

Received: December 2023 Accepted: January 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58262/ks.v12i2.301>

Determinants of Innovative Work Behavior the Moderation Role of Knowledge Sharing in the Banking Industry

Husain Nurisman^{1*}, Armanu Thoyib², Dodi Wirawan Irawanto³, Mintarti Rahayu⁴

Abstract

The aim of this study was to address the gap concerning the importance of constructing an integrated model with leadership, perceived organizational support, and cultural intelligence as three independent variables. Previous exploration has consistently shown the influence of the variables on innovative work behavior. Specifically, the current study conceptualized leadership variable as innovation leadership. The analysis explored the impact of innovation leadership, perceived organizational support, and cultural intelligence on innovative work behavior, focusing on the role of knowledge sharing in strengthening this relationship. Data was collected through a structured questionnaire and analyzed using SEM-PLS, concentrating on high-order constructs. Subsequently, a quantitatively oriented survey approach was used in the design, and the population was represented in the sample using a proportional random sampling approach. The results showed that cultural intelligence and perceived organizational support played crucial roles in determining innovative work behavior, and knowledge sharing could moderate the relationship between innovation leadership and innovative work behavior. Despite the evidence that leadership could influence innovative work behavior, innovation leadership did not inherently contribute significantly to innovative work behavior. In this scenario, leaders could not effectively use their abilities to encourage optimal innovative behavior among employees. The theoretical significance of this study was in advancing the social science exchange theory, explicitly showing that engaging in positive behavior promoted the establishment of high-quality exchange connections. Consequently, this study provided a practical contribution to the banking industry by examining the factors influencing the enhancement of innovative work behavior among employees.

Keywords: Innovation Leadership, Perceived Organizational Support, Cultural Intelligence, Knowledge Sharing, Innovative Work Behavior

Introduction

The fourth industrial revolution is unfolding at the beginning of this century, merging digital, physical, and biological technologies and instigating transformative changes in various aspects (Maynard, 2015). Compared with the previous revolutions, the present one advances exponentially, not linearly, as it transforms entire systems across countries, companies, industries, and society (Park, 2016). One of the sectors affected by these changes is the banking industry. According to Malviya (2020), three significant trends are recorded, namely 1) a focus on enhancing customer experience for revenue generation, 2) an emphasis on technological innovation, and 3) a drive to increase cost-effectiveness. As part of the service sector, the banking industry is exploring innovative approaches to customer service provision (Alam, 2013). This implies that banks need to possess the capability to both attract and retain new customers through superior service. To address this challenge, banks are expected to prioritize service innovation (Fujii et al., 2014).

In examining employees across various banks in India, Garg (2017) showed that individuals maintaining positive working relationships with their organizations and superiors tend to show innovative behavior in service provision while receiving support in navigating work-related

¹ Doctor Student of Management, Doctoral Program Faculty of Economics and Business, Brawijaya University, Malang, Orchid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5186-8024>

² Professor in Economics, Doctoral Program Faculty of Economics and Business, Brawijaya University, Malang, Orchid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8022-1430>

³ Professor in Economics, Doctoral Program Faculty of Economics and Business, Brawijaya University, Malang, Orchid id: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0348-4499>

⁴ Ph.D. in Economics, Doctoral Program Faculty of Economics and Business, Brawijaya University, Malang, Orchid id: <https://orcid.org/0009-0009-2161-7273>

*Correspondence: husainnurisman@student.ub.ac.id

challenges. Furthermore, in developing countries, banking managers need to efficiently manage creative behavior to meet the evolving needs of customers and rapidly changing market conditions. Managers are expected to empower employees by promoting an innovative spirit, proactively approaching challenges, and being willing to take risks (Kör, 2016). This approach improves the effectiveness of managing employees' innovative behavior. The manifestation of employee innovative behavior is attributed to knowledge and human resources in the organization, as well as employee motivation, influenced by the quality of connections between the organization, employees, and superiors.

Innovation is the primary driver behind organizational competitive advantage, with innovative employee behavior forming the micro foundation of organizational innovation (Lukes & Stephan, 2017). Organizations prioritizing innovation maintain positive relationships with human resource management practices, particularly in the banking industry. These practices include recruitment, training, compensation, and performance processes (Farouk et al., 2016). Service-oriented organizations focusing on Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) improve service innovation and strengthen the bond between customers and organizations, improving organizational performance and competitiveness (Zhang et al., 2022). Extensive literature focused on innovative employee behavior, exploring organizational climate and creativity for innovation, which has been summarized in meta-analytic studies (T. M. Amabile et al., 1996; Hunter et al., 2007). Additionally, factors including organizational culture (Scott & Bruce, 1994), psychological contracts (T. T. Kim et al., 2018), knowledge sharing (KS) (T. T. Kim & Lee, 2013), autonomy (Sönmez & Yıldırım, 2019), personality (Sönmez & Yıldırım, 2019), and leadership style (Dhar, 2016) play crucial roles in determining IWB. Nagarajan (2005) affirmed that organizational justice, job design, and psychological contracts influence IWB.

The study by Garg (2017) on employees in Indian banks revealed that those with high-quality working relationships who received superior support to resolve workplace challenges tended to show innovative service behavior. These relationships motivate employees toward service excellence and innovative service delivery. A similar study in Jordan described the significance of motivational, inspirational leaders promoting creativity among banking employees (Suifan & Al-Janini, 2017), contributing to innovative employee behavior. Banking managers in developing nations must enhance their efficiency in managing innovative behavior to meet consumer needs and adapt to market dynamics. To increase the efficacy of managing creative behavior, managers should empower individuals with autonomy, cultivate a culture of continuous innovation, show proactivity, and embrace risk-taking (Kör, 2016). Innovation behavior is crucial in the banking sector for improving competition. Innovation behavior originates from a company's knowledge and human resources, along with employee motivation driven by quality relationships between the organization, employees, and superiors. In the service business context, the dynamic nature of client expectations increases the demand for IWB among employees. Consequently, a leader capable of providing excellent service can effectively stimulate the growth of innovative behavior among employees (Akram et al., 2020).

The achievement of promoting IWB is intrinsically related to the way a leader engages with subordinates (Scott & Bruce, 1994). Effective leadership necessitates cultivating interpersonal connections with associates, surpassing economic and social transactions. This includes promoting a sense of satisfaction and dependence in the leader (Bass, 1985) and earning admiration from followers (Conger et al., 2000). Leaders must be supportive when individuals need encouragement or assistance during challenging situations to enhance the relationship between superiors and subordinates. Furthermore, it incorporates recognizing and appreciating subordinates for their performance, achievements, and contributions. The action helps to provide opportunities for skill development, offer consultation before making decisions, encourage participation in decision-making, delegate additional responsibilities and authorities, and trust subordinates to make decisions without seeking the leader's approval (Yukl et al., 2009). The positive behavior of a leader improves norms of mutual concern and trust between superiors and subordinates, encouraging subordinates to show positive behavior, including innovative contributions to their work. In the service business context, where client expectations are dynamic, there is an increased need for workers' IWB. Therefore, a leader possessing practical service skills can stimulate the development of innovative behavior among employees, thereby improving organizational growth (Akram et al., 2020). The investigation on developing innovative work behavior (IWB) in this study includes innovation leadership (IL), perceived organizational support (POS), cultural intelligence (CI), and knowledge sharing (KS), as shown in Figure 1.

