THE APPROACH OF MANAGERS REGARDING INNOVATIVE WORK BEHAVIOUR

Yulia Fithriany Rahmah[1], M Sandi Marta[2*], Mohamad Anton Athoillah[3], Diana Farid[4]
[1,2,3]Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia; [4]Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Darul Arqom Muhammadiyah Garut, Indonesia.
Email: [1]yulia.fithriany@uinsgd.ac.id, [2*]sandimarta@uinsgd.ac.id, [3]anton_athoillah@uinsgd.ac.id, [4]dianafarid71@yaoo.com

Abstract

Purpose of the study: Although many factors can influence innovative work behaviour, we may not know exactly which practices make a difference in influencing innovative work behaviour. This study aims to determine which positive and negative factors can affect the IWB theory understanding.

Methodology: This study used a qualitative approach by a systematic review of the literature, the authors conducted a content analysis of 32 international journals.

Main Findings: The analysis results gave evidence that transformational leadership, knowledge sharing, and organizational learning were positive factors in creating innovative work behaviour. Meanwhile, organizational politics, job insecurity, and transactional leadership were negative factors that could decrease innovative work behaviour.

Applications of this study: The results of this study provide practical information for professional leaders and managers to develop employees' innovative work behaviour that might help build an innovative environment.

Novelty/Originality of this study: This study has a difference in terms of study approaches by looking at positive and negative factors that could affect innovative work behaviour in a literature review technique.

Keywords: Transformational Leadership, Organizational Learning, Knowledge Sharing, Innovative Work Behaviour, Organizational Politics, Job Insecurity, Transactional Leadership.

INTRODUCTION

In a present company environment, innovation is an essential factor for dealing with rapid economic changes, especially if the company desires to have a competitive advantage (Nurjaman, Marta, Eliyana, Kurniasari, & Kurniasari, 2019). Innovation is an integral part of organizational performance (Atitumpong & Badir, 2018). Innovation not only prepares an organization for profit but also maintains internal process efficiency based on excellent production process and service (Widmann, Messmann, & Mulder, 2016). It may be noted that innovation is the primary strategy to be undertaken by organizations to achieve organizational goals (Slater, Mohr, & Sengupta, 2014).

Organizational innovation provides advantages in responding to challenges quickly and can create new opportunities (Bos-Nehles, Renkema, & Janssen, 2017). Many previous studies of innovation have focused on the organizational level. Meanwhile, many studies have tried to approach innovation at the individual level because innovation comes from employees within the organization. Innovative work behaviour is a very complicated process that often faces difficulties, obstacles, and frustration since the innovative work approach requires investment in the form of cognitive effort. Innovative individuals not only face a hard situation to complete the stages of innovation but also face rejection regarding their innovation efforts (Agarwal, 2016). Therefore innovative work behaviour requires very high capital to support the sustainability of the innovation.

Improved work behaviour of employee innovation functions to achieve organizational goals (Hu, Horng, & Sun, 2009). It is very difficult for a company manager to create and especially maintain employees' innovation behaviour. This is a big challenge for a manager to find ways to develop and maintain innovative work behaviour (T. T. Kim & Lee, 2013). How managers motivate their subordinates to create innovative work behaviour is a question in a variety of organizational studies. This article put effort into explaining what must be done by a manager in creating employees who behave innovative work and what must be considered so that company employees do not lose their innovative work behaviour. Managers need a broad understanding of the mechanisms and processes of developing innovative work behaviour at the employee level so that they can know the shape and stimulus of innovative work behaviour so that they can read challenges that come from inside and outside of the organization.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Innovative work behaviour

The terms creativity and innovation are often encountered in several studies. The difference between the two concepts lies in their substances (West & Farr, 1990). Nonetheless, there are several recent consensuses on the definitions of creativity and innovation. Creativity is related to the creation of new and useful ideas, while innovation is related to the implementation of new and useful ideas (Beer, 2006). Scientists and practitioners have proven the core role of

innovation in the long-term sustainability of the organization since innovation is related to the introduction process and intentional application to roles, ideas of groups or organizations, processes, products, and procedures (West & Farr, 1990). According to Scott & Bruce (1994), innovation consists of three dimensions, namely idea generation, idea promotion, and idea realization. Idea generation deals with generating of novel and useful ideas in the organization's actions. Idea promotion is a task whereby employees bind ideas that have been generated by finding sponsors with the influence and power needed. Furthermore, idea realization deals with the implementation of ideas that appear perfectly. Innovation is closely related to employee behaviour in the organization. Employees' behaviour in carrying out creativity and innovation in organizations is known as innovative work behaviour (IWB).

