Journal of Management World **2025**, 1:457-466
DOI: 10.53935/jomw.v2024i4.714

Exploring Innovative Work Behavior to Bridge the Fragmented Knowledge

Hernani D. Manalo[1*], Ma. Riza T. Manalo[2], EI Jireh P. Bibangco[3]

[1]Faculty of Business, Higher Colleges of Technology, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; hmanalo@hct.ac.ae (H.D.M.).
[2]Faculty of Advance Studies, Carlos Hilado Memorial State University, Talisay City Philippines.
[3]Faculty of Information Technology, Carlos Hilado Memorial State University, Talisay City Philippines.

Abstract. Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) is crucial for organizations aiming to thrive in dynamic markets and achieve sustainability. Despite its importance, there remains a fragmented understanding of the factors that foster IWB. This study explores the influence of Human Resource (HR) practices—Training and Development (TD), Rewards and Recognition (RR), Diversity Management (DM), and Work-Life Balance (WB)—on various dimensions of IWB such as Idea Exploration (IE), Idea Generation (IG), Idea Championing (IC), and Idea Implementation (II). Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) was used to analyze the data from 111 participants across 9 industries in the UAE. The results reveal that TD positively impacts IE but negatively affects IG, suggesting that while training encourages exploration, it inhibits idea generation. DM consistently positively influences all IWB dimensions, highlighting the importance of diversity in fostering innovation. Conversely, RR negatively impacts IG, IC, and II, indicating that excessive focus on rewards can stifle creativity. WB has a mixed impact; it negatively affects IE but enhances IG, IC, showing that a balanced work-life environment supports innovative behaviors. These findings provide valuable insights for organizations aiming to enhance innovation capabilities through targeted HR practices. It thus adds value to the latent literature of IWB.

Keywords: Diversity Management, Human Resource Practices, Idea Championing, Idea Exploration, Idea Generation, Idea Implementation, Innovative Work Behavior, Rewards and Recognition, Training and Development, Work-Life Balance.

1. INTRODUCTION

Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) is increasingly recognized as a critical factor for organizations to adapt to dynamic markets and maintain sustainability. Studies indicate that fostering IWB can significantly enhance organizational performance and innovation capabilities (Lin et al., 2018). Despite its significance, there remains a fragmented understanding of what truly cultivates IWB in the workplace (Bos-Nehles & Veenendaal, 2017; Nadežda et al., 2021).

The concept of IWB is still evolving, with varying behavioral dimensions and inconclusive findings from existing works (Choi et al., 2021; De Spiegelaere et al., 2014). Foremost, there is no generally accepted definition for IWB. Two prominent definitions often cited are by West and Farr (1990) and Janssen (2000), who define IWB as "the intentional creation, introduction, and application of new ideas within a work role, group, or organization to benefit role performance, the group, or the organization." However, this definition often overlaps with other behavioral constructs such as work creativity, organizational citizenship behavior, and intrapreneurship (De Spiegelaere et al., 2014). This overlap and the absence of a generally accepted definition confuse many researchers.

Different authors have operationalized IWB in various ways: uni-dimensional (Scott & Bruce, 1998), bi-dimensional (Dorenbosch et al., 2005), or multi-dimensional (Kleysen & Street, 2001). The inconsistency in these measures and the lack of established validity in foundational studies (Dahiya & Raghuvanshi, 2022) have led to cautious adoption by organizational leaders (Scott & Bruce, 1998; Janssen, 2000; Krause, 2004). Moreover, internal and external environments influence employees' IWB, complicating the identification of effective organizational practices. Human Resource (HR) practices have been proposed as critical in shaping IWB (Bos-Nehles et al., 2017; Salas-Vallina et al., 2020). Previous research suggests that HR practices can significantly impact employees' innovative behaviors, whether examined as a bundle or individually. For example, training and development practices enhance performance and innovative behavior (Hoeppe, 2014; Birdi et al., 2012), while work-life balance practices positively affect employees' behavior (Yasir & Majid, 2019).

Given these premises, this study aims to address the inconsistent findings in the literature by examining how specific HR practices—namely Training and Development (TD), Rewards and Recognition (RR), Diversity Management (DM), and Work-Life Balance (WB)—influence the dimensions of IWB, including Idea Exploration (IE), Idea Generation (IG), Idea Championing (IC), and Idea Implementation (II).

Specifically, this study investigates whether:

1. TD practices positively relate to IWB in the IE and IG dimensions.
2. RR practices positively relate to IWB in the IG, IC, and II dimensions.
3. DM practices positively relate to IWB in the IE, IG, IC, and II dimensions.
4. WB practices positively relate to IWB in the IE, IG, IC, and II dimensions.

* Correspondence: hmanalo@hct.ac.ae

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. Innovative Work Behavior and Its Dimensions

Addressing the definition and dimensional nature of IWB takes an ongoing debate among researchers due to its broad concept and substantial overlap with other constructs such as creativity, intrapreneurship, organizational citizenship behavior, and employee-driven innovation (De Spiegelaere et al., 2014). According to Lambriex-Schmitz et al. (2020), Kanter (1988) laid the foundation for IWB. However, Janssen (2000) proposed the term for the "intentional creation, introduction, and application of new ideas within a work role, group, or organization to benefit role performance, the group, or the organization." Janssen's proposal has been widely adopted by de Jong & den Hartog (2010), Tuominen & Toivonen (2011), and Thurlings et al. (2015).