Figure 1: Theoretical Framework.

Literature Review

Schumpeter (1934) defines innovation as a novel combination of new or existing knowledge, resources, equipment, and other factors. On the other hand, innovativeness is an organizational inclination to innovate or develop new products (Ettlie et al., 1984). From a corporate perspective, innovativeness involves introducing something new to the industry, consumers, the market, and the world (Asurakkody & Shin, 2018). According to Farr (1990), IWB is the proactive action by individuals to generate new ideas, processes, products, or procedures through intentional efforts in their work roles, groups, or organizations. Consequently, the phenomenon is critical for organizational success, as innovation cannot be achieved without employees' contributions.

The individual's innovative behavior is a result of interacting systems, namely leaders (Scott & Bruce, 1994), POS (Alpkan et al., 2010; L. Qi et al., 2019), and CI (Fan et al., 2020; Korzilius et al., 2017). Regarding innovation, the Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) theory suggests that the quality of the relationship between leaders and team members plays a crucial role in influencing innovation. This includes how superiors and subordinates are engaged in the development process, the decision-making latitude, and the allowable autonomy of subordinates. Leaders' positive behavior can create a sense of obligation among employees by establishing favor exchanges, thereby promoting indebtedness on various levels, including trust, control of organizational resources, and competence (M. S. Kim & Koo, 2017). Employees with a high level of LMX with their leaders may feel compelled to work harder, yielding positive organizational outcomes, one is the demonstration of IWB (M. S. Kim & Koo, 2017).

Innovative Leadership and Innovative Work Behavior

Many studies describe the crucial role of leadership in the innovation process. However, they often focus on leadership styles or actions to encourage creativity (T. M. Amabile, 1988). This traditional leadership approach is more pertinent to predicting productivity outcomes than innovation (Waldman & Bass, 1991). The Leader-Subordinate Exchange theory can describe leadership associated with innovation, as the leader's role influences IWB by modifying innovative behavior based on expectations received from others (Scott et al., 1994).

The exploration of Alharbi (2021) on IL shows differences between innovative and traditional leadership behavior. An innovative leader is expected to have various leadership style characteristics. For example, transformational leadership can inspire logical thinking and creative idea generation (Afsar et al., 2014). Providing autonomy, growth opportunities, and diverse skills can motivate employees to learn new things and increase participation in creativity and innovation (Afsar & Umrani, 2019). With an internalized moral perspective and relational transparency, authentic leadership focuses on followers and acts ethically, leading to positive employee performance for the company's best interests (Schuckert et al., 2018). Moreover, entrepreneurial leadership incorporates creating new ideas to solve problems, appreciating and supporting employees' innovative ideas, and developing strategies to facilitate innovation (Li et al., 2020). Self-leadership aids individuals in developing IWB by providing self-management, self-motivation, and self-influence on thoughts and behavior (Kör, 2016). Alharbi (2021) also explained that to become an innovative leader, There is a need to discard the notion of "best practices," expedite decision-making and empower members to take multiple initiatives or problem-solving approaches.

Sen (2007) stated that a leader embracing innovation should be well-versed in history, attuned to current conditions, and adept at predicting the future. Moreover, the leader should establish a vision and mission capable of reshaping and creating new political, economic, cultural, and technological conditions to address present and future challenges and fulfill the demands of individuals in organizations and countries. These leaders believe they can and should shape the future through shared visions, courageous actions, and calculated risk-taking. A shared vision incorporates core beliefs and articulates strong desires, aspirations, and dreams for achieving significant objectives. It also provides focus, sets direction, motivates and unites people in a collective effort, and supports fundamental values for effective implementation.

IL incorporates diverse leadership philosophies to influence and inspire employees to generate cutting-edge products, services, and ideas (Alharbi, 2021). Furthermore, IL catalyzes novel ideas in the workplace by promoting an environment that nurtures creativity and efficiently manages innovation (Kremer et al., 2019). This variable is believed to drive the achievement of the organization's vision and objectives, with leadership possessing the skills, moral principles, and expertise to recognize current threats and foresee potential adverse effects (Şen & Eren, 2012). Lastly, it should possess explicit knowledge and values (Farkas & De Backer, 1996), particularly understanding social ideas, beliefs, intuitions, transactions, and imagination (Lebow & Simon, 1997). IL must comprehend their organization's approaches, rules, processes, and technology to determine how, what, and why when resolving issues encountered (Şen et al., 2013).

Today's predominant leadership challenge comprises navigating complex and ambiguous conditions compared to previous times—a situation where the future is uncertain. To address these conditions, Wollmann (2020) contended that a leader must offer clear guidance and inspire organizational members to engage with the organization and contribute (sustainable purpose). The leader should be prepared to embrace change, possess a high sense of curiosity, be open, experimental, and capable of overcoming uncertainty and unexpected obstacles (traveling organization). Additionally, leaders should manage connectivity to prevent the development of disconnected strategies and processes. With flexible connectivity, it becomes possible to balance various interests in the company and among stakeholders (connecting resources).

As explained above, no single leadership style perfectly describes the concept of IL. However, this study argued that, for sustainable goals, traveling organizations and connecting resources come closest to describing IL and can motivate innovative behavior among employees. Based on this explanation, the first hypothesis is formulated as follows:

H1 = *IL has a significant positive effect on IWB*

Perceived Organization Support and Innovative Work Behavior

Eisenberger (1986) introduced the concept of POS to elucidate how to strengthen employee commitment to the organization. This concept comprises improving general beliefs about how much the organization values employees' contributions and cares about their well-being. Employees who perceive high levels of organizational support tend to feel valued by the organization, as it shows care for their welfare (Mayes et al., 2017). A leader who embraces new ideas, technologies, and processes promotes a sense of value and care among employees (L. Qi et al., 2019). POS that encourages employees intellectually to propose alternative solutions to existing problems or enhance current procedures will promote employee innovative behavior (Nazir et al., 2019).

For employees introducing new ideas to challenge established norms, their innovative behavior may face resistance from colleagues seeking to maintain the status quo or avoid the uncertainty associated with change. Consequently, employees with innovative capabilities may opt for the safer path or avoid situations requiring change (Agarwal, 2014). This is where the organization's role becomes crucial in meeting employees' needs and welfare, enhancing employee motivation and performance for engaging in innovative behavior. Organizations should ensure that every employee perceives the organization positively, achieved through superior support by recognizing new ideas, providing job security, and offering work autonomy (Afsar & Badir, 2017). Other studies show that employees with a positive POS contribute value-added innovation, deliver better service quality, show exceptional performance, and consistently apply new ideas in their work (Altunoglu & Bulgurcu Gürel, 2015).

