

Chapter 1

Enhancing Employee Innovative Work Behavior Through Human Resource Management Practices

Nurten Polat Dede
Istanbul Medipol University, Turkey

ABSTRACT

Innovation capacity is one of the essential elements that ensure sustainability of the organizations. Organizations need to be creative and innovative so as to put products and services to market by forecasting customer needs to get competitive advantage in a rapidly changing business environment. Businesses that are more pioneering in innovation will be more successful if they can respond to changing environmental conditions and develop new capabilities that will allow them to deliver better performance. Innovation helps businesses to reduce costs, improve performance, and create new products and services to increase their competitiveness. Scholars contend that the development and implementation of human resource management is critical to benefit such essential employee contributions.

INTRODUCTION

The shifts brought by the trends such as globalization, technological developments and knowledge based economy, and the pace of these shifts expose today's businesses to ever-increasing pressure to be more innovative (Chan Kim & Mauborgne, 2005). The wishes and expectations of consumers are constantly changing and becoming more complex. Products known as state-of-the-art are either suddenly abandoned by technology developed by agile entrepreneurs or live a very short life (Miller & Keoleian 2015). In order to be able to adapt to these conditions, more and more companies have to fight harder and it is vital for businesses to be able to respond to expectations on time and in a complete manner. (Dess & Picken, 2000).

After 1990s, as the role of the HR managers in the organization expanded, HR managers were included in the enterprise strategic planning processes. The most important reason for this development is the fact that HR managers made significant contributions to the improvement of the organization and

DOI: 10.4018/978-1-5225-7180-3.ch001

to create organizational competences and willingness and determination of HR managers in undertaking strategical roles and creating their own plans and assessments as strategical planners. (Dede, 2018)

Human resources management departments are not responsible for innovations such as direct product development, process development or technology development in enterprises. But they can influence the innovation performance of the company positively or negatively as a formative, or as a practitioner of organizational policies. As a matter of fact, Huselid, Jackson and Schuler (1997) have defined “human resources management” as “strategic” and as the design and realization of internally consistent policies and practices that provide human capital and help to achieve firm objectives.

BACKGROUND

Studies on creativity and innovation in the field date back to 1940s and from 1940s to the present date, the aim to determine under which conditions creativity can be achieved and factors affecting innovation and innovation performance has been one of the most crucial issues in the field of management (Rothwell, 1992; Xu, Chen, Xie, Liu, Zheng & Wang, 2007).

The fact that many factors both inside and outside of the organization affect innovation performance, and because of the issues’ multidimensional structure, from many aspects of life such as innovation economy, business, management, industrial psychology, sociology and marketing, countless lots of researchers and authors have been affected while interest in HRM started much later.

In the period up to the 1990s, in order to improve innovation performance, employees in the literature on Business and Management were seen as important assets in this process and proposals were made for employees. However, they did not go beyond being the tools used in the innovation process.

Up to 20 Until now, apart from just few researchers who mentioned the need for HR policies as an enterprise strategy regarding innovation, there were no studies on HRM-innovation relationship (Miles & Snow, 1984; Schuler & Jackson, 1987).

Schuler and Jackson (1987) citing Porter, argued that a firm should follow one of its innovation, quality improvement and cost reduction strategies to gain competitive advantage. The authors have stated that all three strategies must demonstrate employees with specific skills and their different role behaviors. According to competitive strategies, Miles and Snow (1984) apply firms are divided as the ones implementing defensive strategies, implementing leading strategies, and firms implementing analyst strategies. Researchers likewise argued that each type of strategy would need organizational and human resources and policies to be managed and regulated in a manner appropriate to it.

However, much attention has not been paid to HR policies for innovation in their work-the conversion to specific HR practices or the consequences of these policies to “organizational innovation”.

What lies beneath handling HRM practices as a systems is the aim to increase the performance and organizational commitments of employees by directing their positive work attitude and behaviors effectively. For this reason, some HR activities sets systems are proposed in the literature for the implementation of HR practices in companies by bringing together a set of HR activities as the best practices of the HR. It is thought that these two systems will provide effective results with organizational output by increasing the skill, motivation of the employees and providing the opportunities that the employees can contribute.

Researchers show that high commitment work systems (HCWS) have a positive effect on various attitudes and behaviors. However, it is seen that these studies have produced different conclusions about whether high commitment work systems directly affect attitudes and behaviors or not. No consensus has

been reached in the literature as to whether the perceived high commitment work systems and innovative work behavior are directly related or not and which mediating and moderating variables play a role in this relationship. Researchers present different approaches, assumptions, and suggestions regarding these relationships. In this study, a conceptual framework on how the high commitment work system can affect employees' innovative work behavior through the influence of employees on the ability-motivation-opportunity and organizational commitment levels will be discussed. In addition, related proposals will be made regarding mediating-moderating variables which are expressed as black box of HRM in relation to HCWS- innovative work behavior.

This study fills an important gap in the literature with regard to the introduction of HRM practices that support individual creativity and innovative work behavior. To have a clear understanding of innovation management, it emphasizes the relationship human resource management and innovative organizations. The relationship between HRM and employees' innovative behaviors at individual level are among the subjects this study will examine in addition to the focus on HRM practices. This chapter also shows the basic literature relevant to the concept of human resource management and innovation management and discusses the connections and discrepancies discussed by existing researchers and their empirical findings to emphasize this relationship.

In this study, in order to strengthen the theory of high commitment work systems-innovative work behavior relationship, issues in the literature such as resource-based theory, universalistic theory, contingency theory, AMO model, the best HRM practices, high commitment work systems, social exchange theory, organizational commitment will be given.

Under the light of the above evaluations, it is expected that the work will contribute to researchers in HR and innovation management and practitioners in the sector explaining the high commitment work system and its impact of employees on the innovative behaviors and the reasons of this impact.

STRATEGIC HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND HIGH-COMMITMENT WORK SYSTEM (HCWS)

Quinn, Anderson & Finkelstein (1996), stated that having intellectual assets within the new economic structure, managing human and intellectual capital and directing them in line with enterprise aims is the most significant competency. Recently, it is seen that in HRM literature, high interest in HRM-Organizational Performance (OP) relationships has shifted to HRM-Organizational Innovation Performance (OIP) relationship and its results (Shipton, West, Dawson, Birdi, & Patterson, 2006; Beugelsdijk, 2008; De Winne & Sels, 2010). The interest in HRM-Innovation Performance (OIP) relationship at organizational level has accelerated after researchers and authors have reached a consensus on the effect of Innovation Performance (OIP) on Organizational Performance (OP).