IWB can be characterized as "the intentional creation, introduction, and application of novel ideas within a work role, group or organization, to benefit role performance, the group, or the organization" (Janssen, 2000). According to De Jong & Den Hartog, (2010) IWB consists of four stages, namely first, the idea of exploration deals with the process of finding an opportunity to improve conditions or respond to threats quickly; Second, idea generation deals with the process of combining information and concepts in solving problems and improving performance; Third, idea championing deals with the process of promoting ideas by seeking support and finding the right coalition for the use of ideas; Fourth, idea implementation deals with making innovation as part of the work process and behaviour in the development of a product.

The development of employee's behaviour is influenced by internal and external factors (Fuller & Marler, 2009). Internal factors are based on the willingness of the employees themselves to carry out the work provided. And external factors come from environmental stimuli where the employee is located. In organizations, external factors that influence employee behaviour are very important to consider. Among these factors is leadership, transformational and transactional forms of leadership have a significant impact on organizational progress, especially employee innovation behaviour (Afsar, Badir, & Saeed, 2014; Peiterse, Knippenberg, Scippers, & Stam, 2010).

Leadership that focuses on organizational progress and employee well-being creates work comfort. While leadership that is not oriented to employee welfare and organizational development can worsen organizational performance. Transformational leadership is leadership that encourages subordinates to develop, so that loyalty and respect emerge in employees (Choi, Cundiff, Kim, & Akhatib, 2018). Furthermore, transactional leadership is a way for a leader to encourage his subordinates to do work based on transactions for the benefit of both parties (Peiterse et al., 2010; Rank, Nelson, Allen, & Xu, 2009). This leadership might be right for employees who want to get a big profit, but in the process of innovation, transactional leadership slows employee innovation.

On the other hand, organizational learning and knowledge sharing are factors that can improve employees' innovative work behaviour. Organizational learning is the process of increasing the abilities and skills of employees through the knowledge and understanding provided by the organization (Awang, Sapie, Hussain, Ishak, & Yusof, 2019; Battistelli, Odoardi, Vandenberghe, Di Napoli, & Piccione, 2019). While knowledge sharing is the process of providing knowledge by organizations to employees to improve employee capabilities (Akhavan, Hosseini, Abbasi, & Manteghi, 2015; W. Kim & Park, 2017; Radaelli, Lettieri, Mura, & Spiller, 2014). Organizational learning and knowledge sharing are inseparable from the role of the organization. Therefore, organizations must actively provide knowledge to employees so that employees have creativity and innovation (Purba, 2009).

Other factors that can influence innovative work behaviour are organizational politics and job security. Organizational politics is the perception of individuals related to the politics of their work environment that causes organizational injustice to employees (Ferris et al., 2005; Kacmar & Carlson, 1997). Whereas job insecurity is an employee's concern for all future work about its sustainability (Choi et al., 2018; De Spiegelaere, Van Gyes, De Witte, Niesen, & Van Hootegem, 2014).

METHODOLOGY

This study attempts to find out the positive and negative factors that can influence innovative work behaviour. This study is armed with a qualitative approach that relies on the study, discovery, depiction, and explanation of the idiosyncrasy of the phenomenon discussing their findings. Furthermore, the author conducted a systematic literature review analysis of previously published literature. The use of previously published literature as a source of data is a core requirement in carrying out systematic literature review methods to complete this research. The systematic review, according to Mulrow (1994), is the most efficient and effective method for identifying and evaluating reputable international journals. Systematic review or meta-analysis is a scientific method for investigating prior research studies that have been determined based on criteria to build scientific novelty about the field of study studied.

The procedure for determining reputable international journals used indexed criteria on Google Scholar and Scopus, articles used were those written in English and published from 2009 to 2019. From the selection results using these criteria, there were 32 articles to be used to complete this literature review study. Analysis using the literature review method was applied to understand deeply about positive and negative factors that can influence innovative work behaviour. This method has the opportunity to be able to find out which parts have not been discussed by previous researchers (Tranfield, Denyer, & Smart, 2003).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The emergence of Innovative Work Behaviour

The intentions and attitudes of the organization build the general perceptions of employees, the policies and procedures applied by the organization to employees as well as organizational representatives can link employee attitudes and behaviour with their superiors based on the treatment they receive (Levinson, 1965). Therefore, IWB is a behaviour that implements ideas based on the results of deep thought. The emphasis of concepts in the creation and development of IWB can be explained in the formation of transformational leadership, knowledge sharing, organizational learning.