Innovative behavior is considered risky, typically by employees committed to the organization (Nazir et al., 2019). The degree of employee commitment can be influenced by fairness in decision-making, superiors' concern for employee welfare, and acknowledgment of employee contributions (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). Additionally, organizational support can be realized through managerial practices, including encouraging idea generation, providing adequate free time for developing new ideas, allowing freedom in decision-making, implementing a performance-based system to motivate innovation, and permitting risk-taking for the implementation of new ideas (Alpkan et al., 2010). Based on this information, the following hypotheses are proposed:

H2 = *POS has a significant positive effect on IWB*

Cultural Intelligence and Innovative Work Behavior

Earley (2003) defined CI as an individual's ability to navigate diverse cultural settings effectively. Consequently, it focuses on an individual's capacity to thrive in various intercultural contexts, in line with broader definitions of intelligence that show the ability to adapt to specific environments (Hong et al., 2015). According to Hu (2019), active employee interaction increases innovative ideas and behavior. Individuals with high CI are motivated to communicate effectively with colleagues from diverse cultural backgrounds. The acquisition of adequate, valuable, and up-to-date information stimulates thinking, encourages innovative ideas, and promotes the adoption of innovative behavior by integrating various existing information. High CI aids employees in seeking information assistance from colleagues, improving the generation of innovative ideas and engagement in innovative behavior.

CI can address cultural diversity issues that impede team collaboration. Additionally, it is a competency capable of reducing perceptions of cultural differences and breaking down cultural barriers between team members (Puyod & Charoensukmongkol, 2019; Rockstuhl & Ng, 2008; Young et al., 2017). People tend to develop positive perceptions and react more favorably toward those who are culturally similar, making it easier to share knowledge and achieve innovative performance (Ratasuk & Charoensukmongkol, 2020). Additional study suggests that individuals with high CI find it easier to obtain relevant information, generating potential ideas for innovation (Fan et al., 2020). Korzilius (2017) describes the significant influence of CI, particularly in multicultural relations. A lack of multicultural competence makes it challenging for an individual to interact with people from other cultures due to a lack of understanding of values, desires, talents, or knowledge of cultures different from their own. CI is a cross-cultural competency comprising adaptation processes through encounters with other cultures (cognition), motivation to adapt (motivation), and active learning and adaptation to other cultures (behavior) (Earley & Ang, 2003). CI is selected for this study due to the diverse regional cultures in Indonesia, which can impact employee interactions. As a result, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H3 = *CI has a significant positive effect on IWB*

The Moderating Role of Knowledge Sharing

Du Plessis (2007) defined innovation as a knowledge process that concentrates on developing commercially viable solutions. The innovation process combines and diffuses diverse knowledge to create new knowledge, thereby developing new products and services. Knowledge plays a crucial role in enhancing an organization's competitive advantage, prompting many organizations to consider knowledge management an essential element of Human Resource Management (HRM) (Obeidat et al., 2016). Additionally, knowledge creation incorporates the conversion between tacit and explicit knowledge. Explicit knowledge can be easily explained and documented, whereas tacit knowledge is challenging to articulate (Nonaka, 1994). Many argue that converting tacit knowledge into explicit knowledge is difficult due to its nature, which is best communicated through direct interaction and storytelling (Goffin & Koners, 2011). The presence of tacit knowledge in businesses is critical due to its inherent qualities of being non-imitable, unique, and easily transferable. Moreover, tacit knowledge can enhance the manifestation of IWB, which is crucial for effectively adapting to and navigating changes in the dynamic corporate environment (Işık et al., 2021). The sharing of information and knowledge is a fundamental element in knowledge management. Consequently, KS is viewed as behavior (process or operation) in which individuals exchange knowledge (information, skills, and expertise).

KS can act as a variable that has a direct relationship or as a mediating or moderating variable in influencing innovative work behavior. Akram (2020) reported that in their research, KS among colleagues has a direct positive and significant impact on employees' IWB and can mediate between organizational justice and employee IWB. A study by Khorakian (2019) describes KS as sharing best practices and mistakes that have been made, both of which positively affect IWB. This study stated that KS directly influences innovative work behavior and can mediate between ethical and innovative work behavior. Apart from being a mediator, KS can also be used as a moderating factor. As stated by Afsar (2019), KS can mediate between transformational leadership and innovative work behavior. In other words, the relationship

between transformational leadership and IWB strengthens as the KS process becomes effective. Usmanova (2020) presented research that showed different results from three previous studies, stating no significant relationship between KS and IWB. This study suggests that the relationship between KS and IWB can be strengthened by enhancing the appropriate communication patterns between superiors and employees through spiritual stimulation and incentives for collaboration.

KS incorporates two fundamental components, namely "knowledge collection" and "donation" (Kmieciak, 2020). Knowledge accumulation involves seeking intellectual capital from others to acquire insights, while knowledge donation involves sharing personal intellectual capital. The willingness to engage in KS is determined by an individual's attitude, focusing on the group's interests and anticipating reciprocity, where group members reciprocate by sharing knowledge. This study examines the role of KS in strengthening the relationship between IL, POS, and CI on IWB. Accordingly, the following hypothesis is proposed:

H4a = *KS positively moderates the relationship between IL and IWB*

H4b = *KS positively moderates the relationship between POS and IWB*

H4c = *KS positively moderates the relationship between CI and IWB*

Methodology

Data Collection and Respondents

To accomplish the study objectives, a proportionate stratified random sampling approach was used (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). Samples were drawn from government banks in the West Java region, consisting of 15 branches and 141 sub-branch offices. Respondents included permanent employees in operational roles: lower-level, middle-level, and upper-level management. The region was selected based on having the most significant number of employees and customers to serve. A structured questionnaire was designed using Google Forms and distributed via email and the WhatsApp platform to ensure a broader range of responses. A selection of questions leading to predetermined criteria-based choices was included to maintain questionnaire validity. Questionnaires were distributed after the company where the respondent worked approved this research, and the respondent agreed to contribute to filling out the questionnaire.

Sebelum kuesioner dibagikan kepada responden. Semua responden yang terlibat dalam penelitian ini telah menyetujui untuk berpartisipasi dalam mengisi kuesioner serta penyebaran kuesioner telah disetujui oleh perusahaan tempat responden bekerja

Before collecting the primary data, a pilot study comprising 50 bank employees was conducted to ensure the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. Test results showed that all items from the questionnaire were valid and within the accepted reliability threshold, set at 0.7 (Hair et al., 2018). Primary data collection occurred from January to March 2023, resulting in 469 valid responses, representing 80.2% of the 585 questionnaires received. 116 respondents (19.8%) had invalid answers due to not meeting predetermined criteria and showing straight-lining patterns in the data.