In this context HRM applications have begun to be studied both at the organizational level (OIP) and at the individual level in terms of their impact on innovative work behavior (IWB) performance. It is stated that HRM-OIP organizational innovation performance relationship is studied more at organizational level but ignored at individual level (IWBP).

In the next part of the study, Soft and Hard Models of Human Resource Management, Resource- Based Theory, Universalistic Perspective of HRM, Contingency Perspectives of HRM, Strategic Fit which form the theoretical sub-structure of HRM- innovative work behavior relationship and some important HRM approaches and assumptions will be tried to be explained.

Strategic Human Resource Management

Wright and McMahan (1992) describe Strategic Human Resource Management (SHRM) as planned HRM activities that are implemented to enable the business to achieve its objectives. According to Tyson (1995), strategic human resources management is to manage human resources processes in accordance with the strategy determined by the business as a management process that enables business strategies to be realized more effectively.

Schuler and Walker (1990), on the other hand, consider SHRM as a tool for integrating human resources management activities and its processes into operational strategies; and human resources strategies as the plans, the programmes, the body of trends which HR and department managers share in order to meet the human capital who can meet the future needs shaped by the shifts around the organization.

Soft and Hard Models of Human Resource Management

The soft view of HRM as “human management” was introduced in 1984 by Beer, Spector, Lawrence, Mills and Walton at Harvard University. Unlike hard HRM approaches, according to this model, human resources are the most important assets of the business, not the variable costs, and the employees are important sources of competition. The soft model emphasizes the individuals, the self direction of individuals, and centralizes commitment, trust and self-regulated behavior of employees. The assumptions about the nature of the human potential are based on the theories of organizational behavior put forward by Maslow and Herzberg. In this approach, HRM departments should undertake coordination tasks to ensure that the vision and mission of the top management are shared by employees and provide a high degree of commitment to the firm, competent and motivated workforce output. Approach emphasizes the importance of responsibilities that line managers must undertake in activities related to HRM (providing motivation for employees, improving training, managing performances, increasing employee participation and positively promoting perceived organizational support) and of cooperation between HR managers and line managers. Another important of the Flexible Approach is the fact that it points to the importance of employees’ commitment to the business and to the role of the HR managers in increasing employees’ commitment to the business in order for organizational aims to be successful at operational level (Baird & Meshoulam 1988; Mabey & Salaman, 1995; Dede 2007). advocate that HRM should focus on employee participation, ensuring the continuity of human resources, the reward system and the working environment in order to regulate the relationships between business and employees.

Universalistic Perspective of HRM

The researchers who suggest universalist theory (Becker and Gerhart, 1996, Delery and Doty 1996; Huselid, 1995; Osterman, 1994); claim that some HRM applications, called “best human resources practices,” are more likely to create more effective results in organizational performances. According to the principles of the approach, some HRM activities are always superior to others, and these practices produce the best organizational outputs in all kinds of organizations. All of HRM activities can not be considered strategic, therefore HRM practice, which provides the highest financial performance, must be applied. When some HRM activities are used simultaneously, the impact of these HRM practices on performance is the result of the individual impact of each HRM application (Allani, Arcand & Bayad, 2003).

Contingency Approach

Within the scope of system understanding and complementarity of SHRM applications, the internal compatibility of all individual HR applications and external compatibility with all organizational goals, environment and strategies of the SHRM system are discussed (Truss & Gratton, 1994). The situational approach suggests that organizations with HR policy and implementation are better prepared to respond to external factors that provide superior performance. This approach assumes conformity of HRM practices with business strategy. This approach assumes that the performance of the organization is the cause of the harmony between the structure of the organization and the characteristics of the environment (Allani et al., 2003). The situational approach assumes that the HR strategy will be more effective when it is appropriately integrated with a particular organizational and environmental context (April Chang & Huang, 2005).

Researchers working on integration between HRM and business strategic planning and management have generally followed two basic approaches. First approach suggests that HR function is a more reactive task and advocates that organizational strategy is the basis for HR management strategies and policies. According to these views; HR appraisal such as performance appraisal, employment, training and remuneration are important contributors to the implementation of organizational strategic plans for managers. Harmonization of HR planning with strategic management and business planning is possible with these systems. The second approach suggests that human resources can assume a more proactive role in the strategy-setting process. In this case, HR managers assume responsibilities both in the formulation of the strategies and in the implementation phase.

HIGH-COMMITMENT WORK SYSTEM (HCWS)

According to Allen and Meyer (1990), commitment is a psychological condition which reflects the relationship of individuals with the organization. Organizational commitment refers to the discretionary behaviors which employees show and go beyond though “they are not written in the contract” and the organization will benefit from in achieving its goals (Janssen, 2000; Henssen, Voordeckers, Lambrechts & Koiranen, 2014). Organizational commitment increases the potential for employees to take initiative and show innovative work behavior with a sense of ownership and responsibility for their own psychological ownership and a feeling of concern about the future of the organization.

The flexible model of HRM recognizes the development of human resources, the management of its performance, the provision of opportunity to participate and the creation of its commitment – as a key strategy for the survival and growth of organizations. The ever-increasing pressure of being more innovative has increased the expectations of organizations for innovative work behavior and employee performance. It is not enough for employees to effectively fulfill their role requirements. It is expected that both employees and HRM departments will go beyond fulfilling their role requirements and demonstrate extra role behaviors that they think the organization will benefit from.

Some authors consider innovative work behavior, as extra role behaviors (Veenendaal, 2015). The relationship of organizational commitment with innovative work behaviors plays a crucial role in affecting employees showing extra role behaviors beyond their described roles by the organization. Because of this crucial role, researchers consider the relationship of organizational commitment with innovative

work behaviors important and they suggest models at conceptual and empirical level which try to explain mediating and moderating variables (Oly Ndubisi & Agarwal, 2014; Kehoe & Wright, 2013).