Transformational Leadership

According to Burns (1978), transformational leadership is leadership that inspires subordinates through a vision that makes the spirit and goals challenging so that subordinates are motivated to move forward. Meanwhile, according to Bednall, E. Rafferty, Shipton, Sanders, & J. Jackson (2018), transformational leadership is described as a process in which leaders play ideal role models, stimulate and encourage innovative work behaviour, provide inspirational motivation and engage in supporting and guide followers to achieve the organization's shared vision and goals. Furthermore, according to Bass (1991), the dimensions of transformational leadership are idealized influence, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, and inspirational motivation. Transformational leadership has an enormous impact on innovative behaviour. Leadership formed by coaching employees can create creative and innovative employee behaviour (Bednall et al., 2018).

A study conducted by Afsar, Badir, & Saeed (2014), stated that transformational leadership had a positive effect on the innovative work behaviour of corporate employees in China. Transformational leadership is filled with motivation, self-confidence, and increased awareness of the vision so that employees feel they are getting a stimulus in doing creativity and innovation (Rank et al., 2009). The study is also supported by Choi, Kim, Ullah, & Kang (2016), that transformational leadership was a significant factor in improving employees' innovative work behaviour. Furthermore, Afsar & Umrani (2019), conducted a further study related to transformational leadership on innovative work behaviour. The results also showed a similar result that transformational leadership was a crucial factor in encouraging employees to have innovative behaviour.

Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge sharing is the exchange of knowledge carried out by individuals in an organization with other individuals in the form of relevant information, advice, and expertise (Bartol & Srivastava, 2002). The dimensions of knowledge sharing are: First, knowledge donating is the process by which individuals communicate their intellectual property to other individuals. Second, knowledge collecting is the process of collecting knowledge through consultation to obtain the knowledge possessed by their colleagues (Hooff & Ridder, 2004). In the organizational context, sharing knowledge determines organizational results, because sharing is needed in the organizational environment (Akhavan et al., 2015; Bartol & Srivastava, 2002; W. Kim & Park, 2017). Besides, employees can enhance their learning and innovative abilities by sharing skills and expertise related to tasks with their coworkers (Hu et al., 2009). As such, we assume that sharing knowledge helps generate novel ideas and learning that facilitates further business opportunities to innovate and support employees' innovative behaviour (T. T. Kim & Lee, 2013).

A study conducted by Mura, Lettieri, Radaelli, & Spiller (2013), explained that knowledge sharing had enormous potential in improving innovative work behaviour. When an employee shares knowledge indirectly, he will activate the learning process itself, as a result, the knowledge of the employee increases. The study was reaffirmed by W. Kim & Park (2017), which showed a similar result that knowledge sharing affected employees' innovative work behaviour. According to the authors, when individuals tried to share knowledge, they not only transferred information to others, but they also attempted to describe, combine, and 'translate' it into a clear and relevant form to the recipient. A study conducted by Akhavan, Hosseini, Abbasi, & Manteghi (2015), also supported the positive effect of knowledge sharing on innovative work behaviour. According to the study, knowledge sharing acted as an element that encouraged individuals to create knowledge and turn it into a greater force. When employees were more involved in knowledge sharing, they internalized much knowledge for other employees to improve their innovative work behaviour. Likewise, a study conducted by Helmy, Adawiyah, & Banani (2019), that knowledge sharing allowed people to work on existing knowledge inside and outside the organization so that they could increase their capacity in producing creative ideas that had an impact on employees' innovative work behaviour.

Organizational learning

A continuous learning process forms human behaviour. Learning plays an essential role in ensuring that knowledge must be replenished continuously and updated to enable work behaviour that is suitable for changes in a competitive environment (Lemon & Sahota, 2004). According to Fiol & Lyles (1985), organizational learning is the process of increasing action through better knowledge and understanding, whereas according to Sapie, Hussain, Awang, & Ishak (2015), organizational learning is a process where knowledge is generated through organizational relationships and the environment that is developed. Learning is a factor that can directly affect innovation (Amara, Landry, Becheikh, &

Ouimet, 2008). Therefore, mastering knowledge with learning can increase the capacity for innovation and becomes a major source of organizational change (Khaki, Erfanian Khanzadeh, & Babaki Rad, 2017).