Measurement

This study used a 48-item questionnaire adapted from previous exploration. IL comprised three dimensions, namely sustainable purpose (Bass & Avolio, 1996), traveling organization (Miller & Miller, 2020), and connecting resources (Afsar & Umrani, 2019). POS (Alpkan et al., 2010) included five dimensions: management support for idea generation, allocation of free time, flexibility in work, performance-based reward systems, and risk tolerance. CI (Ang et al., 2007) comprised three dimensions: cognition, motivation, and behavior. On the other hand, KS (Kmieciak, 2020) had two dimensions: knowledge collection and knowledge donation. IWB (J. De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010) comprised three dimensions: idea creation, idea promotion, and idea implementation. A Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly concur) was used to evaluate the questionnaire.

This investigation used Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) based on partial least squares

(PLS-SEM) using the SmartPLS 4 software with a copyright license. In addition, the study analyzed reflective high-order construct (second-order) measurements using a two-stage strategy and the construct score to examine the concept in greater depth at the indicator level (Hair et al., 2022). PLS-SEM was chosen for its ability to generate latent variable scores for further analysis, consistent with validating the theoretical framework from a predictive standpoint.

Results

The characteristics of the respondents in Table 1 showed a relatively balanced distribution between male and female participants, with 258 female respondents (55.01%) and 211 male respondents (44.99%). This suggested an even distribution of questionnaires among men and women. The majority of respondents above 41 were 218 (46.48%). Regarding years of service, the highest distribution was among those who had worked for more than 16 years, totaling 204 respondents (43.50%), followed by employees with 11-15 years of tenure, constituting 109 respondents (23.24%). The data on age and years of service showed that most respondents were loyal employees who had been with the company since the beginning of their careers. Additionally, the respondents were predominantly employees working in branch offices (48.4%), with the majority employed in the credit department (27.93%) and front liners (23.24%). Therefore, most respondents were operational employees directly participating in customer interactions.

Table 1. Profile of respondents

Before exploring the measurement model analysis, verifying its validity and reliability was crucial. The indicator reliability (Outer Loading factor), internal consistency reliability, and convergent validity served as measures for assessing the reflective model's reliability and construct validity (Hair et al., 2022). Convergent validity was assessed using the average variance extracted (AVE), commonly called commonality. Moreover, AVE was considered good when it had a minimum value of 0.5, showing that, on average, the construct explained 50% or more of the variance of the indicator. The reliability of the measurement model was determined by outer loading, where a high outer loading on a construct implied that the related indicators were in line with those captured by the construct. The standard for outer loading was a minimum of 0.708, although a value between 0.40 and 0.70 could be acceptable if the model already showed good internal consistency reliability and convergent validity.

Internal consistency reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha (α) and composite reliability (Cr). These values ranged from 0 to 1, with values close to 1 showing high reliability. Generally, the acceptable minimum limit for Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability in the exploratory study was between 0.60 and 0.70, while results between 0.70 and 0.95 represented a satisfactory level of reliability. The structural model's relevance and predictive accuracy were evaluated using the Explanatory Power Model (R^2) and effect size (f^2). For example, R^2 quantified the extent to which predictor factors contributed to the outcome construct. The rules for assessing f^2 showed that values of 0.02 (small), 0.15 (medium), and 0.35 (large) determined the effect size. Meanwhile, an effect value of <0.02 suggested no effect (Hair et al., 2019).

Table 2: Validity and Reliability Test.

In Table 2, each indicator had an outer loading greater than 0.708, indicating good reliability of the existing instruments. AVE value exceeding 0.5 showed strong convergent validity, affirming the quality of the study instrument. The internal consistency reliability test yielded a score above 0.7 for both Cronbach's alpha and Composite reliability, confirming the instrument's robust internal consistency and reliability. Additionally, the measurement results of the Explanatory Power Model (Table 3) showed a moderate strength of 63.6% ($R^2 = 0.636$). This meant that 63.6% of the variables influencing IWB were represented by IL, POS, CI, and KS, while the remaining 36.4% were influenced by factors not described in this model. Typically, f^2 analysis showed that POS ($f^2 = 0.021$) and CI ($f^2 = 0.045$) had a negligible impact, while IL ($f^2 = 0.000$) had no impact on IWB. However, when IL, POS, and CI were collectively considered, CI became the factor with the most significant impact on IWB.

Table 3: Explanatory Power Model.

The hypothesis testing in this study incorporated 5000 bootstrap samples (Hair et al., 2022) with a significance level of 0.05. The critical t value for two-sided testing, more significant than

1.96, was acceptable for a significance level of 5% (p value < 0.05). Path coefficients were employed for structural model analysis, facilitating the interpretation of data by testing hypothesized relationships between constructs. These coefficients typically ranged between -1 and +1, with values approaching +1 showing a strong positive relationship. The results in Table 4 show the outcomes of the structural model.

Table 4: Hypothesis Testing.

Hypothesis 1, examining the effect of IL on IWB, showed a negative and insignificant impact ($\beta = -0.020$; $T = 0.339 < 1.96$; $P = 0.735 > 0.05$). This suggested that IL had no positive effect and exerted a weak influence, leading to the rejection of hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 2, testing the influence of POS on IWB, produced significant positive results ($\beta = 0.164$; $T = 2.372 > 1.96$; $P = 0.018 < 0.05$), showing a strong positive influence. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was accepted. Hypothesis 3, examining the impact of CI on IWB, showed a positive and significant influence ($\beta = 0.222$; $T = 3.026 > 1.96$; $P = 0.002 < 0.05$), leading to the acceptance of hypothesis 3.

The subsequent test aimed to determine the moderating effect of whether KS could strengthen the relationship between IL, POS, and CI on IWB. The results showed that the interaction between IL and IWB was not statistically significant in the negative direction ($\beta = -0.090$; $T = 1.579 < 1.96$; $P = 0.114 > 0.05$). This implied that KS could not strengthen or influence this relationship, resulting in the rejection of hypothesis 4a. On the other hand, the interaction of CI on IWB was statistically significant in the negative direction ($\beta = -0.099$; $T = 2.214 > 1.96$; $P = 0.027 < 0.05$), signifying a substantial role of KS in reducing IWB influenced by CI. Therefore, hypothesis 4c was rejected. Meanwhile, the interaction between POS and IWB was statistically significant in the positive direction ($\beta = 0.171$; $T = 2.429 > 1.96$; $P = 0.015 < 0.05$). This showed that KS significantly increased the relationship between POS and IWB, leading to the acceptance of hypothesis 4b. Slope analysis was used to confirm the direction of the moderation effect. Figure 2 showed that with high KS (+1 SD), the influence of POS on IWB was higher than with no KS. However, Figure 3 shows the increase in IWB between high KS (+1 SD) and low KS (-1 SD), indicating that low KS had a higher relationship between CI and IWB.