Human resources departments can influence the knowledge, skills, attitudes, behaviors and motivations of employees through practices and policies they have developed (Wright, McMahan & McWilliams, 1994; Jackson, Schuler & Rivero, 1989; Schuler and Jackson, 1987). Arthur (1994) states that dependency-based human resource systems (HCWS) provide a psychological link between the aims of organizations and individuals, enabling employees to exhibit desirable attitudes and behaviors. In this context, commitment-based human resource systems include structured human resources practices in order to increase employee commitment and involvement.

The aim of participative work practices is to ensure that employees work more effectively and efficiently. It is also expected that these types of working practises should improve employees' performance apart from their motivation and result in more ideas and information sharing. (Burton & O'Reilly, 2004) state that increasing the organizational commitment of employees will improve the performance of the organization due to better process and product quality.

According to Lepak, Liao, Chung & Harden (2006), it is necessary for human resources systems to be properly structured in order to reach various strategic goals (Arthur, 1992). Human resources applications as a system; complement each other, strengthen and influence the performance of individuals and associations through interrelated human resource practices (Laursen and Foss, 2003; Becker and Huselid, 1998; Huselid, 1995; McDuffie, 1995). As Laursen and Foss (2003) have pointed out, the impact of combined human resources practices on innovation performance may be greater than the individual impact of each human resource application.

HRM practices have limited ability to ensure innovative work behavior and organizational innovation. When these are combined with HRM practices, (providing more benefit as a result of interacting with another HRM practises) these HRM practice bundles (HCWP) influences business innovation performance and employee innovative work behavior more. For this reason, among the HRM practices which create high commitment business system, it is highly important to know which HRM practices will affect each other, whether these HRM practices will reduce each other's contribution, whether these HRM practices will affect employee creativity positively or negatively.

According to the complementarity of HR practices or systems, HRM systems are designed internally consistent and will create additional value for organizations if the HRM systems can then be linked to the firm's competitive strategy (Huselid 1998; Laursen & Foss, 2003). The concept of complementarity was first used by Edgeworth. According to this, if the return obtained by applying any one of the HR functions increases the yield to be obtained by the application of the others, this application integrates the others and creates synergies (Ataay, 1999). However, if system elements conflict with each other internally or externally, instead of creating value, they can reduce or even eliminate each other's values (Truss & Gratton, 1994). According to Becker, Huselid, Pickus & Spratt (1997), lethal associations may have a single meaning for the firm, while other human resources become a disaster when combined with their applications and wrong choices.

INNOVATIVE WORK BEHAVIOR

According to Scott and Bruce (1994); human beings are the only entity which pioneers innovations, develops new ideas, works on these ideas and matures them. Innovative employees are needed not only in the development of new ideas but in all stages of the innovation process.

Creativity skill and innovative work behavior are not the same thing. Innovative work behavior includes creativity, but it does not mean that an individual with every ingenuity will exhibit innovative work behavior. Some researchers say that concept of creativity is “the stage of producing ideas” of the innovative working behavior. In this context, creativity is considered to be the most fundamental element of innovative work behavior (IWB) and is considered important. Rawlinson (2017) states that creativity is in every human being, but in some individuals, with the influence of external influences, creativity is forced to remain hidden under some other abilities.

Until recently, research on employee creativity has focused on defining the individual characteristics of employees and the characteristics of their working environment in relation to creative performance (Ürü & Yozgat, 2009). Amabile (1988) indicates that organizational systems, procedures and processes will reach the organizational dimension by “strengthening individual creativity.” In particular, researchers working in the field of psychology and industrial psychology, contribute a lot to the researchers who are trying to develop applications, and practitioners in the sector in order to increase innovative work behavior.

According to Oly Ndubisi & Agarwal (2014, p.43), “Encouraging their employees to be innovative is an option for institutions to be more innovative.” Innovative work behavior often starts with the development of new ideas to overcome the problems and performance deviations in the innovation process.

Janssen (2000) also defines innovative work behavior as application of creating new ideas, presentation, practise discretionarily in order to provide benefit within the business role, group or organization.

De Jong & Den Hartog (2007, 2008) refers to innovative behavior as individual behaviors that employees express as discretionary to “bring out new and useful ideas, products, processes” and “put them into practice”.

Dorenbosch, Engen & Verhagen, (2005) defines innovative work behavior is a voluntary initiative taking behavior by employees to produce and implement ideas, procedures, or products within a group or organization.

Until today, studies investigating the relationship between HRM practices and innovative work behavior have developed “different models of the stages of the development of innovative work behavior. Unlike many articles which considered IWB as a one-dimensional construct (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010; Bonesso & Tintorri, 2014). Some scholars, such as Noefer, Stegmaier, Molter & Sonntag (2009), considered IWB as two-dimensional construct; idea generation and idea implementation. However, Some scholars considered as three-dimensional construct; idea generation, introducing ideas to others, and application (Janssen 2000, Ma Prieto & Pilar Perez-Santana 2014). However, there is no clarity among researchers in the literature regarding the measurement of innovative work behavior. Different researchers, who define innovative work behavior in 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5 stages, exhibit different approaches.

As a result, consensus has not yet been reached regarding the measurement of innovative work behavior processes in measurement tools developed to measure innovative work behavior.

AMO MODEL AND INNOVATIVE WORK BEHAVIOR

Researchers working on the relationship between HRM and individual performance have mentioned three factors which they think have impact on this relationship. Vroom (1964) mentioned motivation and ability factors as the first two of these factors. According to Vroom (1964) as cited in Armstrong and Taylor (2014); performance is a result of ability and motivation. According to this, the impact of motivation on performance is not independent of employees' abilities. In the same way, the ability of employees are not independent of their motivation.

The effects of "ability and motivation on performance" are not additive. Namely, neither motivation nor ability alone is enough for performance. The absence of one (ability or motivation to be zero / zero) diminishes or totally destroys the other. The relationship of motivation with ability as personal traits affecting can be made clear by the following question; how motivating is it to talk about motivation to a person in a cockpit who has no idea about how to fly an aeroplane? But the presence of both talent and motivation has a more positive impact on employee performance than on their own. Armstrong and Taylor (2014) express the multiplicative relationship between these variables with the following formula:

$$\text{Performance} = f(\text{Ability} \times \text{Motivation}).$$

Bailey, Berg and Sandy (2001) reported that "The fact that non-managerial employees have the freedom to organize their own work processes" creates an opportunity for employees to show their voluntary and self-sacrificing efforts for their institutions" This opportunity increases employees' performance.

