on the performance of employees in competitive sectors: Systematic review," International Journal of Applied Business and Management Studies, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2024.
[24]D. Julindrastuti and I. Karyadi, "The influence of organizational climate on employee performance with job satisfaction as a mediating variable," Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Administrasi Publik, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 235–242, 2025.
[25]D. R. Cardona Echeverri and R. Zambrano Cruz, "Revisión de instrumentos de evaluación de clima organizacional," Estudios Gerenciales, vol. 30, no. 131, pp. 184–189, 2014, doi: 10.1016/j.estger.2014.04.007.
[26]B. J. Powell et al., "Measures of organizational culture, organizational climate, and implementation climate in behavioral health: A systematic review," Implementation Research and Practice, vol. 2, pp. 1–29, 2021, doi: 10.1177/26334895211018862.
[27]M. F. Fadilah, A. Armanu, and D. Wirawan Irawanto, "Organizational climate, organizational culture and employee performance: The mediating role of job satisfaction," Jurnal Pendidikan Bisnis dan Manajemen, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 136–146, 2021, doi: 10.17977/um003v7i22021p134.
[28]S. L. Simowibowo, Ardi, M. Pink Berlianto, and R. A. Sunarjo, "The effect of intrinsic motivation, self-efficacy, and organizational climate on job performance of marketing division employees at PT.XYZ," Journal Research of Social Science, Economics, and Management, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 4261–4274, 2025, doi: 10.59141/jrssem.v5i4.1195.
[29]J. F. Hair, J. Risher, M. Sarstedt, and C. M. Ringle, "When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM," European Business Review, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 2–24, 2019, doi: 10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203.
[30]G. Dash and J. Paul, "CB-SEM vs PLS-SEM methods for research in social sciences and technology forecasting," Technological Forecasting & Social Change, vol. 173, pp. 1–11, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121092.
[31]J. F. Hair Jr., G. T. M. Hult, C. M. Ringle, and M. Sarstedt, A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: SAGE Publications, 2017.
[32]N. Kock and P. Hadaya, "Minimum sample size estimation in PLS-SEM: The inverse square root and gamma-exponential methods," Information Systems Journal, 2016, doi: 10.1111/isj.12131.
[33]S. Asif and M. Saeed Shahbaz, "Project success through organizational climate and work behavior: Systematic literature review," Journal of Organizational Behavior Research, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2025, doi: 10.51847/cUhkprt6DJ.
[34]S. Yalçınyiğit and G. Karaçay, "A glimpse into employee proactive behavior: The followership perspective," Current Psychology, vol. 44, pp. 13037–13061, 2025, doi: 10.1007/s12144-025-08048-8.
[35]M. A. Griffin, A. Neal, and S. K. Parker, "A new model of work role performance: Positive behavior in uncertain and interdependent contexts," Academy of Management Journal, vol. 50, no. 2, pp. 327–347, 2007, doi: 10.5465/amj.2007.24634438.
[36]M. Gallucci and S. Jentschke, "SEMLj: jamovi SEM Analysis" [jamovi module], 2021. [Online]. Available: https://semlj.github.io/
[37]Y. Rosseel, "lavaan: An R package for structural equation modeling," Journal of Statistical Software, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 1–36, 2012, doi: 10.18637/jss.v048.i02.
[38]T. D. Jorgensen, S. Pornprasertmanit, A. M. Schoemann, and Y. Rosseel, "semTools: Useful tools for structural equation modeling" [R package], 2019. [Online]. Available: https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=semTools