As IWB evolves, so does its definition. Recent definitions, such as those by Afsar et al. (2020) and supported by Zhang et al. (2021), describe IWB as a "set of behavioral tasks that help employees develop, promote, and implement new and innovative ideas." This definition emphasizes that IWB is not limited to innovation. It includes idea development and implementation, broadening the concept beyond creativity (Farrukh et al., 2023).

The dimensions of IWB vary among authors. Some view the construct as bi-dimensional, uni-dimensional, or multi-dimensional. For example, Scott and Bruce (1994) operationalize IWB as a "three-stage process: idea generation, coalition building, and implementation." Janssen (2000), however, developed a "multi-dimensional measure: idea generation, idea promotion, and idea implementation." De Jong and den Hartog (2010) argue that "each of the proposed dimensions must contribute to an overall construct of IWB" and validated this through Confirmatory Factor Analysis, resulting in four IWB dimensions: exploration, generation, championing, and implementation. Their large-scale study showed that the four-factor model performed better than competing models, clearly contributing to the overall construct of IWB. Consequently, this paper adopts these four IWB dimensions, described as follows:

- Idea Exploration (IE) involves the discovery of an opportunity or the identification of a problem. It includes looking for ways to improve current products, services, or processes (Kanter, 1988; Farr & Ford, 1990; Basadur, 2004).
- Idea Generation (IG) encompasses generating ideas about new products, services, or processes, improvements in current work processes, or general solutions to identified problems (Kanter, 1988). It involves asking critical questions about the current situations at work and activating innovation development by creating new, applicable, and potentially valuable ideas (Janssen, 2000).
- Idea Championing (IC) focuses on individuals in informal roles who push creative ideas past obstacles in their organizations and help realize innovative ideas (De Jong & den Hartog, 2010). Championing includes finding support, building coalitions, expressing enthusiasm and confidence about the success of the innovation, being persistent, and involving the right people (Howell et al., 2005).
- Idea Implementation (II) refers to the effort and result-oriented attitude needed to make ideas happen. It includes making innovations part of regular work processes and behaviors like developing new products or work processes and testing and modifying them (Kleysen & Street, 2001; Kanter, 1988).

2.2. Human Resource Management and Innovative Behaviors

Human Resource Management (HRM) is crucial in developing and transforming organizational culture through various practices. HRM is a communication channel between employers and employees, conveying important objectives and influencing employee outcomes (Abstein & Spieth, 2014). According to Mumford (2000), HR practices foster creativity, innovation, and organizational growth by enhancing individual employees' skills. Several studies have examined the role of HRM in promoting IWB through a bundle of practices, highlighting HRM's potential to influence and shape employees' attitudes and behaviors (Veenendaal & Bondarouk, 2015). Despite the existing knowledge, findings on HRM impacts on IWB remain fragmented (Bos-Nehles et al., 2017). Stinglhamber and Vandenberghe (2003) argue that when employees perceive the organization provides value, the employees feel obliged to reciprocate by contributing positively, such as helping the organization achieve its goals. Therefore, HR practices tend to cultivate desired behaviors in employees while they discourage undesired ones. Moreover, Bos-Nehles and Veenendaal (2019) posit that individual perceptions of HR practices designed to foster high commitment significantly impact IWB. This perspective underscores the importance of aligning HR strategies with organizational goals to enhance innovation and performance.

2.3. HR Practices and IWB: Hypothesis Development

2.3.1. Training & Development (TD) and Idea Exploration & Generation

Training can significantly enhance IWB by improving thought processes and providing educational opportunities that enhance task domain expertise (Shalley & Gilson, 2004). The relationship between TD and IWB can be best understood through the social exchange construct, where employees need to reciprocate through positive attitudes and behaviors that are not formally rewarded or contractually enforceable (Sanders et al., 2010). Hoeppe (2014) emphasized that TD escalates employee performance. Furthermore, Birdi et al. (2012) found that TD is positively related to IG but unrelated to II. Similarly, Veenendaal and Bondarouk (2015) asserted that perceptions of TD significantly affect IG. Thus, TD enhances employees' innovative behavior

(Mumford, 2000; De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010). Based on theoretical insights and empirical evidence, this study supports the following Hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1: TD has a positive and significant relationship with IWB in terms of IE (H1a) and IG (H1b)

2.3.2. Rewards & Recognition (RR) and Idea Generation, Championing, & Implementation

When rewarded, employees become more committed and produce innovative ideas, enhancing company proficiency (Khan et al., 2020). Rewards can significantly increase employees' attention towards their jobs and improve overall company performance (Baer et al., 2003). However, the role of rewards in promoting creativity and innovation remains less investigated (Mascareño et al., 2020). Thneibat et al. (2022) found that performance-based rewards are directly associated with employees' IWB based on structural equation modeling. Based on this information, this study proposes Hypothesis

Hypothesis 2: RR has a positive and significant relationship with IWB in terms of IG (H2a), IC (H2b), and II (H2c).