A study conducted by Sapie et al. (2015), stated that the effect of organizational learning could improve the innovative work behaviour of manufacturing company employees in Malaysia. The study was supported by Lin & Lee (2017), who conducted a study in Southern Taiwan that showed that organizational learning had an enormous impact on the formation of innovative work behaviour of employees. According to the authors, the learning process in the organization triggered employees in finding innovative thoughts in solving problems by conducting group interactions. Furthermore, Awang, Sapie, Hussain, Ishak, & Yusof (2019) conducted further study in manufacturing companies in Malaysia, which showed a similar finding that organizational learning had a significant effect on increasing innovative work behaviour. The study is also strengthened by a study conducted by Battistelli, Odoardi, Vandenberghe, Di Napoli, & Piccione (2019), which stated that organizational learning formed by organizations for the benefit of employee mastery in their work and tasks could encourage employees to bring out their creativity so that innovative work behaviour appeared in employees.

Loss of innovative work behaviour

The formation of innovative work behaviour in an organization is not always smooth, so it requires extensive knowledge about factors that can reduce innovative work behaviour. Organizational politics, job insecurity, and transactional leadership are the focus of this discussion, so this study is very different from the previous discussion which focused on positive factors in the formation of innovative work behaviour.

Organizational politics

Organizational politics is the degree to which individuals see their work environment full of politics, then employees know that organization behaves unfairly (Kacmar & Carlson, 1997). More clearly, organizational politics deals with illegitimate, self-serving activities and is strategically designed to benefit and protect one's interests, because it often sacrifices the organization and its members (Rosen, Ferris, Brown, Chen, & Yan, 2014). Besides, an employee who views that politics is widespread in his organization, the impression tactic becomes an appropriate way of convincing others (Zivnuska, Kacmar, Witt, Carlson, & Bratton, 2004). If political practice dominates the work environment, it will harm employee creativity and innovation(Rasyid & Marta, 2020). Politics emphasizes more on ways to get position and power in a way that can harm others. Therefore, politics must be avoided in all organizational processes so that innovation can increase among employees (Bozeman, Hochwarier, Perrewe, & Brymer, 2001; Kacmar, Bozeman, Carlson, & Anthony, 1999).

A study conducted by Abbas & Raja (2014) showed that organizational politics could weaken innovative work behaviour. According to them, organizational politics tended to ignore justice aspects in the organization, especially in the reward and promotion system, as a result, employees might experience stress levels on their work. A study conducted by Agarwal (2016), stated that organizational politics harmed innovative work behaviour. The organizational environment filled with politics will form the employee's perception that the work they do has no meaning in the sight of their superiors. They consider superiors more concerned with closeness than the quality of work that employees provide.

Job Insecurity

Another factor that can reduce proactive employee behaviour is job insecurity in the organization. Job insecurity is an employee's overall concern about the continued existence of the job or its sustainability in the future (Cheng & Chan, 2008). Meanwhile, according to Marques, Galende, Cruz, & Ferreira (2014), job insecurity relates to the perception of the inability of employees to maintain the continuity of their expectations in threatened condition. Unsecure environments make employees reduce their motivation to do the best for the organization (Cheng & Chan, 2008; Marques et al., 2014).

A study conducted by De Spiegelaere, Van Gyes, De Witte, Niesen, & Van Hootegem (2014), that job insecurity harmed innovative work behaviour of employees in organization because employees who did not feel secure in their job also felt less obliged to do it to reduce motivation to complete work beyond the scope of their normal job description. This situation can be called "disinvolvement syndrome". The study is also supported by Marques et al. (2014), that job insecurity could weaken the innovative work behaviour of employees in the organization. Condition of work insecurity felt by employees in the organization may cause a sense of helplessness, difficulty in accessing essential resources, additional workloads, or even organizational limitations in using resources to innovate. A subsequent study conducted by Choi, Cundiff, Kim, & Akhatib (2018), stated that if employees had the perception of not having job security, then it could weaken the potentials possessed by those employees in developing their creativity.

Transactional leadership

According to Liu, Liu, & Zeng (2011), Transactional leadership is a condition where the followers agree with, accept, or obey the leaders in terms of exchange of rewards and resources to avoid actions that can harm the organization. In other words, transactional leadership tends to make exchanges where followers are valued based on the achievement of predetermined goals (Bass, 1991; Denti & Hemlin, 2012). According to Sethibe & Steyn (2017), transactional leader

strategies in managing individuals are divided into two components namely Contingency reward and Management-by-exception. Transaction-based leadership negatively affects employee creativity and innovation.