Figure 2: Sample Slope Analysis KS x POS to IWB.

Figure 3: Sample Slope Analysis KS x CI to IWB.

DISCUSSION

The testing of the six hypotheses resulted in several key insights. Firstly, the results partially confirmed POS's significant and positive influence on IWB (H2) and CI on IWB (H3). In this investigation, POS referred to employees' perceptions of the organization regarding managerial practices and behavior patterns to support employees in generating sustainable competitive advantages through IWB. The desired employee perception comprised encouraging management to develop and generate new ideas, providing ample time for idea development without the burden of routine work, supporting decision-making initiatives, endorsing performance-based compensation or reward systems, and having organizational backing for risk-taking in implementing created ideas (Alpkan et al., 2010). Among the five dimensions measured, it was identified that freedom in work held the most significant influence in determining employee IWB. The next influential dimension was the organization's tolerance for taking risks concerning implementing ideas. Haq (2017) suggested that providing employees with the freedom to implement new ideas facilitated experimentation to enhance work processes or create new products, and tolerance for failure enhanced employees' understanding that innovation was in progress. Freedom at work also motivated proactive employees to be more creative.

Additionally, freedom at work could be viewed as employee flexibility in performing tasks (X. Qi et al., 2023). Employees with low flexibility could be stimulated by creating regulations that reduce work requirements and encourage skill improvement. Moreover, highly flexible employees benefited from increased challenges through greater flexibility in work demands. A challenge in the banking industry, specifically government banking, was the compliance with numerous regulations, indirectly impinging on employees' freedom to express new ideas. This showed the crucial need for organizational support in promoting employee freedom at work, particularly in the banking sector (Forbes.com, 2021).

Concerning H3, the results disclosed that CI significantly and positively influenced IWB. These results showed the importance of CI as a significant factor in leveraging diversity as an added value for organizations to enhance IWB. Ratasuk (2020) suggested that individuals with high CI showed higher levels of IWB due to their reduced tendency to cling to knowledge, enabling increased creativity. CI endowed individuals with enhanced verbal and non-verbal abilities, facilitating more effective communication across cultures and promoting a deeper understanding of multicultural experiences (Afsar et al., 2021). Moreover, it eased adaptation to different cultural situations (Korzilius et al., 2017) and enhanced cross-cultural capabilities (Fan et al., 2020), stimulating individual creativity to devise innovative solutions.

Secondly, the empirical results did not support Hypothesis 1 (H1), stating that IL did not show a significant positive relationship with IWB. As described in the preceding section, studies on IL characteristics remained scarce. Typically, explorations associated IL with existing leadership styles. It should be acknowledged that participative and supportive leadership significantly impacts employee creativity (Tung & Yu, 2016). In parallel, investigation on entrepreneurial leadership (Akbari et al., 2021), Transformational Leadership (Bak et al., 2022), Empowering leadership (Hassi et al., 2022), inclusive leadership (Guo et al., 2023), and servant leadership (Guo et al., 2023) showed their influence on IWB. This phenomenon was interesting, given the theoretical and empirical evidence establishing leadership's crucial role in promoting or hindering workplace creativity and innovation (Hughes et al., 2018). To enhance creativity and innovation, innovation leaders had to adopt new approaches, embrace different approaches, and maintain competitiveness. Trust and confidence in team members were crucial for improving innovative attitudes. This included respecting subordinates' skills and experiences and enabling them to innovate in task execution and idea generation (Alharbi, 2021). Additionally, effective leadership comprised articulating a vision (J. P. J. de Jong & Den Hartog, 2007), providing constructive feedback (T. Amabile, 1996), clarifying tasks and roles (T. Amabile, 1996), and motivating and encouraging subordinates (Zhou & Shalley, 2003).

Thirdly, the analysis of KS as a moderator yielded three hypotheses, namely, KS positively moderated the relationship between IL and IWB (H4a), the relationship between POS and IWB (H4b), and the relationship between CI and IWB (H4c). These results showed that high organizational support prompted employees to enhance diligence in fulfilling work responsibilities, increasing employee participation and improved behavior (Eisenberger et al., 1990). Elevated employee commitment manifested as a positive attitude towards the organization, fostering a social exchange process. Positive attitudes included employees willingly sharing knowledge with colleagues (Choi et al., 2022). Employees consistently allocated time to share work-related information or ongoing ideas to facilitate KS. Moreover, employees actively looked for optimal approaches and developed new ideas when confronted with challenging work issues (implementation of ideas). However, KS did not strengthen the relationship between IL and IWB, contrary to the results by Mittal and Dhar (2015), who stated that employee creativity was reinforced through KS. High perceptions of leadership and creative self-efficacy could heighten employee creativity, provided employees believed that sharing knowledge yielded superior creative results. Afsar, Masood and Umrani (2019) similarly stated that sharing knowledge was a facilitator, aiding leadership in guiding employees toward innovation.

Finally, an anomaly appeared in the study results, and a typical example of this was KS, which reduced the impact of the relationship between CI and IWB. This anomaly may have stemmed from the characteristics of respondents in this study, which predominantly focused on employees working in branch offices (48.4%) and sub-branches (30.3%), where the employee emphasis leaned more towards operational banking activities such as credit positions (27.93%), Frontliner (23.24%), and Sales/Marketing (15.57%). This situation burdened employees when formal KS was required. On the contrary, leveraging their CI, they could innovate in their daily work. The questionnaire analysis showed that bank employees enjoyed interacting with colleagues from different cultures, effortlessly adapting to diverse cultural environments even when different from their own. However, when it came to sharing knowledge, they were less inclined to share skills or experiences, explicitly using the formal concept of knowledge management. Due to their role in the banking operations, these employees had limited time to share their knowledge, causing challenges when generating ideas related to their work environment. Results might have differed if most respondents were based in the head office and held non-operational positions such as Information Technology, Finance, and Human Resources.

Practical Implications

In general, this study was developed from the competitive strategies proposed by Porter (1997), comprising an innovation process requiring the participation of human resources (Schuler & Jackson, 1987). The three behavior factors, developed by (Scott & Bruce, 1994) and knowledge management by Nonaka (1994), served as foundational assets for organizations in competition (Barney, 1991; North & Kumta, 2018; Sarra et al., 2013). Settoon (1996) explained that desired work behavior, whether appropriate or superior, depended on the nature of the relationship with the superior. A relationship based on mutual trust, loyalty, interpersonal effects, and respect yielded superior performance in expected behavior.