2.3.3. Diversity Management (DM) and Idea Exploration, Generation, Championing, & Implementation

Various studies support the notion that organizational diversity is positively related to performance, innovation, and IWB (Østergaard et al., 2011). Effective diversity management can enhance cross-cultural learning and knowledge sharing, fostering IWB within business firms (Backes-Gellner & Veen, 2009; Kaiser & Müller, 2013). However, some studies have reported mixed results concerning the relationship between DM and IWB. Bogilović et al. (2020) argue that employee diversity can hinder effective IWB due to dissimilarity, proximity, and the creation of multiple subgroups. Conversely, other authors suggest that effectively managed employee diversity can bring more perspectives and ideas to business firms, fostering innovation and creativity (Bassett-Jones, 2005; Van der Vegt & Janssen, 2003). For example, Gupta (2011) found that workplace diversity positively relates to creativity, innovation, and competitive advantage. Similarly, Syed et al. (2021) found that DM positively affects IWB through employee engagement and affective commitment. Based on the outcomes of previous studies, this study supports this Hypothesis:

Hypothesis 3: DM has a positive and significant relationship with IWB in terms of IE (H3a), IG (H3b), IC (H3c), and II (H3d).

2.3.4. Work-Life Balance (WB) and Idea Exploration, Generation, Championing, & Implementation

WB supporting employers include flexi-time, job-sharing, transitioning from full-time to part-time work, compressing working hours, home-working, term-time-only working, and paid leave to care for dependents in an emergency (Wood, 2018). WB benefits relate to motivation, engagement, and creativity in the workplace. WB could be an effective complementary means to assess the innovativeness of firms (Vidal & Pasamar, 2017). Mohammed and Al-Qaisi (2022) found that WB is associated with IWB. Additionally, Lestari and Satrya (2020) suggest that WB mediates the relationship between work autonomy and IWB. Based on these premises, this study proposes this Hypothesis:

Hypothesis 4: WB has a positive and significant relationship with IWB in terms of IE (H4a), IG (H4b), IC (H4c), and II (H4d).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

This study employed a quantitative research design using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) to analyze the relationships between HR practices and IWB. SEM is particularly suitable for this study as it examines complex relationships between observed and latent variables, providing a comprehensive understanding of how different HR practices influence various dimensions of IWB. According to Kline (2015), SEM combines factor analysis and multiple regression analysis, making it ideal for simultaneously testing models involving multiple variables. This capability is crucial for exploring the multifaceted nature of IWB and its antecedents in the form of HR practices.

Based on the review of the literature and the supporting hypotheses, the research framework is shown in Figure 1:




Figure 1: The Framework and Main Hypotheses of the Study.

3.2. Respondents

The study population comprised employees from various organizations in the UAE. GPower software was utilized for an a priori analysis to estimate the optimal sample size necessary for achieving adequate statistical power (Faul et al., 2007). This approach ensures that the study can detect significant effects and relationships between HR practices and IWB dimensions, thereby minimizing the risk of Type I and Type II errors (Kang, 2021). For a medium effect size ($f^2 = 0.15$), a power level of 0.80, and an alpha level of 0.05, GPower calculated that 88 participants are needed; however, given the complexity of the SEM model, which includes nine latent variables and 41 observed variables, a larger sample size is required for robust model estimation. Consequently, 111 participants from nine industries in the United Arab Emirates were recruited for this study to ensure reliable detection of significant effects.

3.3. Instrument

The research instruments used in this quantitative investigation were adapted from various established sources, including de Jong and den Hartog (2010), Zhu et al. (2014), Dahiya and Raghuvanshi (2021), Bos-Nehles et al. (2017), and Lambriex-Schmitz et al. (2020). Some statements in the instruments were modified to fit the specific contexts of this study. The final instruments consisted of 7 statements related to IWB classification, 8 statements related to the IWB dimensions, and 26 statements related to HR practices. To ensure clarity and ease of response, the survey employed a Likert scale with 5 response categories: 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Internal consistency was assessed by calculating Cronbach's alpha, with all variables yielding Cronbach's alpha values above 0.70, indicating good internal consistency.

Table 1: Reliability Test Result.

Variables	No. of Statements	Cronbach's Alpha	Interpretation
Innovative Work Behavior (IWB)	7	0.752	There is good internal consistency among the items within this group.
IWB Dimensions	8	0.845	There is an excellent level of internal consistency among the items, indicating that the dimensions of IWB are being measured reliably.
HR Practices	26	0.972	There is an excellent internal consistency among the items, confirming that the HR practices are being measured with high reliability.

3.4. Data Collection Process

Data were collected over four weeks in 2024 through online surveys. Participants were recruited from various organizations and invited to participate via email. Each email included a detailed explanation of the study's purpose, procedures, and the importance of their contribution. In addition, the participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity, with clear instructions that their responses would be used solely for research purposes and reported only in aggregate form. Informed consent was obtained from all participants before they began the survey. They were informed that participation was voluntary, and they could withdraw from the study without any negative consequences.

3.5. Data Analysis

This study utilized SEM with the Semopy library in Python. Full Information Maximum Likelihood (FIML) was used as the estimator, ensuring robust handling of missing data. Sequential Least Squares Programming (SLSQP) was employed as the optimizer to refine model parameters. Hypothesis testing was based on p-values calculated by Semopy, determining the statistical significance of relationships within the model. Model fit was assessed using multiple fit indices, including the chi-square test, Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI), Normed Fit Index (NFI), Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA). These fit indices helped ensure that the model accurately represented the data, providing a reliable basis for interpreting the results.

SEM analysis using Semopy provides several key metrics to evaluate the model fit and overall adequacy, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Model Fit Metrics and Results.

Chi2	Chi2 P-Value	Chi2 Baseline	CFI	GFI	AGFI	NFI	TLI	RMSEA	AIC	BIC
386.84	1	16631.02	1.018	0.977	0.975	0.977	1.02	0	171.43	445.095

The chi-square value of 386.84 with a p-value of 1 suggests that the model fits the data well. Typically, a lower chi-square value and a p-value closer to 1 indicate a good fit, as the model's predictions closely match the observed data. The baseline chi-square value of 16631.02 is significantly higher, indicating that the specified model is much better than the baseline model, which assumes no relationships among variables.