A study conducted by Jansen, Vera, & Crossan (2009), evidenced that transactional leadership could weaken explorative innovation in organizations. Likewise, a study conducted by Rank, Nelson, Allen, & Xu (2009), stated that transactional leadership had a negative influence on employee innovation and performance. The reason why transactional leadership negatively influenced innovation was that transactional leadership focused on supervising employees, and as a result, employees felt less free in issuing their ideas so that their intrinsic motivation employees decreased. The study result is also supported by Peiterse, Knippenberg, Scippers, & Stam (2010), that transactional leadership harmed innovative work behaviour because transactional leadership focuses on performance rather than a stimulus to undertake new activities. Furthermore, there is inherent supervision of employees in the transactional leadership process to reduce employee creativity (Peiterse et al., 2010). Denti & Hemlin (2012) also tried to confirm the study and concluded that transactional leadership could weaken the innovative work behaviour of employees in the organization.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results of the research using the systematic literature review method, it can be concluded that managers' perceptions regarding factors that can influence employee's innovative work behaviour can be classified into two approaches. First, the positive factors of managers' perceptions related to transformational leadership, knowledge sharing, and organizational learning. Transformational leadership shapes employee perceptions that their leaders have more responsibility to employees (Afsar & Umrani, 2019). This perception drives employees to behave in innovation. Likewise, knowledge sharing can trigger employee innovation behaviour because the knowledge shared with employees forms trust in the organization (Akhavan et al., 2015). Furthermore, organizational learning can trigger innovation because organizational learning simplifies the process of employee tasks (Lin & Lee, 2017). Therefore, transformational leadership, knowledge sharing, and organizational learning had a positive effect on improving the innovative work behaviour of employees in the company. This means that the higher the transformational leadership, knowledge sharing, and organizational learning carried out by the organization, the higher the employee's innovative work behaviour.

Second, negative factors of manager's perception related to organizational politics, job insecurity, and transactional leadership. Organizational politics form the mindset of employees associated with the organizational treatment of employees themselves, if the organization treats employees unjustly, innovation will not emerge (Rasyid & Marta, 2020). Likewise, the perceived security perceived by employees in their work is the essential factor in building innovation behaviour (De Spiegelaere et al., 2014). Furthermore, transactional leadership in organizations only encourages regular employee performance rather than employee innovation behaviour (Peiterse et al., 2010). Therefore, organizational politics, job insecurity, and transactional leadership harmed the innovative work behaviour of employees in the company. This means that the higher organizational politics, job security, and transactional leadership in the organizational environment, the weaker the innovative work behaviour of employees in the organization.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE STUDY

This study certainly has limitations. First, this study only focused on the literature review which had not been empirically tested by researchers in the work environment in Indonesia. It is essential to conduct an empirical study in the Indonesian work environment to know what factors are positively and negatively related to innovative work behaviour. Second, this study only used a direct relationship between variables so that it ignored media and moderation variables. In future studies, it is expected to use mediating variables as well as moderating variables in examining the factors that influence innovative work behaviour. Third, the method was not free from bias because it was influenced by previous experience and existing knowledge, and had an error due to equating different contexts in the same way. This means that the same problem in different contexts cannot always be answered with the same solution. Therefore, to reduce this potential problem, further study is recommended to more clearly determine the condition that can trigger innovative work behaviour.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Before implementing the practices of transformational leadership, knowledge sharing, organizational learning in achieving IWB, organizations need group and work unit decisions for their willingness to take action. The study showed that IWB could be enhanced by transformational leadership, knowledge sharing, organizational learning. If leaders in a company desire to encourage IWB implementation among their workers, they have to implement the joint decisions they make in their composition and tasks. The job must be designed to create challenge and encouragement for the employees to carry out their job with passion and effort. Additional rewards also need to be implemented so that workers are motivated to increase their knowledge. Employees in organizations need to be accompanied by financial reward encouragement so that the balance of work passion can be created. After all, blue-collar workers see the financial reward as an advantage when they increase IWB (De Spiegelaere, Van Gyes, & Van Hootegem, 2012).