The current study offered several implications for management, particularly in the banking sector. Specifically, the results showed that to enhance IWB, organizations needed to support employees in idea generation, allowing them free time and autonomy to develop and implement ideas in their daily work. In implementing these ideas, organizations should be flexible and willing to make concessions if initial ideas do not meet expectations. The goal was to encourage employees to continue being creative without fear. Finally, organizations should recognize and reward employees for their creative achievements. To address existing cultural diversity, continuous interaction among employees from different cultures, as shown through body language, speaking style, and actions, could diminish perceived cultural differences and break down cultural barriers among team members (Puyod & Charoensukmongkol, 2019; Rockstuhl & Ng, 2008; Young et al., 2017). Frequent interaction facilitated the exchange of valuable information, triggering thoughts that promoted innovative ideas and behavior by integrating diverse information sources (Hu et al., 2019). As organizational trust grew and diversity management was effectively implemented, employee motivation to share knowledge increased, turning it into a valuable source of ideas for the organization.

Organizations still require the presence of an innovation leader because leaders play a significant role in influencing employee creativity in innovation (Alsolami et al., 2016). To achieve this, organizations should have encouraged their leaders to adopt new approaches and approaches to stay competitive. Leaders needed to instill trust and confidence in their team members, shaping attitudes based on subordinates' skills and experiences to improve innovative employees who appreciate subordinates when performing tasks and presenting new ideas. Additionally, a leader had to articulate a vision (J. P. J. de Jong & Den Hartog, 2007), provide feedback (T. Amabile, 1996), explain tasks and roles (Amabile et al., 2004), and motivate and encourage subordinates (Zhou & Shalley, 2003).

Limitations And Future Study

This study had several limitations that needed consideration for future exploration. Firstly, data collection was limited to the banking industry in the West Java region, potentially limiting the generalizability of the results to other sectors. Therefore, there is a need to broaden the scope of the investigation across multiple industries and regions. Secondly, the investigation was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, where lockdown policies, such as Work From Home directive, might have influenced questionnaire results. As a result, future work was recommended to consider respondents' conditions when sampling. Lastly, the study on IL was challenging due to the absence of a definitive formula. Consequently, there is a need to explore IL from various perspectives to enrich references on the subject.

Author Contributions Statement

Husain Nurisman designed, conceptualized, analyzed, and interpreted the results. Armanu Thoyib, Dodi Wirawan Irawanto, and Mintarti Rahayu supervised the study results. All authors engaged in discussions regarding the results, reached a consensus, and shared responsibility for all outcomes of this study.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s)

Funding

No funding was received

Data Availability

The data supporting the results of this study can be obtained from the corresponding author upon a reasonable request.

References

- Afsar, B., Al-Ghazali, B. M., Cheema, S., & Javed, F. (2021). Cultural intelligence and innovative work behavior: the role of work engagement and interpersonal trust. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 24(4), 1082–1109. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-01-2020-0008>
- Afsar, B., & Badir, Y. (2017). Workplace spirituality, perceived organizational support and innovative work behavior: The mediating effects of person-organization fit. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 29(2), 95–109. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JWL-11-2015-0086>
- Afsar, B., Badir, Y. F., & Saeed, B. Bin. (2014). Transformational leadership and innovative work behavior. *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, 114(8), 1270–1300. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IMDS-05-2014-0152>
- Afsar, B., Masood, M., & Umrani, W. A. (2019). The role of job crafting and knowledge sharing on the effect of transformational leadership on innovative work behavior. *Personnel Review*, 48(5), 1186–1208. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-04-2018-0133>
- Afsar, B., & Umrani, W. A. (2019). Transformational leadership and innovative work behavior: The role of motivation to learn, task complexity and innovation climate. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 23(3), 402–428. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-12-2018-0257>
- Agarwal, U. A. (2014). Examining the impact of social exchange relationships on innovative work behaviour: Role of work engagement. *Team Performance Management*, 20(3–4), 102–120. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TPM-01-2013-0004>
- Akbari, M., Bagheri, A., Imani, S., & Asadnezhad, M. (2021). Does entrepreneurial leadership encourage innovation work behavior? The mediating role of creative self-efficacy and support for innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 24(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-10-2019-0283>
- Akram, T., Lei, S., Haider, M. J., & Hussain, S. T. (2020). The impact of organizational justice on employee innovative work behavior: Mediating role of knowledge sharing. *Journal of Innovation and Knowledge*, 5(2), 117–129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2019.10.001>
- Al-Husseini, S., El Beltagi, I., & Moizer, J. (2021). Transformational leadership and innovation: the mediating role of knowledge sharing amongst higher education faculty. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*, 24(5), 670–693. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13603124.2019.1588381>
- Alam, I. (2013). Customer interaction in service innovation: evidence from India. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, 8(1), 41–64. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17468801311297273>
- Alharbi, I. B. A. (2021). Innovative Leadership: A Literature Review Paper. *Open Journal of Leadership*, 10(03), 214–229. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojl.2021.103014>
- Alpkan, L., Bulut, C., Gunday, G., Ulusoy, G., & Kilic, K. (2010). Organizational support for intrapreneurship and its interaction with human capital to enhance innovative performance. *Management Decision*, 48(5), 732–755. <https://doi.org/10.1108/00251741011043902>
- Alsolami, H. A., Guan Cheng, K. T., & M. Ibn Twalh, A. A. (2016). Revisiting Innovation Leadership. *Open Journal of Leadership*, 05(02), 31–38. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ojl.2016.52004>
- Altunoğlu, A. E., & Bulgurcu Gürel, E. B. (2015). Effects of Leader–member Exchange and Perceived Organizational Support on Organizational Innovation: The Case of Denizli Technopark. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 207, 175–181. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.10.170>
- Amabile, T. (1996). *Creativity in context* Westview Press. Boulder, Colorado.
- Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. *Research in*