The Comparative Fit Index (CFI) value of 1.018 is well above the conventional threshold of 0.90, indicating an excellent fit between the model and the data. While CFI values greater than one can sometimes occur due to the estimation method or model constraints, they generally signify a good fit. The Goodness of Fit Index (GFI) and Adjusted Goodness of Fit Index (AGFI) values are close to 1, with the GFI at 0.977 and AGFI at 0.975, suggesting that the model explains a large proportion of the variance in the data.

The Normed Fit Index (NFI) and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) values indicate the model's fit compared to a null model (one with no relationships among variables). Both indices are above the threshold of 0.90, suggesting a good fit. The TLI value exceeding one further confirms an excellent fit. On the other hand, a Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) value of 0 indicates a perfect fit, RMSEA values below 0.05 are generally considered indicative of a close fit, and values approaching 0 are ideal. This suggests that the model has a minimal error in approximating the population covariance matrix.

Furthermore, the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) and the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) are used to compare models. Lower values of AIC and BIC indicate a better fit. In this case, the low values of AIC (171.43) and BIC (445.095) further suggest a well-balanced model.

These fit indices collectively confirm that the data strongly supports the specified relationships between HR practices and IWB dimensions, providing a reliable basis for interpreting the results.

The excellent fit indices and the very low RMSEA suggest that the model accurately represents the data, supporting the specified relationships between HR practices and IWB dimensions. This firm model fit supports the hypothesis that HR practices such as TD, RR, DM, and WB significantly impact various dimensions of IWB. Organizations can leverage these insights to design and implement HR practices that foster an innovative work environment. The positive fit indices suggest that the practices examined in the study are critical for enhancing IE, IG, IC, and II within organizations. The robust model fit encourages further research to refine and expand the model, potentially including additional HR practices or exploring other mediators and moderators.

4. FINDINGS

The Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis reveals several significant relationships between HR practices and Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) dimensions. Table 3 provides a summary of the SEM results.

Table 3: Summary of Results of SEM.

Relationship	Estimate	Std. Err.	p-value	Positive Significance
IE ~ TD	10.0136	0.003655	< 0.05	Supported
IE ~ DM	0.7436	0.00414	< 0.05	Supported
IE ~ WB	-10.0095	0.00457	< 0.05	Not Supported
IG ~ TD	-45.2645	0.00135	< 0.05	Not Supported
IG ~ RR	-38.3096	0.00126	< 0.05	Not Supported
IG ~ DM	17.1027	0.00169	< 0.05	Supported
IG ~ WB	62.3163	0.00134	< 0.05	Supported
IC ~ RR	-7.4439	0.00639	< 0.05	Not Supported
IC ~ DM	3.6169	0.00751	< 0.05	Supported
IC ~ WB	3.7172	0.00761	< 0.05	Supported
II ~ RR	-10.6863	0.00572	< 0.05	Not Supported
II ~ DM	4.8728	0.00672	< 0.05	Supported
II ~ WB	5.1499	0.00688	< 0.05	Supported

4.1. Training & Development

The excellent fit Hypotheses Result: H1 has partial significance; (TD supports IE [H1a] but not IG [H1b]). The significant positive effect of TD on IE indicates that TD activities are strongly associated with exploring new ideas. When employees are given opportunities to learn and develop new skills, they are more likely to engage in behaviors that seek out, explore, and consider new possibilities or solutions. This positive impact may result from enhanced skills, exposure to new ideas, and increased employee confidence (Birdi et al., 2012). Furthermore, training programs that emphasize creative thinking and problem-solving can significantly contribute to fostering an innovative mindset (Shalley & Gilson, 2004).

Conversely, the substantial negative effect of TD on IG presents an intriguing and unexpected finding. Typically, one might expect TD to positively influence all aspects of innovative work behavior, including generating new ideas. However, this negative relationship suggests that while TD encourages exploration, it can simultaneously create conditions that inhibit the free generation of new ideas. This inhibition could stem from overemphasizing specific methodologies or solutions that restrict creative thinking. Alternatively, it can reflect a temporary effect where increased knowledge and skills raise standards for what constitutes a viable idea, thus temporarily suppressing idea generation (de Jong & den Hartog, 2010).

4.2. Rewards & Recognition

Hypotheses Result: H2 has No significance; all sub-hypotheses are rejected (RR does not support IG [H2a], IC [H2b], & II [H2c]).

The analysis reveals a counterintuitive relationship between RR and various dimensions of IWB, specifically IG, IC, and II. Typically, one would expect RR to positively influence these dimensions, as rewards and recognition are designed to motivate and encourage innovative behaviors. However, the findings indicate an inverse relationship in this context. For IG, higher levels of RR are associated with lower levels of idea generation. This suggests that an excessive focus on rewards or an overly competitive environment creates pressure, inhibiting the free flow of creative ideas. While rewards aim to motivate, they inadvertently stifle the spontaneous and exploratory nature necessary for generating new ideas. Employees will become risk-averse, fearing failure or not meeting the reward criteria, reducing their engagement in the creative process (Baer et al., 2003).