Furthermore, to avoid organizational political practices, leaders must have to provide fair work, fair positions, fair incentives, and fair opportunities for employees so that political practices do not interfere with company processes. Besides, the creation of a safe environment and career clarity must also be carried out by the company so that employees

can enhance their creativity and innovation. Forms of employee security must be outlined in standard operational procedures known to employees. Another factor that needs to be considered by leaders in the leadership problem that they do, if the leader wants innovation to increase in the organization then the leader must avoid transactional leadership since the leadership does not foster creativity but adds a further burden to employees. Transactional leadership is only focused on performance rather than employee creativity. The right method that leaders can do is to convey the organization's vision and apply it to employees. Leadership in line with the organization's vision creates employee awareness to be responsible for the organization.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

In this study, the first author provides concepts and theories in completing the literature review. The second author as a correspondent writer responsible for this research. The third author, determine the research method and provides a reference source in this study. The fourth author, carry out an analysis of the results of the study.

REFERENCES

1. Abbas, M., & Raja, U. (2014). Impact of Perceived Organizational Politics on Supervisory-Rated Innovative Performance and Job Stress: Evidence from Pakistan. *Journal of Advanced Management Science*, *2*(2), 158–162. https://doi.org/10.12720/joams.2.2.158-162

2. Afsar, B., Badir, Y., & Saeed, B. (2014). Transformational leadership and innovative work behaviour. *Industrial Management and Data Systems*, *114*(8), 1270–1300. https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-05-2014-0152

3. Afsar, B., & Umrani, W. A. (2019). Transformational leadership and innovative work behaviour: The role of motivation to learn, task complexity, and innovation climate. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-12-2018-0257

4. Agarwal, U. A. (2016). Examining perceived organizational politics among Indian managers: Engagement as mediator and locus of control as moderator. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, *24*(3), 415–437. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-07-2014-0786

5. Akhavan, P., Hosseini, S. M., Abbasi, M., & Manteghi, M. (2015). Knowledge-sharing determinants, behaviours, and innovative work behaviours: An integrated theoretical view and empirical examination. *Aslib Journal of Information Management*, *67*(5), 562–591. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJIM-02-2015-0018

6. Amara, N., Landry, R., Becheikh, N., & Ouimet, M. (2008). Learning and novelty of innovation in established manufacturing SMEs. *Technovation*, *28*(7), 450–463. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2008.02.001

7. Atitumpong, A., & Badir, Y. F. (2018). Leader-member exchange, learning orientation, and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, *30*(1), 32–47. https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-01-2017-0005

8. Awang, A. H., Sapie, N. M., Hussain, M. Y., Ishak, S., & Yusof, R. M. (2019). Nurturing innovative employees: Effects of organizational learning and work environment. *Economic Research-Ekonomska Istrazivanja*, *32*(1), 1152–1168. https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2019.1592007

9. Bartol, K. M., & Srivastava, A. (2002). Encouraging Knowledge Sharing: The Role of Organizational Reward Systems. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, *9*(1), 64–76. https://doi.org/10.1177/107179190200900105

10. Bass, B. M. (1991). From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to Share the Vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, *19*(3), 19–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(90)90061-S

11. Battistelli, A., Odoardi, C., Vandenberghe, C., Di Napoli, G., & Piccione, L. (2019). Information sharing and innovative work behaviour: The role of work-based learning, challenging tasks, and organizational commitment. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *30*(3), 361–381. https://doi.org/10.1002/hrdq.21344

12. Bednall, T. C., E. Rafferty, A., Shipton, H., Sanders, K., & J. Jackson, C. (2018). Innovative Behaviour: How Much Transformational Leadership Do You Need? *British Journal of Management*, *29*(4), 796–816. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12275

13. Beer. (2006). *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behaviour*. Los Alamitos: Delta Publishing Company.

14. Bos-Nehles, A., Renkema, M., & Janssen, M. (2017). HRM and innovative work behaviour: a systematic literature review. *Personnel Review*, *46*(7), 1228–1253. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-09-2016-0257

15. Bozeman, D. P., Hochwarier, W. A., Perrewe, P. L., & Brymer, R. A. (2001). Organizational politics perceived control, and work outcomes: Boundary conditions on the effects of politics. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *31*(3), 486–503. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb02052.x

16. Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper and Row.