- Organizational Behavior, 10(1), 123–167.
- Amabile, T. M., Conti, R., Coon, H., Lazenby, J., & Herron, M. (1996). Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5), 1154–1184.
- Ang, S., Dyne, L. Van, Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., Chandrasekar, N. A., Van Dyne, L., Koh, C., Ng, K. Y., Templer, K. J., Tay, C., & Chandrasekar, N. A. (2007). Cultural Intelligence: Its Measurement and Effects on Cultural Judgment and Decision Making, Cultural Adaptation and Task Performance. *Management and Organization Review*, 39(2), 335–371. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j-1>
- Asurakkody, T. A., & Shin, S. Y. (2018). Innovative Behavior in Nursing Context: A Concept Analysis. *Asian Nursing Research*, 12(4), 237–244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anr.2018.11.003>
- Bak, H. U., Jin, M. H., & McDonald, B. D. (2022). Unpacking the Transformational Leadership-Innovative Work Behavior Relationship: The Mediating Role of Psychological Capital. *Public Performance and Management Review*, 45(1), 80–105. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2021.1939737>
- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: The Free Press.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1996). Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Western Journal of Nursing Research*.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership*. Psychology press.
- Chua, R. Y. J., Morris, M. W., & Mor, S. (2012). Collaborating across cultures: Cultural metacognition and affect-based trust in creative collaboration. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 118(2), 116–131.
- Conger, J. A., Kanungo, R. N., & Menon, S. T. (2000). Charismatic leadership and follower effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21(7), 747–767. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379\(200011\)21:7<747::AID-JOB46>3.0.CO;2-J](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-1379(200011)21:7<747::AID-JOB46>3.0.CO;2-J)
- 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>
- de Jong, J. P. J., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2007). How leaders influence employees' innovative behaviour. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 10(1), 41–64. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14601060710720546>
- Dhar, R. L. (2016). Ethical leadership and its impact on service innovative behavior: The role of LMX and job autonomy. *Tourism Management*, 57, 139–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.05.011>
- Du Plessis, M. (2007). The role of knowledge management in innovation. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 11(4), 20–29. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270710762684>
- Earley, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural intelligence: Individual interactions across cultures*.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.500>
- Ettlie, J. E., Bridges, W. P., & O'keefe, R. D. (1984). Organization strategy and structural differences for radical versus incremental innovation. *Management Science*, 30(6), 682–695.
- Fan, P., Song, Y., Nepal, S., & Lee, H. T. (2020). Can Cultural Intelligence Affect Employee's Innovative Behavior? Evidence From Chinese Migrant Workers in South Korea. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11(September). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.559246>
- Farkas, C. M., & De Backer, P. (1996). *Maximum leadership: The world's leading CEOs share their five strategies for success*. Macmillan.
- Farouk, S., Abu Elanain, H. M., Obeidat, S. M., & Al-Nahyan, M. (2016). HRM practices and organizational performance in the UAE banking sector: The mediating role of organizational innovation. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 65(6), 773–791. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-01-2016-0010>
- Farr, J. L., & Ford, C. M. (1990). *Individual innovation*.
- Forbes.com. (2021). *The World's Best Banks 2021: Financiers To The Looming Economic Recovery*. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/antoinagara/2021/04/13/the-worlds-best-banks-2021-financiers-to-the-looming-economic-recovery/?sh=227b5f682e17>

- Fujii, H., Managi, S., & Matousek, R. (2014). Indian bank efficiency and productivity changes with undesirable outputs: A disaggregated approach. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 38, 41–50.
- Garg, S., & Dhar, R. (2017). Employee service innovative behavior: The roles of leader-member exchange (LMX), work engagement, and job autonomy. *International Journal of Manpower*, 38(2), 242–258. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJM-04-2015-0060>
- Goffin, K., & Koners, U. (2011). Tacit Knowledge, Lessons Learnt, and New Product Development. 300–318.
- Guo, Y., Jin, J., & Yim, S. H. (2023). Impact of Inclusive Leadership on Innovative Work Behavior: The Mediating Role of Job Crafting. *Administrative Sciences*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci13010004>
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2018). *Multivariate data analysis*. Annabel Ainscow.
- Hair, J. F., Hult, G. T. M., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2022). *A Primer on Partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM) (3rd ed.)*. Sage publications.
- Hair, J. F., Risher, J. J., Sarstedt, M., & Ringle, C. M. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review*, 31(1), 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>
- Haq, M. A., Usman, M., & Hussain, J. (2017). Enhancing Employee Innovative Behavior: The Moderating Effects of Organizational Tenure. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences*, 11(3), 814–832.
- Hassi, A., Rohlfer, S., & Jebsen, S. (2022). Empowering leadership and innovative work behavior: the mediating effects of climate for initiative and job autonomy in Moroccan SMEs. *EuroMed Journal of Business*, 17(4), 503–518. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EMJB-01-2021-0010>
- Hong, Y., Gelfand, M. J., & Chiu, C. (2015). *Handbook of Advances in Culture and Psychology (5th ed.)*. Oxford University Press.
- Hu, N., Wu, J., & Gu, J. (2019). Cultural intelligence and employees' creative performance: The moderating role of team conflict in interorganizational teams. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 25(1), 96–116. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2016.64>
- Hughes, D. J., Lee, A., Tian, A. W., Newman, A., & Legood, A. (2018). Leadership, creativity, and innovation: A critical review and practical recommendations. *Leadership Quarterly*, 29(5), 549–569. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.03.001>
- Hunter, S. T., Bedell, K. E., & Mumford, M. D. (2007). Climate for creativity: A quantitative review. *Creativity Research Journal*, 19(1), 69–90.
- Işık, C., Aydın, E., Dogru, T., Rehman, A., Alvarado, R., Ahmad, M., & Irfan, M. (2021). The nexus between team culture, innovative work behaviour and tacit knowledge sharing: Theory and evidence. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 13(8). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13084333>
- Kim, M. S., & Koo, D. W. (2017). Linking LMX, engagement, innovative behavior, and job performance in hotel employees. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 29(12), 3044–3062. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJCHM-06-2016-0319>
- Kim, T. T., Karatepe, O. M., & Lee, G. (2018). Psychological contract breach and service innovation behavior: psychological capital as a mediator. *Service Business*, 12(2), 305–329. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11628-017-0347-4>
- Kim, T. T., & Lee, G. (2013). Hospitality employee knowledge-sharing behaviors in the relationship between goal orientations and service innovative behavior. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 34(1), 324–337. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2013.04.009>
- Kmiecik, R. (2020). Trust, knowledge sharing, and innovative work behavior: empirical evidence from Poland. *European Journal of Innovation Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-04-2020-0134>
- Kör, B. (2016). The mediating effects of self-leadership on perceived entrepreneurial orientation and innovative work behavior in the banking sector. *SpringerPlus*, 5(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-3556-8>
- Korzilius, H., Bücken, J. J. L. E., & Beerlage, S. (2017). Multiculturalism and innovative work behavior: The mediating role of cultural intelligence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 56(January), 13–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2016.11.001>
- Kremer, H., Villamor, I., & Aguinis, H. (2019). *Innovation leadership: Best-practice*