Similarly, the negative relationship persists for IC. Increased RR correlates with a decrease in the tendency of employees to champion or advocate for new ideas. This could be due to reward structures not adequately recognizing the efforts required to advocate for new ideas. Instead, the focus will likely be on immediate, quantifiable outcomes, discouraging employees from engaging in the more challenging aspects of innovation. This finding aligns with the notion that intrinsic motivators such as personal growth and intellectual challenge will be more effective in promoting innovative behaviors than extrinsic rewards (Bos-Nehles et al., 2017).

4.3. Diversity Management

Hypotheses Result: H3 has Positive significance. All sub-hypotheses are accepted (DM fully supports IE [H3a], IG [H3b], IC [H3c], and II [H3d).

The analysis revealed that DM positively influences IE, suggesting that a diverse workforce fosters an environment where employees feel encouraged to explore new ideas and perspectives. Diverse viewpoints can stimulate curiosity and promote a broader approach to problem-solving. The strong alignment between the indicators of DM reinforces the validity and reliability of the DM construct within this study (Bos-Nehles & Veenendaal, 2017).

Regarding IG, the positive relationship with DM underscores the role of diversity in enhancing creative processes within organizations. When employees from different backgrounds and experiences collaborate, they bring unique ideas and approaches that contribute to generating innovative solutions. This diversity of thought is crucial for creativity, as it helps challenge existing norms and assumptions, leading to more robust and novel ideas (Østergaard et al., 2011).

In the IC dimension, DM also shows a positive impact, suggesting that diversity within the workforce supports the advocacy and promotion of new ideas. Employees in diverse teams can feel more empowered to champion their innovative ideas, knowing that the organization values and supports their unique perspectives. This empowerment is vital for progressing ideas from mere concepts to actionable plans, as it involves garnering the necessary support and resources for implementation. Furthermore, the significant relationships between DM and other HR practices, such as TD and RR, highlight the interconnectedness within HR practices, suggesting that a holistic approach to HR can enhance IWB (Bogilović et al., 2020).

In terms of II, the positive effect of DM indicates that diversity management is crucial for successfully executing innovative ideas. A diverse team can bring varied skills and approaches essential for overcoming the practical challenges of implementing new ideas. The findings suggest that organizations that effectively manage diversity can enhance their overall innovative capacity, ensuring that ideas are generated, championed, and successfully brought to fruition. These results emphasize the importance of fostering a diverse and inclusive work environment to support all stages of innovation (Bassett-Jones, 2005).

4.4. Work-Life Balance

Hypotheses Result: H4 has partial Positive significance. Hypotheses are accepted for H4b, H4c, & H4d (WB fully supports IG [H4b], IC [H4c], & II [H4d). However, it has no significance for IE (H4a).

For IE, the analysis results indicate a negative relationship with WB, which suggests that employees are less inclined to explore new ideas when they perceive a better balance between their work and personal lives. One possible explanation is that employees who achieve an excellent work-life balance focus more on maintaining stability and routine rather than venturing into new and uncertain territories that idea exploration often requires. This insight implies that while work-life balance is crucial, organizations must also find ways to encourage exploratory thinking without disrupting employees' sense of balance (Baer et al., 2003).

In contrast, the relationship between WB and IG is strongly positive. This finding highlights the importance of WB in fostering a conducive environment for creativity and generating new ideas. Employees who feel that their work-life balance is well-managed will likely experience lower stress levels and higher job satisfaction, significantly enhancing their creative capacities. The positive impact of WB on IG underscores the value of supporting employees' overall well-being to stimulate innovative thinking and idea generation. Organizations should implement policies and practices that promote a healthy work-life balance to boost creativity and innovation (Vidal & Pasamar, 2017).

For IC, WB also shows a positive impact. This suggests that employees who enjoy a good work-life balance are more likely to advocate for and promote new ideas within the organization. When employees feel balanced and supported in their personal and professional lives, they are more inclined to take the initiative and push for the implementation of innovative ideas. This indicates that a supportive WB can empower employees to become innovation champions. Organizations should recognize and reward efforts to champion new ideas, fostering an environment where innovative thinking is encouraged (Abstein & Spieth, 2014).

In terms of II dimension, its positive relationship with WB indicates that employees who perceive a good work-life balance are more effective in executing and implementing new ideas. A well-balanced work-life environment provides employees with the mental and emotional resources to tackle the practical challenges of bringing new ideas to fruition. These findings suggest that organizations should prioritize work-life balance initiatives as part of their strategy to enhance overall innovative capacity. By fostering a work environment that supports employees' personal and professional needs, organizations can ensure that ideas are generated, championed, and successfully implemented, leading to sustained innovation and competitive advantage. These insights imply that integrating work-life balance into the organizational culture is crucial for long-term success and continuous innovation (Choi et al., 2021).

5. DISCUSSION

The positive impact of TD on IE suggests that training enhances employees' ability to explore new ideas. This finding aligns with previous research indicating that training programs emphasizing creative thinking and problem-solving can significantly contribute to fostering an innovative mindset (Birdi et al., 2012; Shalley & Gilson, 2004). However, the negative impact of TD on IG indicates that while training encourages exploration, it might also create conditions that inhibit the generation of new ideas. These conditions prompt the organizations to design TD programs that balance structured learning with opportunities for free exploration, allowing employees to apply their knowledge in novel ways (Bos-Nehles et al., 2017). For HR strategy and innovation management, the negative impact of TD on IG implies re-evaluation of the structure and outcomes of learning and development activities and close monitoring and adjustment of TD program content and delivery to ensure they stimulate rather than stifle creativity (Abstein & Spieth, 2014).