17. Cheng, G. H. L., & Chan, D. K. S. (2008). Who suffers more from job insecurity? A meta-analytic review. *Applied Psychology*, *57*(2), 272–303. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2007.00312.x

18. Choi, S. B., Cundiff, N., Kim, K., & Akhatib, S. N. (2018). The Effect of Work-Family Conflict and Job Insecurity On Innovative Behaviour of Korean Workers: The Mediating Role of Organisational Commitment

and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, *22*(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919618500032

19. Choi, S. B., Kim, K., Ullah, S. M. E., & Kang, S.-W. (2016). How transformational leadership facilitates the innovative behaviour of Korean workers: examining mediating and moderating processes. *Personnel Review*, *45*(3), 459–479. https://doi.org/10.1108/00483481011075611

20. De Jong, J., & Den Hartog, D. (2010). Measuring innovative work behaviour. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, *19*(1), 23–36. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00547.x

21. De Spiegelaere, S., Van Gyes, G., De Witte, H., Niesen, W., & Van Hootegem, G. (2014). On the relation of job insecurity, job autonomy, innovative work behaviour, and the mediating effect of work engagement. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, *23*(3), 318–330. https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12079

22. De Spiegelaere, S., Van Gyes, G., & Van Hootegem, G. (2012). Job Design and Innovative Work Behaviour: One Size Does Not Fit All Types of Employees. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management, and Innovation*, *8*(4), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.7341/2012841

23. Denti, L., & Hemlin, S. (2012). Leadership and innovation in organizations: A systematic review of factors that mediate or moderate the relationship. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, *16*(3), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919612400075

24. Ferris, G. R., Treadway, D. C., Kolodinsky, R. W., Hochwarter, W. A., Kacmar, C. J., Douglas, C., & Frink, D. D. (2005). Development and validation of the political skill inventory. *Journal of Management*, *31*(1), 126–152. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206304271386

25. Fiol, C. M., & Lyles, M. A. (1985). Organizational Learning. *Academy of Management Review*, *10*(4), 803–813. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1985.4279103

26. Fuller, B., & Marler, L. E. (2009). Change is driven by nature: A meta-analytic review of the proactive personality literature. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, *75*(3), 329–345. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2009.05.008

27. Helmy, I., Adawiyah, W. R., & Banani, A. (2019). Linking psychological empowerment, knowledge sharing, and employees' innovative behaviour in Indonesian SMEs. *Journal of Behavioural Science*, *14*(2), 66–79.

28. Hooff, B. van den, & Ridder, J. A. d. (2004). Knowledge sharing in context: The influence of organizational commitment, communication climate, and CMC use on knowledge sharing. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *8*(6), 117–130. https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270410567675

29. Hu, M.-L. M., Horng, J. S., & Sun, Y.-H. C. (2009). Hospitality teams: Knowledge sharing and service innovation performance. *Tourism Management*, *30*(1), 41–50. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2008.04.009

30. Jansen, J. J. P., Vera, D., & Crossan, M. (2009). Strategic leadership for exploration and exploitation: The moderating role of environmental dynamism. *Leadership Quarterly*, *20*(1), 5–18. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.11.008

31. Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of eVort–reward fairness, and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *73*, 287–302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2010.01.018

32. Kacmar, K. M., Bozeman, D. P., Carlson, D. S., & Anthony, W. P. (1999). An Examination of the Perceptions of Organizational Politics Model: Replication and Extension. *Human Relations*, *52*(3), 383–416. https://doi.org/10.1177/000841745502200404

33. Kacmar, K. M., & Carlson, D. S. (1997). Further validation of the perceptions of politics scale (pops): A multiple sample investigation. *Journal of Management*, *23*(5), 627–658. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639702300502

34. Khaki, I., Erfanian Khanzadeh, H., & Babaki Rad, A. (2017). Talent Management and Innovative Behaviour Based on the Mediating Role of Organizational Learning. *International Letters of Social and Humanistic Sciences*, *79*, 16–28. https://doi.org/10.18052/www.scipress.com/ILSHS.79.16

35. Kim, T. T., & Lee, G. (2013). Hospitality employee knowledge-sharing behaviours in the relationship between goal orientations and service innovative behaviour. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *34*(1), 324–337. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.04.009

36. Kim, W., & Park, J. (2017). Examining structural relationships between work engagement, organizational procedural justice, knowledge sharing, and innovative work behaviour for sustainable organizations. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *9*(2). https://doi.org/10.3390/su9020205

37. Lemon, M., & Sahota, P. S. (2004). Organizational culture as a knowledge repository for increased innovative capacity. *Technovation*, *24*(6), 483–498. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4972(02)00102-5

38. Levinson, H. (1965). Reciprocation: between Man and Relationship Organization. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *9*(4), 370–390. https://doi.org/10.2307/2391032