- recommendations for promoting employee creativity, voice, and knowledge sharing. *Business Horizons*, 62(1), 65–74. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.08.010>
- Lebow, R., & Simon, W. L. (1997). *Lasting change: The shared values process that makes companies great*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Li, C., Makhdoom, H. U. R., & Asim, S. (2020). Impact of Entrepreneurial Leadership on Innovative Work Behavior: Examining Mediation and Moderation Mechanisms. *Psychology Research and Behavior Management*, Volume 13, 105–118. <https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S236876>
- Lukes, M., & Stephan, U. (2017). Measuring employee innovation: A review of existing scales and the development of the innovative behavior and innovation support inventories across cultures. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour and Research*, 23(1), 136–158. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEER-11-2015-0262>
- Malviya, R., Hegde, A., & Joshi, M. (2020). Global Trends in the Banking Industry 2020. In Infosys Knowledge Institute. <https://www.infosys.com>
- Mayes, B. T., Finney, T. G., Johnson, T. W., Shen, J., & Yi, L. (2017). The effect of human resource practices on perceived organizational support in the People's Republic of China. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(9), 1261–1290. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2015.1114768>
- Maynard, A. D. (2015). Navigating the fourth industrial revolution. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 10(12), 1005–1006. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nnano.2015.286>
- Miller, L., & Miller, A. F. (2020). Innovative work behavior through high-quality leadership. *International Journal of Innovation Science*, 12(2), 219–236. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIS-04-2019-0042>
- Mittal, S., & Dhar, R. L. (2015). Transformational leadership and employee creativity. *Management Decision*, 53(5), 894–910. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-07-2014-0464>
- Nagarajan, R., Patrick, C. F., Tracey, S., & Ron, S. (2005). Determinants of innovative work behaviour: Development and test of an integrated model. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 14(2), 142–150. <http://proquest.umi.com/pqdweb?did=878076761%7B&%7DFmt=7%7B&%7DclientId=1917%7B&%7DRQT=309%7B&%7DVName=PQD>
- Nazir, S., Shafi, A., Atif, M. M., Qun, W., & Abdullah, S. M. (2019). How organization justice and perceived organizational support facilitate employees' innovative behavior at work. *Employee Relations*, 41(6), 1288–1311. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ER-01-2017-0007>
- Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, 5(1), 14–37.
- North, K., & Kumta, G. (2018). *Knowledge management: Value creation through organizational learning*. Springer.
- Obeidat, B. Y., Al-Suradi, M. M., Masa'deh, R., & Tarhini, A. (2016). The impact of knowledge management on innovation. *Management Research Review*, 39(10), 1214–1238. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-09-2015-0214>
- Park, H. A. (2016). Are We Ready for the Fourth Industrial Revolution? *Yearbook of Medical Informatics*, 1, 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.15265/iy-2016-052>
- Porter, M. E. (1997). *Competitive Strategy*. *Measuring Business Excellence*, 1(2), 12–17. <https://doi.org/10.1108/eb025476>
- Puyod, J. V., & Charoensukmongkol, P. (2019). The contribution of cultural intelligence to the interaction involvement and performance of call center agents in cross-cultural communication: The moderating role of work experience. *Management Research Review*.
- Qi, L., Liu, B., Wei, X., & Hu, Y. (2019). Impact of inclusive leadership on employee innovative behavior: Perceived organizational support as a mediator. *PLoS ONE*, 14(2), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0212091>
- Qi, X., Liu, H., Li, X., & Liu, H. (2023). The influence of flexible work arrangements on innovative employee behaviour in China: a perspective of person-job fit. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 29(3), 479–500. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602381.2021.2001181>
- Ratasuk, A., & Charoensukmongkol, P. (2020). Does cultural intelligence promote cross-cultural teams' knowledge sharing and innovation in the restaurant business? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*, 12(2), 183–203. <https://doi.org/10.1108/APJBA-05-2019-0109>
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714. [Kurdish Studies](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

9010.87.4.698

- Rockstuhl, T., & Ng, K.-Y. (2008). The effects of cultural intelligence on interpersonal trust in multicultural teams. *Handbook of Cultural Intelligence: Theory, Measurement, and Applications*, 206–220.
- Sarra, B., Benabou, D., & Tabeti, H. (2013). The Role of Strategic Human Capital Management in Achieving the Competitive Advantage. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(3), 361–368. <https://doi.org/10.5901/ajis.2013.v2n3p361>
- Schuckert, M., Kim, T. T., Paek, S., & Lee, G. (2018). Motivate to innovate: How authentic and transformational leaders influence employees' psychological capital and service innovation behavior. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, 30(2), 776–796. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijchm-05-2016-0282>
- Schuler, R. S., & Jackson, S. E. (1987). Linking Competitive Strategies with Human Resource Management Practices. 1(3), 207–219.
- Schumpeter, J. (1934). *The Theory of Economic Development*. New York: Routledge.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of Innovative Behavior: A Path Model of Individual Innovation in the Workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580–607. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256701>
- Scott, S. G., Bruce, R. A., Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of Innovative Behavior: A Path Model of Individual Innovation in the Workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 580–607. <https://doi.org/10.5465/256701>
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). *Research methods for business: A skill building approach*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Sen, A. (2007). Leadership with a shared vision in the 21st century. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, 2, 13–30.
- Şen, A., & Eren, E. (2012). Innovative Leadership for the Twenty-First Century. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 41, 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2012.04.001>
- Şen, A., Kabak, K. E., & Yangınlar, G. (2013). Courageous Leadership for the Twenty-First Century. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 75, 91–101. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.04.011>
- Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N., & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social exchange in organizations: Perceived organizational support, leader-member exchange, and employee reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3), 219–227. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.81.3.219>
- Sönmez, B., & Yıldırım, A. (2019). The mediating role of autonomy in the effect of pro-innovation climate and supervisor supportiveness on innovative behavior of nurses. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 22(1), 41–58. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-05-2018-0088>
- Suifan, T. S., & Al-Janini, M. (2017). The Relationship Between Transformational Leadership and Employees' Creativity in the Jordanian Banking Sector. *International Review of Management and Marketing*, 7(2), 284–292.
- Swift, M. L., & Virick, M. (2013). Perceived Support, Knowledge Tacitness, and Provider Knowledge Sharing. *Group & Organization Management*, 38(6), 717–742. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601113507597>
- Tung, F. C., & Yu, T. W. (2016). Does innovation leadership enhance creativity in high-tech industries? *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 37(5), 579–592. <https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-09-2014-0170>
- Usmanova, N., Yang, J., Sumarlah, E., Khan, S. U., & Khan, S. Z. (2020). Impact of knowledge sharing on job satisfaction and innovative work behavior: the moderating role of motivating language. *VINE Journal of Information and Knowledge Management Systems*, 51(3), 515–532. <https://doi.org/10.1108/VJIKMS-11-2019-0177>
- Waldman, D. A., & Bass, B. M. (1991). Transformational leadership at different phases of the innovation process. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, 2(2), 169–180. [https://doi.org/10.1016/1047-8310\(91\)90002-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/1047-8310(91)90002-6)
- Wang, S., & Noe, R. A. (2010). Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, 20(2), 115–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2009.10.001>
- Wollmann, P., Kühn, F., & Kempf, M. (2020). *Three Pillars of Organization and Leadership in Disruptive Times*. Springer.
- Young, C. A., Haffeejee, B., & Corsun, D. L. (2017). The relationship between ethnocentrism and cultural intelligence. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 58(April), 31–41.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2017.04.001>

- Yukl, G., O'Donnell, M., & Taber, T. (2009). Influence of leader behaviors on the leader/member exchange relationship. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24(4), 289–299. <https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940910952697>
- Zhang, Y., Xi, W., & Xu, F. Z. (2022). Determinants of employee innovation: an open innovation perspective. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing and Management*, 31(1), 97–124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2021.1934933>
- Zhou, J., & Shalley, C. E. (2003). Research on employee creativity: A critical review and directions for future research. *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management*, 22, 165–217.