Boxall and Purcell (2003) as cited in Armstrong and Taylor (2014) then proposed the following formula, expressed as "AMO", by combining Vroom's (1964) and Bailey et al. (2001).

$$\text{Performance} = f(\text{Ability} + \text{Motivation} + \text{Opportunity}).$$

According to the researchers, the AMO model suggests that employee performance is a function of Ability + Motivation + Opportunity to Participate.

When the model is focused on, "talent", "motivation" and "opportunity to participate" influence employees' performance independent of one another. The fact that one is zero does not remove the influence of other factors. The relationship in this form is additive, not multiplicative.

AMO model enables to identify the influence of employees' performance factor such as motivation, opportunity to practise with HR practises such as systems training practices and development practices, selection practices, recruitment practices, reward practices, compensation practices, incentive practices, involvement practices and job design practices enables employees to determine the "ability and motivation of employees to influence.

HIGH COMMITMENT WORK SYSTEMS, AMO MODEL AND INNOVATIVE WORK BEHAVIOR

The necessity of innovation and the need for “innovative employees” are manifested in all areas and have become obligatory. However, current studies suggest that organizations need to define the characteristics and behavior of innovative individuals; as a result, they need to understand how they will support and encourage employees.

The HCWS creates a mutually beneficial environment for the employee and the organization. If the HR practises or systems, which are started by HRM department for employees’ benefit are appreciated by the employees, then the employees will think that it is something for their benefit as a rewarding or appreciation by their company. Then employees whose expectations are met in line with reciprocity norm, feel obliged to give back what they were given. According to Social Exchange Theory; individuals, others (individuals, groups or organizations) collaborate to achieve the desired outcomes (Emerson, 1976). In this context, employees can also act as discretionary extra-role behaviors in order to achieve the results they desire, in order to achieve organizational goals (Emerson, 1976; Uen, Chien & Yen, 2009). In other words, it is stated high commitment work systems will positively affect the employees’ attitudes and acts, and through intrinsic motivator or extrinsic motivator, the desire of employees to show innovative work behaviors will increase consequently.

Researchers working on the HRM-Performance relationship, focused on the the bundles of human resource (HR) rather than the effect of HR practises seperately in order to find out the effect of HRM practises on organizational performance (Huselid, 1995, MacDuffie, 1995). The additive, synergistic, and substitutive relations between the HRM practices that form the bundle that results from categorizing the HRM applications are determinative in achieving the desired results.

According to Jiang, Lepak, Han, Hong, Kim & Winkler (2012), HRM system consists of HR practises such as recruitment practices, selection practices, training practices, performance management practices, compensation practices, incentive practices, involvement practices and job design in order to find out the the construct of HR systems. Jiang et al. (2012) The categorisation of practices in bundles were put forward to enhance workers’ abilities (A), motivations (M) and opportunities to participate (O), Specific HRM practises advocated the skills and knowledge of individual workers, their willingness to exert effort and their opportunities to express their performance and innovative work behavior (Jansen; 2000, Jiang et al., 2012)

Jansen, (2000) and Jiang et al., (2012) suggest that HRM practises enhance the skills and knowledge of individual workers, their willingness to exert effort and their opportunities to express their performance and innovative work behavior

Researchers who work on HRM innovation relationship on individual or organizational based benefited from HR practise bundles which were recommended in previous terms in order to create HR practise bundles to increase Ability (A) Motivations (M) and opportunities to participate (O) of employees based on AMO modelling (Janssen, 2000; Jiang et al., 2012; Bos-Nehles, Renkema and Janssen, 2017; Veenendaal, 2015; Schimansky, 2014).

A very useful framework for researchers is provided by the AMO model. In this context, HR practices, which are expressed as best HRM practices, are classified under the “ability enhancing human resorce practices”, “motivation enhancing human resorce practices” and “opportunity to participate enhancing

human resource practices” factors in terms of their impact on performance at the individual level. These classifications can be made as additive, substitute or synergistic as a result of bringing together the HR practices that are gathered under the factors of “ability enhancing human resource practices”, “motivation enhancing human resource practices” and “opportunities to participate in enhancing human resource practices” the effects of HRM practices on innovative behavior are analyzed and analyzed.

Ability Enhancing Human Resource Practices

“Ability enhancing human resource practices” are usually associated practices with such as recruitment, selection and training development (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, Kalleberg, & Bailey, 2000; Jiang et al., 2012; Bello-Pintado, 2015; Janssen, 2000). Recruiting a new worker is not just adding a new person to the organization, but also incorporating new skills, knowledge and attitudes. HRD departments have to reach out to find the right candidates to add new skills, knowledge and attitudes to the organization, and to develop and implement the most appropriate selection practices in the organization. Selection techniques used in the process of selection and placement, and selection criteria (selection criteria, employees’ capability to learn, interpersonal abilities, cultural fit attitudes, personality traits) will raise the innovation performance of the business choosing the candidates with the top innovative business attitude performance potential in the future. The extensive training programs and mentoring programs to support recruitment have been positive for the IWB according to (Ma Prieto & Pilar Perez-Santana, 2014).

Motivation Enhancing Human Resource Practices

Performance management, compensation, incentive, internal promotion and job stability practices are generally associated with “Motivation enhancing human resource practices” (Appelbaum et al., 2000; Jiang et al., 2012).

Organizational rewards are considered to be one of the most motivating HR practices to increase the innovative work behavior of employees in an organization. “Reward and wage systems” that can be developed and put into practice in the right way in organization are influencing the entrepreneurial and creative behaviors and organizational commitment in the organization by motivating the employees more positively. It is expressed that if the person who is awarded is informed about the extent of creativity, creativity will significantly increase. (Eisenberger & Rhoades, 2001).

However, Bos-Nehles et al. (2017) states that the relationship between Reward in the literature and innovative work behavior (IWB) is not clear. Bysted and Jespersen (2014) refer to negative relationships between the financial mechanism and the IWB.