39. Lin, H. C., & Lee, Y. D. (2017). A study of the influence of organizational learning on employees' innovative behaviour and work engagement by a cross-level examination. *Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science and Technology Education*, *13*(7), 3463–3478. https://doi.org/10.12973/eurasia.2017.00738a

40. Liu, J., Liu, X., & Zeng, X. (2011). Does transactional leadership count for team innovativeness? The moderating role of emotional labour and the mediating role of team efficacy. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, *24*(3), 282–298. https://doi.org/10.1108/09534811111132695

41. Marques, T., Galende, J., Cruz, P., & Ferreira, M. P. (2014). Surviving downsizing and innovative behaviours: A matter of organizational commitment. *International Journal of Manpower*, *35*(7), 930–955. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-03-2012-0049

42. Mulrow, C. D. (1994). The rationale for systematic reviews. *BMJ*, *309*(6954), 597–599. https://doi.org/10.2323/jgam.35.151

43. Mura, M., Lettieri, E., Radaelli, G., & Spiller, N. (2013). Promoting professionals' innovative behaviour through knowledge sharing: The moderating role of social capital. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *17*(4), 527–544. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-03-2013-0105

44. Nurjaman, K., Marta, M. S., Eliyana, A., Kurniasari, D., & Kurniasari, D. (2019). Proactive work behaviour and innovative work behaviour: Moderating effect of job characteristics. *Humanities and Social Sciences Reviews*, *7*(6), 373–379. https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2019.7663

45. Peiterse, A. N., Knippenberg, D. Van, Scippers, M., & Stam, D. (2010). Transformational and transactional leadership and innovative behaviour: The moderating role of psychological empowerment. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, *31*, 609–623. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.650

46. Purba, S. (2009). Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi, Modal Intelektual, dan Perilaku Inovatif terhadap Kinerja Peminpin Jururusan di Universitas Negeri Medan. *Kinerja*, *13*(2), 150–167.

47. Radaelli, G., Lettieri, E., Mura, M., & Spiller, N. (2014). Knowledge sharing and innovative work behaviour in healthcare: A micro-level investigation of direct and indirect effects. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, *23*(4), 400–414. https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12084

48. Rank, J., Nelson, N. E., Allen, T. D., & Xu, X. (2009). Leadership predictors of innovation and task performance: Subordinates' self-esteem and self-presentation as moderators. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *82*(3), 465–489. https://doi.org/10.1348/096317908X371547

49. Rasyid, F. A., & Marta, M. S. (2020). Impact of organizational politics on proactive behaviour of government employees: the moderating role of self-efficacy. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, *18*(1), 385–393. https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.18(1).2020.33

50. Rosen, C. C., Ferris, D. L., Brown, D. J., Chen, Y., & Yan, M. (2014). Perceptions of organizational politics: A need satisfaction paradigm. *Organization Science*, *25*(4), 1026–1055. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2013.0857

51. Sapie, N. M., Hussain, M. Y., Awang, A. H., & Ishak, S. (2015). Work Environment Determinants of Innovative Work Behaviour : Study of Malaysian Small and Medium Enterprises in Three Selected Cities. *Journal for Studies in Management and Planning*, *01*(05), 149–159.

52. Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behaviour: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, *37*(3), 580–607. https://doi.org/10.1049/iet-rsn:20080009 9

53. Sethibe, T., & Steyn, R. (2017). The impact of leadership styles and the components of leadership styles on innovative behaviour. *International Journal of Innovation Management*, *21*(2), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919617500153

54. Slater, S. F., Mohr, J. J., & Sengupta, S. (2014). Radical product innovation capability: Literature review, synthesis, and illustrative research propositions. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *31*(3), 552–566. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12113

55. Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a Methodology for Developing Evidence-Informed Management Knowledge using Systematic Review. *British Journal of Management*, *14*(2), 207–222. https://doi.org/10.2307/249689

56. West, M. A., & Farr, J. L. (1990). *Innovation and Creativity at Work: Psychological and Organizational Strategies*. United States of America: Willey.

57. Widmann, A., Messmann, G., & Mulder, R. H. (2016). The Impact of Team Learning Behaviours on Team Innovative Work Behaviour: A Systematic Review. *Human Resource Development Review*, *15*(4), 429–458. https://doi.org/10.1177/1534484316673713

58. Zivnuska, S., Kacmar, K. M., Witt, L. A., Carlson, D. S., & Bratton, V. K. (2004). Interactive effects of impression management and organizational politics on job performance An Expectancy Theory Perspective on Organizational. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, *25*, 627–640. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.262