The analysis also reveals a counterintuitive relationship between RR and various dimensions of IWB, specifically IG, IC, and II. Higher levels of RR are associated with lower levels of idea generation, championing, and implementation. This shows that an excessive focus on rewards may create pressure or an overly competitive environment that inhibits the free flow of creative ideas. While rewards aim to motivate, they might inadvertently stifle the spontaneous and exploratory nature necessary for generating and implementing new ideas. Employees may become risk-averse, fearing failure or not meeting the reward criteria (Baer et al., 2003). This finding underscores the need for organizations to carefully design and implement their RR programs to support and enhance all stages of innovation genuinely. Organizations should provide a mix of intrinsic and extrinsic motivators to cater to diverse employee needs and preferences. Recognizing and rewarding the innovation process, not just the outcomes, can encourage ongoing creative efforts and mitigate the fear of failure. Tailoring RR programs to match the specific motivations and needs of employees engaged in innovative activities is crucial (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010). By aligning RR strategies with employees' intrinsic motivations and by promoting a supportive innovation culture, organizations can better harness the creative and innovative potential of their workforce, ultimately leading to sustained competitive advantage (Farrukh et al., 2023).

DM positively influences all dimensions of IWB, suggesting that a diverse workforce fosters an environment where employees feel encouraged to explore new ideas and perspectives. Diverse viewpoints can stimulate curiosity and a broader approach to problem-solving. This finding is consistent with previous research indicating that diversity enhances creative processes and organizational performance (Østergaard et al., 2011; Bogilović et

al., 2020). Effective diversity management can enhance cross-cultural learning and knowledge sharing, fostering IWB within organizations. A diverse team can bring varied skills and approaches essential for overcoming the practical challenges of implementing new ideas (Bassett-Jones, 2005). These results emphasize the importance of fostering a diverse and inclusive work environment to support all stages of innovation. Encouraging a culture that values diversity and inclusivity is essential for fostering innovation. Organizations should recognize and reward the outcomes of innovative efforts and the processes and collaborations that lead to these outcomes. Creating an environment where diverse perspectives are valued, and employees feel psychologically safe expressing their ideas can significantly enhance innovative behaviors (Salas-Vallina et al., 2020).

The analysis of the relationship between WB and various dimensions of IWB reveals some nuanced findings. WB negatively impacts IE, suggesting that employees might be less inclined to explore new ideas when they perceive a better balance between their work and personal lives. One possible explanation is that employees who achieve a good work-life balance may focus more on maintaining stability and routine rather than venturing into new and uncertain territories (Baer et al., 2003). In contrast, WB positively impacts IG, IC, and II, highlighting the importance of a balanced work-life environment for fostering creativity and implementing new ideas. Employees who feel that their work-life balance is well-managed will likely experience lower stress levels and higher job satisfaction, significantly enhancing their creative capacities. This suggests that organizations should implement policies and practices that promote a healthy work-life balance to boost creativity and innovation (Vidal & Pasamar, 2017). Additionally, recognizing and rewarding the innovation process, not just the outcomes, can encourage ongoing creative efforts and mitigate the fear of failure.

6. CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATION, & FUTURE RESEARCH

This study comprehensively analyzes the relationships between various HR practices and dimensions of Innovative Work Behavior (IWB). The findings significantly affect organizational learning and development, HR management, and innovation strategy.

Specifically, this study has four key findings:

1. The positive impact of TD on IE indicates that providing employees with opportunities to learn and develop new skills encourages them to explore new ideas. However, the negative impact of TD on Idea Generation (IG) suggests that while training encourages exploration, it might also create conditions that inhibit the generation of new ideas. This highlights the need for organizations to design TD programs that balance structured learning with opportunities for creative exploration and innovation.

2. The study reveals a counterintuitive negative relationship between RR and various dimensions of IWB, including IG, IC, and II. This suggests that an excessive focus on rewards may create pressure and inhibit creativity. Organizations should carefully design RR programs to support and enhance all stages of innovation, recognizing and rewarding the innovation process, not just the outcomes.

3. DM positively influences all dimensions of IWB, underscoring the importance of fostering a diverse and inclusive work environment. A diverse workforce brings varied perspectives essential for generating innovative ideas. These findings support integrating DM into HR strategies to enhance organizational innovation capabilities.

4. The mixed effects of WB on IWB dimensions indicate that while a good work-life balance boosts creativity, advocacy, and implementation of new ideas, it may reduce the inclination to explore new ideas. Organizations should promote WB initiatives that support employees' well-being without hindering their innovative potential.

Based on these findings, the following are recommended: First, develop TD initiatives that foster an environment conducive to creativity and innovation, incorporating elements that target creative thinking, problem-solving, and challenging existing norms. Second, RR strategies should be tailored to match the specific motivations and needs of employees engaged in innovative activities, recognizing the process and outcomes of innovation. Third, policies and practices that support diversity and inclusivity should be promoted, such as inclusive hiring practices, diversity training programs, and initiatives encouraging cross-functional and cross-cultural collaboration. Lastly, flexible working arrangements should be implemented, and employees' well-being should be supported to create a motivated and engaged workforce capable of generating and implementing innovative ideas.

The excellent model fit and significant relationships identified in this study suggest that targeted HR practices can significantly enhance various dimensions of IWB. By leveraging these insights, organizations can design and implement HR strategies that foster an innovative work environment, ultimately leading to sustained competitive advantage in dynamic markets. This study contributes to a more cohesive framework for understanding how HR practices influence IWB, providing valuable recommendations for academic research and practical application in organizational settings.