To explain the differences in relation to IWB-Reward, the importance of intrinsic motivation as one of the most important elements of innovative work behavior is expressed by the research. Internal motivation is motivating itself. External motivation is; financial or non-financial rewards outside of the job itself direct the person to a certain behavior. Ürü (2009) states that internal motivation is a prerequisite for creativity, and that creativity must be cautious when awarded. Where, according to Hennessey and Amabile (1998), if the person is motivated internally strongly, the external reward increases the creativity of the person, creating a synergistic effect; when the person is not motivated internally, external rewarding reduces creativity. Amabile (1998) states that “The effects of internal-external motivation on creativity may vary depending on the type of external motivation and the timing of the external award.

Janssen (2000) emphasized the importance of employees' effort-reward fairness perception regarding the reward-innovative work behavior. According to the researcher, there is a positive relationship between effort-reward fairness perception and innovative work behavior. Also, and employees' sense of justice in wage distribution increases the motivation of the individual to show organizational commitment and creative work behavior. The fair and balanced distribution of salary can increase organizational commitment and innovative work behavior. Promotional opportunities and incentives also increase innovative work behaviors.

Opportunity to Participate Enhancing Human Resource Practices

Opportunities to participate into enhancing human resource practices are associated some practices such as practices of job autonomy, employee participation, information sharing and team work (Appelbaum et al., 2000; Ichniowski et al., 1997; Jiang et al., 2012).

According to Bailey et al. (2001) if employees who are not at managerial level have the freedom to organize their own work, employees' innovative work behaviors will be motivated. In the same way, one's work autonomy has an influence on the innovative work behavior by increasing organizational commitment. Job autonomy enables the employee to develop new ideas and find more effective ways of doing their jobs.

Practices to increase employee participation are about how things are organized and how employees do their jobs. The extent of employees' job autonomy and job design are expressed as the best HR practices in HRM-innovative Work behavior relationships regarding the HR practices which increase the employees' participation into innovative behavior. It was stated by Beugelsdijk (2008) that task autonomy and performance based salary raise can increase performance. Also, the importance of empowerment was expressed.

DISCUSSION

It is stated that innovative work behavior, which is not based on any prize or punishment expectation and is regarded as a collective innovative behavior to increase the function and efficiency of the institution, is at the same time considered organizational citizenship. High commitment work practices addressed by the authors involve empowerment, participative decision making, job rotation practices, employment security, recruitment, training and development activities, performance evaluation based on continuous and constructive feedback, providing employees' and management, long-term commitment-based rewards and rewards (Lepak & Snell, 1999, 2002).

Employees' negative or positive perception of high commitment-based HR system has impact on employees' work attitudes and behaviors (Latorre, Guest, Ramos & Gracia, 2009).

High commitment work practices (HCWS); are very closely related to the concepts of organizational support, psychological contract and organizational citizenship. Randall, Cropanzano, Bormann and Birjulin (1999) stated that organizational support perceptions have a positive relationship with employees' organizational behavior. According to Robbins and Judge (2012) perception of organizational support is expressed as "to what extent employees believe the organizations value their contribution. Research results put forward that employees with high perceptions of organizational support will feel themselves as part

of a larger organization and accordingly will exhibit behaviors that are desired in terms of organization such as organizational citizenship behaviors. While AMO Model manages employee business behavior and performance, it provides a employee-oriented perspective in the design of HRM applications (Özçelik & Uyargil 2015; Appelbaum, et al., 2000). Schimansky (2014) argues that the high commitment work system positively influences innovative work behavior with the influence of individual ability, motivation and opportunities (Ability, Motivation, Opportunity-AMO). One important thing that researchers should pay attention to is that The AMO model is concerned with the differences between the expected effect and the actual impact of high-involvement business systems through organizational outreach individual performance. According to Bos-Nehles et al. (2017) even if HRM systems are fairly well-designed and it will not guarantee that these systems will be put into practice with the same efficiency. Bos-Nehles et al. (2017), other departmental managers play a significant role in the implementation of well-designed HRM systems or operating systems. According to this; other line manager's perception of innovation, attitude towards HRM applications designed to encourage innovative work behaviors in the process of managing creative work behaviors of employees, encouraging appropriate attitudes and behaviors in employees and showing extra role behaviors, affect the degree of cooperation and willingness to implement these systems.

In addition, line managers' perception of innovative work behavior or their attitudes and managing styles towards the employees who have innovative traits can reduce or even dismiss employees' innovative work behaviors, as well as their ability to empower innovative employee behavior. In this context, the ability of other department managers to develop innovative behavior and the willingness to do so are very important in terms of HRM-IWB relationships. In fact, it has been stated for a long time that along with senior managers, line managers also have responsibility in designing and implementing of all HRM practices, policies.

In addition to the support and willingness of senior management and other department managers to implement HRM systems in design, which HRM applications should be designed accordingly to improve innovative work behaviors, the last point is how employees perceive these HRM systems and applications.

SOLUTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Laursen and Foss (2012) has conducted a comprehensive literature review that outlines the empirical work on the impact of HR practice / HRM bundles at organizational level on innovation output. Seeck and Diehl (2017) reported a very comprehensive literature review, focusing specifically on studies between 1990 and 2015 using empirical research using the bundle approach to HRM (Seeck & Diehl, 2017). Bos-Nehles et al. (2017) has conducted a literature review reporting empirical studies of HRM-innovative Work Behavior relationships.

Therefore in this chapter, it has been avoided to repeat reported studies because of their extensive scope (till 2017) of their empirical work at both individual and organizational level with HRM Innovation relationship.

When these studies related to HRM-innovative work behavior were examined, various methodological limitations were identified in the researches. It is important to examine these limitations and draw attention to them in order to shed light on the research to be done in the field of HRM-Innovation. Furthermore, in terms of the reliability of the findings obtained, it is necessary to evaluate the research results within the scope of these limitations.

The first of these limitations comes from the fact that researchers have reached an opinion consensus that the HRM practices or systems affect the IWB. However, researchers use different methods to measure and interpret innovative work behaviors. The different methods used also differentiate the reported findings.

According to Bos-Nehles et al. (2017), while the innovative work behavior is measured and accepted as a one-dimensional construct by some researchers (Bonesso & Tintorri, 2014; De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010). As already noted, most articles considered IWB as a one-dimensional construct (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010; Bonesso & Tintorri, 2014). However, some scholars, such as Noefer et al. (2009), measured IWB as “two-dimensional construct”; “idea generation and idea implementation”; Researchers noted that HRM practices differ in the effects of the “idea generation” and “idea implementation” phases. In this context, more empirical work is needed to get to a consulate with IWB measurement. However, two-dimensional structures instead of one dimension will give more insightful results.

The fact that researches are usually based on one point in time (cross sectional) data creates another limitation. In addition, it will be significant to estimate the longitudinal effects and correlations in multiple time periods by repeating the researches not only in one dimension but in many years. Experimental research designs are less preferred due to economic and technical insufficiencies. However, experimental research designs can be very useful in ensuring the internal validity of research in which the factors affecting HRM-innovative Working Behavior relationships are identified.

According to the researchers, another methodological problem is the questions asked to the employees by their own IWB levels. Questions that people ask about their innovative work behavior (IWB) level lead to socially desirable answers. For example, Janssen (2000) found that when employees were asked questions about identifying innovative work behavior potentials, “different results were obtained between employee self-ratings and manager ratings. Especially, it is stated that IWB is more likely to exaggerate innovative potentials when they perceive IWB as a measurement tool for determining their career development. In a similar way in Laursen; HCWP-Innovation in relation to performance relations, researchers have been warned about the socially desirable bias in responding to questions about HRM units that have designed these systems in view of their knowledge of the systems better (Laursen & Foss, 2012).

The bundle approach put forward the assumption that individual practices should fit together in a complementary manner and be implemented in bundles. (Boxall & Macky, 2009; Boxall & Purcell, 2011). Bundled practices are associated with supporting employee commitment and involvement, leaning towards the recent emphasis on so-called high-performance and high-commitment work systems. (Seeck & Diehl, 2017). Despite the consensus on this system, the naming of HR systems in terms of clarifying the structure of the HR systems has varied from one research to another. Considered as a pioneer work; Arthur (1992, 1994) has considered the HRM systems proposed in his research as “high commitment HR systems”; Becker and Huselid (1998) called HRM systems high performance work systems. Guthrie (2001) preferred to call it high involvement HR systems; Lepak, Taylor, Tekleab, Marrone & Cohen (2007) named it as high investment HR systems. Laursen and Foss (2012) referring to Teece (2007), Colombo and Delmastro (2008) and their own study, expressed their “new” or “modern” HRM practices in 2014, using the same name they chose in 2003, as they did in their work.

In this study; High Commitment Work Practices were highlighted “to emphasize employee commitment and involvement”. The fact that the composition of the HR systems varies greatly from one to the other causes differences in the names of these systems to clarify the structure of the HR systems and cause difficulties in the knowledge accumulation of the HR systems (Jiang et al., 2012). The fact that there are differences in HR bundles that make up HRM systems is another difficulty in comparing the

research findings about the relationships at the multilevel level. In order not to experience difficulties in HRM innovation research unlike other researchers did in their researches about HRM-Performance relationship, researchers need to reach a consensus at least on the conceptualization of HR systems, both in terms of knowledge and sharing information.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This study aims to fill an important gap in the literature with regard to the introduction of HRM practices that support individual creativity and innovative work behavior. This chapter also shows the basic literature relevant to the concept of human resource management and innovation management and discusses the connections and discrepancies discussed by existing researchers and their empirical findings to emphasize this relationship.

Future researchers can explore how innovative work behaviors at individual levels affect employees' innovation output and performance at the organizational level (Bos-Nehles et al, 2017; Shipton et al., 2016). Multi-level approaches will provide more integrated information about Innovation-HRM relationships.

As mentioned earlier, it will bring more insightful results for researchers to obtain data by repeating them throughout the years with more than one cross sectional periods rather than one cross sectional period. As stated above, experimental research designs produce more information in identifying the factors affecting HRM-innovative work behavior relationships.

At the organizational level, the effect of factors on innovative work behavior can be investigated. Although there are studies how organizational level human resource practise may strengthen innovative work behavior at individual level, there is still need for empirical work.

It seems that researchers who work on HRM innovation relationship at organizational level ignore creativity and motivation researches in psychology and industry relationship (Laursen & Foss, 2012; Seeck & Diehl, 2017). These studies can contribute to HRM-innovative work behavior relationships by making the relationship between innovative work behavior measurement and individual-innovative work behavior clear. Motivation, Creativity related work also will be very useful in explaining HRM-individual work behavior relations. For this reason, it is suggested to investigate the effect of individual characteristics on innovative work behavior.

Innovative work behavior does not seem to have been reached consensus for the measurement of processes for the time being. The need for the development of measurement tools continues to exist in the field. Creativity and motivation researches in psychology and industry can contribute to the development of measurement of innovative work behavior processes.

There is a need to increase the number of empirical studies regarding which moderating and which mediator variables, how and by which HRM and innovative work behavior relationship influences. Empirical study of these relationships will be helpful in terms of HRM-innovative work relationship.

CONCLUSION

It is suggested by other researchers that the AMO framework is a way to expand the theoretical foundations of the HRM-Innovation relationship relationship (Seeck & Diehl, 2017; Bos-Nehles et al, 2017). In this study, on the basis of approaching HRM practises as a system there is the rationale that innovative

work behavior is a result of employees' knowledge skills and competences and company's "employee involvement opportunities" is formed. Therefore in accordance with the rationale that practices to improve the three component should be used together, ability enhancing HR practices, motivation enhancing HR practices, opportunities to participate enhancing HR practises are categorized in line with AMO model and answers are sought for how and which HRM departments enhance innovative work within the framework of AMO model and the most referred HR practises.

The fact that high commitment work systems have a positive effect on various attitudes and behaviors are shown by researchers. However, different conclusions about whether high commitment work systems directly affect attitudes and behaviors or not have been produced by these studies. There is no consensus in literature as to whether the perceived high commitment work systems and innovative work behavior are directly related or not and which mediating and moderating variables play a role in this relationship. Regarding these relationships different approaches, assumptions, and suggestions are presented by researchers. In this study, a conceptual framework on how the High Commitment Work System can affect employees' innovative work behavior through the influence of employees on the ability-motivation-opportunity and organizational commitment levels was discussed.