Future research should explore additional HR practices that may influence IWB and investigate other potential mediators and moderators that could further elucidate the relationships identified in this study. Expanding the sample size and diversity of industries represented could also enhance the generalizability of the findings. Further studies could also examine the long-term impacts of HR practices on IWB and organizational performance.

REFERENCES

Abstein, A., & Spieth, P. (2014). Exploring HRM meta-features that foster employees' innovative work behavior in times of increasing work-life conflict. Creativity and Innovation Management, 23(2), 211–225. https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12053.

Afsar, Bilal & Al-Ghazali, Basheer & Ehtisham, Sadia & Ahmad, Farheen. (2020). Cultural intelligence and innovative work behavior: the role of work engagement and interpersonal trust. European Journal of Innovation Management. ahead-of-print. 10.1108/EJIM-01-2020-0008.

Baer, M., Oldham, G., & Cummings, A. (2003). Rewarding creativity: when does it really matter?, The Leadership Quarterly, Volume 14, Issues 4–5, 2003, Pages 569-586, ISSN 1048-9843, https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(03)00052-3.

Backes-Gellner, U., & Veen, S. (2009). The impact of workforce age heterogeneity on company productivity (No. 0078). University of Zurich, Institute for Strategy and Business Economics (ISU). https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-25963.

Basadur, M. (2004). Leading others to think innovatively together: Creative leadership. The Leadership Quarterly, 15(1), 103–121. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.007.

Bassett-Jones, N. (2005). The paradox of diversity management, creativity, and innovation. Creativity and Innovation Management, 14(2), 169-175. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.00337.x.

Birdi, K., Leach, D., & Magadley, W. (2012). Evaluating the impact of TRIZ creativity training: An organizational field study. R&D Management, 42(4), 315-326.

Bogilović, S., Bortoluzzi, G., Černe, M., Ghasemzadeh, K., & Žnidaršič, J. (2020). Diversity, climate and innovative work behavior. European Journal of Innovation Management.

Bos-Nehles, A., Renkema, M., & Janssen, M. (2017). HRM and innovative work behavior: A systematic literature review. Personnel Review, 46(7), 1228–1253.

Bos-Nehles, A. & Veenendaal, A, (2017). Perceptions of HR practices and innovative work behavior: the moderating effect of an innovative climate. The International Journal of Human Resource Management. 30. 1-23. 10.1080/09585192.2017.1380680.

Choi, W., Kang, S., & Choi, S. (2021). Innovative behavior in the workplace: An empirical study of moderated mediation model of self-efficacy, perceived organizational support, and leader–member exchange. Behavioral Sciences, 11(12), 182.

Dahiya, R., & Raghuvanshi, J. (2022). Validation of innovative work behavior scale: Indian apparel manufacturing sector. Asia Pacific Management Review, 27(2), 120-136.

de Jong, J., & den Hartog, D. (2010). Measuring innovative work behavior. Creativity and Innovation Management, 19(1), 23-36. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8691.2010.00547.x.

De Spiegelaere, S., Van Gyes, G., & Van Hootegem, G. (2014). Innovatief werkgedrag als concept: Definiëring en oriëntering. Gedrag & Organisatie, 27(2), 139–156.

Dorenbosch, L., Van Engen, M. L., & Verhagen, M. (2005). On-the-job innovation: The impact of job design and human resource management through production ownership. Creativity and Innovation Management, 14(2), 129-141.

Farr, J., & Ford, C. (1990). Individual innovation. In M. West & J. Farr (Eds.), Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies (pp. 63-80). Wiley.

Farrukh, M., Meng, F., Raza, A., & Wu, Y. (2023). Innovative work behavior: The what, where, who, how, and when. Personnel Review. Advanced online publication.

Faul F, Erdfelder E, Lang AG, Buchner A. (2007). G*Power 3: a flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. Behav Res Methods. 2007 May;39(2):175-91 https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03193146. PMID: 17695343.

Gupta, R. (2011). Workforce diversity and organizational performance. International Journal of Business and Management Invention, 2(6), 36-41.

Hoeppe, J. C. (2014). Practitioner's view on sustainability and HRM. In I. Ehnert, W. Harry, & K. J. Zink (Eds.), Sustainability and human resource management: Developing sustainable business organizations (pp. 273–294). Springer.

Howell, J., Shea, C., & Higgins, C. (2005). Champions of product innovations: Defining, developing, and validating a measure of champion behavior. Journal of Business Venturing, 20(5), 641-661. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2004.06.001.

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

Kaiser, U., & Müller, B. (2013). Team heterogeneity in startups and its development over time. ZEW-Centre for European Economic Research Discussion Paper (No. 13-058).

Kang, H. (2021). Sample size determination and power analysis using the G*Power software. Journal of Educational Evaluation for Health Professions, 18, 17.

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

Khan, K., Naqvi, S., Ghafoor, M., & Nayab, G. (2020). Effect of reward system on innovative work behavior through temporary organizational commitment and proficiency: The moderating role of multiculturalism. International Journal of Management Research and Emerging Sciences, 10(2), 96-108. https://doi.org/10.56536/ijmres.v10i2.87.

Kleysen, R. F., & Street, C. T. (2001). Toward a multi-dimensional measure of individual innovative behavior. Journal of Intellectual Capital, 2(3), 284-296.

Kline, R. B. (2016). Principles and practice of structural equation modeling (4th ed.). Guilford Press.