The way influence innovation, and how the clustering of specific practices matters for innovation outcomes are affected by Individual practices were among the subjects to have been discussed. In accordance with the literature on HRM and organizational performance, the best-practice approach or the bundle approach to HRM were used. Advancing and encouraging theory development in the field and guiding future empirical research are among the expectations.

In this study, in order to strengthen the theoretical structure of high commitment work system-innovative Work Behavior relationship, issues in the literature such as Resource-Based Theory, Universalistic Theory, Contingency Theory, AMO model, The best HRM practices, high commitment work system, social exchange theory, organizational commitment was given.

Under the light of the above evaluations, it is expected that the work will contribute to researchers in HR and innovation management and practitioners in the sector explaining the high commitment work system and its impact of employees' on the innovative behaviors and the reasons of this impact.

REFERENCES

- Allani, N., Arcand, M., & Bayad, M. (2003). Impact of strategic human resources management on innovation. In *12th International Conference on Management of Technology* (pp. 13-15). Academic Press.
- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(1), 1–18. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1990.tb00506.x
- Amabile, T. M. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 10(1), 123–167.
- Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P. B., Kalleberg, A. L., & Bailey, T. A. (2000). *Manufacturing advantage: Why high-performance work systems pay off*. Cornell University Press.

April Chang, W. J., & Chun Huang, T. (2005). Relationship between strategic human resource management and firm performance: A contingency perspective. *International Journal of Manpower*, 26(5), 434–449. doi:10.1108/01437720510615125

Armstrong, M., & Taylor, S. (2014). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice*. Kogan Page Publishers.

Arthur, J. B. (1992). The link between business strategy and industrial relations systems in American steel minimills. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 45(3), 488–506. doi:10.1177/001979399204500306

Arthur, J. B. (1994). Effects of human resource systems on manufacturing performance and turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*, 37(3), 670–687.

Ataay, N. A. (1999). *Rekabet Ortamında İnsan Kaynakları Yönetimi Uygulama ve Stratejilerinin Firma Performansına Etkileri ve Özel Sektör İmalat Sanayinde Bir Araştırma* [The Effects of Human Resource Management Practices and Strategies on Firm Performance in the Competitive Environment and a Research in Private Sector Manufacturing Industry] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Istanbul, Istanbul, Turkey.

Bailey, T., Berg, P., & Sandy, C. (2001). The effect of high performance work practices on employee earnings in the steel, apparel and medical electronics and imaging industries. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 54(2A), 525–543. doi:10.1177/001979390105400228

Becker, B., & Gerhart, B. (1996). The impact of human resource management on organizational performance: Progress and prospects. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 779–801.

Becker, B. E., & Huselid, M. A. (1998). High performance work systems and firm performance: A synthesis of research and managerial implications. *Research in Personnel and Human Resource Management*.

Becker, B. E., Huselid, M. A., Pickus, P. S., & Spratt, M. F. (1997). HR as a source of shareholder value: Research and recommendations. *Human Resource Management*, 36(1), 39–47.

Beer, M., Spector, B. A., Lawrence, P. R., Mills, D. Q., & Walton, R. E. (1984). *Managing human assets*. Simon and Schuster.

Bello-Pintado, A. (2015). Bundles of HRM practices and performance: Empirical evidence from a Latin American context. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25(3), 311–330. doi:10.1111/1748-8583.12067

Beugelsdijk, S. (2008). Strategic human resource practices and product innovation. *Organization Studies*, 29(6), 821–847. doi:10.1177/0170840608090530

Bonesso, S., & Tintorri, S. (2014). Bridging the Fields of Innovative Behavior and Human Resource Management: A Systematic Review and Future Research Directions (working paper). *IX International Workshop on Human Resource Management*.

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

Boxall, P., & Macky, K. (2009). Research and theory on high-performance work systems: Progressing the high-involvement stream. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 19(1), 3–23. doi:10.1111/j.1748-8583.2008.00082.x

Boxall, P., & Purcell, J. (2011). *Strategy and human resource management*. Macmillan International Higher Education.

Burton, M. D., & O'Reilly, C. (2004). *Walking the talk: The impact of high commitment values and practices on technology start-ups*. Retrieved from Cornell University, School of Industrial and Labor Relations site: <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/workingpapers/99/>

Bysted, R., & Jespersen, K. R. (2014). Exploring managerial mechanisms that influence innovative work behaviour: Comparing private and public employees. *Public Management Review*, 16(2), 217–241. doi:10.1080/14719037.2013.806576

Chan Kim, W., & Mauborgne, R. (2005). Value innovation: A leap into the blue ocean. *The Journal of Business Strategy*, 26(4), 22–28. doi:10.1108/02756660510608521

Colombo, M., & Delmastro, M. (2008). *The economics of organizational design: Theoretical insights and empirical evidence*. Springer. doi:10.1057/9780230582200

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

De Jong, J. P., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2007). How leaders influence employees' innovative behaviour. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 10(1), 41–64. doi:10.1108/14601060710720546

De Jong, J. P., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Innovative work behavior: Measurement and validation. *EIM Business and Policy Research*, 1-27.

De Winne, S., & Sels, L. (2010). Interrelationships between human capital, HRM and innovation in Belgian start-ups aiming at an innovation strategy. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(11), 1863–1883. doi:10.1080/09585192.2010.505088

Dede, N. P. (2007). *İnsan Kaynakları Yöneticilerinin Değişen Roller ve Yetkinlikleri ve Bir Araştırma* [The Changing Roles and Competencies of Human Resource Managers and a Survey] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). İstanbul University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Dede, N. P. (2018). *İnsan Kaynakları Yöneticilerinin Değişen Roller ve Yetkinlikleri: İlaç Sektörü Örneği* [The Changing Roles and Competencies of Human Resource Managers: The Example of Pharma Sector]. İstanbul: Beta Press.

Delery, J. E., & Doty, D. H. (1996). Modes of theorizing in strategic human resource management: Tests of universalistic, contingency, and configurational performance predictions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), 802–835.