Krause, D. E. (2004). Influence-based leadership as a determinant of the inclination to innovate and of innovation-related behaviors: An empirical investigation. The Leadership Quarterly, 15(1), 79-102. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.006.

Lambriex-Schmitz, P., Van der Klink, M., Beausaert, S., Bijker, M., & Segers, M. (2020). Towards successful innovations in education: Development and validation of a multi-dimensional innovative work behavior instrument. Vocations and Learning, 13, 313–340.

Lestari, P., & Satrya, A. (2020). The influence of work autonomy, work-life balance, and psychological flow on innovative work behavior at application and game developer companies. IBIMA Publishing. ISBN: 978-0-9998551-4-0.

Lin, H., Saixing, Z., Haijian, L., & Chao, L. (2018). Bridging the gaps or fecklessness? A moderated mediating examination of intermediaries' effects on corporate innovation. Technovation, pp. 94-95, 102018. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.technovation.2018.10.018.

Mascareño, J., Rietzschel, E., & Wisse, B. (2020). Envisioning innovation: Does visionary leadership engender team innovative performance through goal alignment? Creativity and Innovation Management, 29(1), 33–48. https://doi.org/10.1111/caim.12341.

Mohammed, K., & Al-Qaisi, A. (2022). Enhancing innovative work behavior through quality of work life. Journal of Positive School Psychology, 6(6), 7685-7694. http://journalppw.com

Mumford, M. D. (2000). Managing creative people: Strategies and tactics for innovation. Human Resource Management Review, 10(3), 313–351. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1053-4822(99)00043-1.

Nadežda, J., Joniaková, Z., & Mišún, J. (2021). Innovative work behavior—A critical factor in business performance? The role of team cognitive diversity and teamwork climate in this relationship. Journal of Risk and Financial Management, 14(4), 185.

Østergaard, C. R., Timmermans, B., & Kristinsson, K. (2011). Does a different view create something new? The effect of employee diversity on innovation. Research Policy, 40(3), 500-509. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2010.11.004.

Salas-Vallina, A., Pozo, M., & Fernandez-Guerrero, R. (2020). New times for HRM? A longitudinal study of well-being-oriented management (WOM), harmonious work passion and innovative work behavior. Employee Relations, 42(3), 561-581.

Sanders, K., Moorkamp, M., Torka, N., Groeneveld, S., & Groeneveld, C. (2010). How to support innovative behavior? The role of LMX and satisfaction with HR practices. Technology and Investment, 1(1), 59–68. https://doi.org/10.4236/ti.2010.11007.

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1998). Following the leader in R&D: The joint effect of subordinate problem-solving style and leader-member relations on innovative behavior. IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 45(1), 3-10. https://doi.org/10.1109/17.658660.

Shalley, C. E., & Gilson, L. L. (2004). What leaders need to know: A review of social and contextual factors that can foster or hinder creativity. The Leadership Quarterly, 15(1), 33-53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.12.004.

Stinglhamber, F., & Vandenberghe, C. (2003). Organizations and supervisors as sources of support and targets of commitment: A longitudinal study. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 24(3), 251–270. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.192.

Syed, J., Ahanchian, M. R., Rahimnia, F., & Ganji, S. F. G. (2021). Analyzing the impact of diversity management on innovative behaviors through employee engagement and affective commitment. Iranian Journal of Management Studies, 14(3), 649-666.

Thneibat, M., Obeidat, A., Obeidat, Z., Al-Dweeri, R., & Thneibat, M. (2022). Promoting radical innovation through performance-based rewards: The mediating role of knowledge acquisition and innovative work behavior. International Journal of Innovation and Technology Management, 19(2), 2250005. https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219877022500055.

Thurlings, M., Evers, A. T., & Vermeulen, M. (2015). Toward a model of explaining teachers' innovative behavior: A literature review. Review of Educational Research, 85(3), 430-471.

Tuominen, T., & Toivonen, M. (2011). Studying innovation and change activities in KIBS through the lens of innovative behavior. International Journal of Innovation Management, 15(2), 393-422. https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919611003209.

Van der Vegt, G. S., & Janssen, O. (2003). Joint impact of interdependence and group diversity on innovation. Journal of Management, 29(5), 729-751. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0149-2063(03)00033-3.

Veenendaal, A., & Bondarouk, T. (2015). Perceptions of HRM and their effect on dimensions of innovative work behavior: Evidence from a manufacturing firm. Management Review, 26, 138–160. https://doi.org/10.5771/0935-9915-2015-2-138.

Vidal, J., & Pasamar, S. (2017). Firm innovativeness and work-life balance. Technology Analysis & Strategic Management, 30(1), 1-13. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2017.1337091.

West, M. A., & Farr, J. L. (1990). Innovation and creativity at work. John Wiley & Sons.

Wood, S. (2018). The shifting landscape of work and working lives. CIPD Applied Research Conference 2018.

Yasir, M., & Majid, A. (2019). Boundary integration and innovative work behavior among nursing staff. European Journal of Innovation Management, 22(1), 2-22.

Zhang, Z., Liu, M., & Yang, Q. (2021). Examining the external antecedents of innovative work behavior: The role of government support for talent policy. International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 18(3), 1213.

Zhu, H., Djurjagina, K., & Leker, J. (2014). Innovative behavior types and their influence on individual crowdsourcing performances. International Journal of Innovation Management, 18(6), 1440015. https://doi.org/10.1142/S1363919614400155.