Dess, G. G., & Picken, J. C. (2000). Changing roles: Leadership in the 21st century. *Organizational Dynamics*, 28(3), 18–34. doi:10.1016/S0090-2616(00)88447-8

Dorenbosch, L., Engen, M. L. V., & 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. doi:10.1111/j.1476-8691.2005.00333.x

Eisenberger, R., & Rhoades, L. (2001). Incremental effects of reward on creativity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(4), 728–741. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.81.4.728 PMID:11642357

Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social exchange theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2(1), 335–362. doi:10.1146/annurev.so.02.080176.002003

Guthrie, J. P. (2001). High-involvement work practices, turnover, and productivity: Evidence from New Zealand. *Academy of Management Journal*, 44(1), 180–190.

Hennessey, B. A., & Amabile, T. M. (1998). Reality, intrinsic motivation, and creativity. *The American Psychologist*, 53(6), 674–675. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.53.6.674

Henssen, B., Voordeckers, W., Lambrechts, F., & Koiranen, M. (2014). The CEO autonomy-stewardship behavior relationship in family firms: The mediating role of psychological ownership. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 5(3), 312–322. doi:10.1016/j.jfbs.2014.01.012

Huselid, M. A. (1995). The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3), 635–672.

Huselid, M. A., Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1997). Technical and strategic human resources management effectiveness as determinants of firm performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 171–188.

Jackson, S. E., Schuler, R. S., & Rivero, J. C. (1989). Organizational characteristics as predictors of personnel practices. *Personnel Psychology*, 42(4), 727–786. doi:10.1111/j.1744-6570.1989.tb00674.x

Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(3), 287–302. doi:10.1348/096317900167038

Jiang, K., Lepak, D. P., Han, K., Hong, Y., Kim, A., & Winkler, A. L. (2012). Clarifying the construct of human resource systems: Relating human resource management to employee performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 22(2), 73–85. doi:10.1016/j.hrmmr.2011.11.005

Kehoe, R. R., & Wright, P. M. (2013). The impact of high-performance human resource practices on employees' attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 39(2), 366–391. doi:10.1177/0149206310365901

Latorre, F., Guest, D., Ramos, J., & Gracia, F. J. (2016). High commitment HR practices, the employment relationship and job performance: A test of a mediation model. *European Management Journal*, 34(4), 328–337. doi:10.1016/j.emj.2016.05.005

Laursen, K., & Foss, N. J. (2003). New human resource management practices, complementarities and the impact on innovation performance. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 27(2), 243–263. doi:10.1093/cje/27.2.243

Laursen, K., & Foss, N. J. (2012). Human resource management practices and innovation. *Handbook of Innovation Management*, 505–530.

- Lepak, D. P., Liao, H., Chung, Y., & Harden, E. E. (2006). A conceptual review of human resource management systems in strategic human resource management research. In *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (pp. 217–271). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (1999). The human resource architecture: Toward a theory of human capital allocation and development. *Academy of Management Review*, 24(1), 31–48. doi:10.5465/amr.1999.1580439
- Lepak, D. P., & Snell, S. A. (2002). Examining the human resource architecture: The relationships among human capital, employment, and human resource configurations. *Journal of Management*, 28(4), 517–543. doi:10.1177/014920630202800403
- Lepak, D. P., Taylor, M. S., Tekleab, A. G., Marrone, J. A., & Cohen, D. J. (2007). An examination of the use of high-investment human resource systems for core and support employees. *Human Resource Management*, 46(2), 223–246.
- Ma Prieto, I., & Pilar Perez-Santana, M. (2014). Managing innovative work behavior: The role of human resource practices. *Personnel Review*, 43(2), 184–208. doi:10.1108/PR-11-2012-0199
- Mabey, C., & Salaman, G. (1995). *Strategic Human Resource Management*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Business.
- MacDuffie, J. P. (1995). Human resource bundles and manufacturing performance: Organizational logic and flexible production systems in the world auto industry. *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 48(2), 197–221. doi:10.1177/001979399504800201
- Miles, R. E., & Snow, C. C. (1984). Designing strategic human resources systems. *Organizational Dynamics*, 13(1), 36–52. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(84)90030-5
- Miller, S. A., & Keoleian, G. A. (2015). Framework for analyzing transformative technologies in life cycle assessment. *Environmental Science & Technology*, 49(5), 3067–3075. doi:10.1021/es505217a PMID:25636136
- Noefer, K., Stegmaier, R., Molter, B., & Sonntag, K. (2009). A great many things to do and not a minute to spare: Can feedback from supervisors moderate the relationship between skill variety, time pressure, and employees' innovative behavior? *Creativity Research Journal*, 21(4), 384–393. doi:10.1080/10400410903297964
- Oly Ndubisi, N., & Agarwal, J. (2014). Quality performance of SMEs in a developing economy: Direct and indirect effects of service innovation and entrepreneurial orientation. *Journal of Business and Industrial Marketing*, 29(6), 454–468. doi:10.1108/JBIM-07-2013-0146
- Osterman, P. (1994). How common is workplace transformation and who adopts it? *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 47(2), 173–188. doi:10.1177/001979399404700202
- Özçelik, G., & Uyargil, C. (2015). A Conceptual Framework for Line Managers' HRM Implementation Effectiveness: Integrating Social Context and AMO Theories. *Journal of Business Economics and Finance*, 4(2), 289–301. doi:10.17261/Pressacademia.2015211620
- Quinn, J. B., Anderson, P., & Finkelstein, S. (1996). Managing professional intellect: Making the most of the best. *Harvard Business Review*, 69–80. PMID:10156468

Randall, M. L., Cropanzano, R., Bormann, C. A., & Birjulin, A. (1999). Organizational politics and organizational support as predictors of work attitudes, job performance, and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 20(2), 159–174. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1099-1379(199903)20:2<159::AID-JOB881>3.0.CO;2-7

Rawlinson, J. G. (2017). *Creative thinking and brainstorming*. Routledge. doi:10.4324/9781315259000

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. (2012). *Essentials of organizational behavior*. Academic Press.

Rothwell, R. (1992). Developments towards the fifth generation model of innovation. *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, 4(1), 73–75. doi:10.1080/09537329208524080

Schimansky, S. (2014). *The effect of a high-commitment work system on innovative behavior of employees* (Unpublished Bachelor's thesis). University of Twente, Enschede, The Netherlands.

Schuler, R. S., & Jackson, S. E. (1987). Linking competitive strategies with human resource management practices. *The Academy of Management Perspectives*, 1(3), 207–219. doi:10.5465/ame.1987.4275740

Schuler, R. S., & Walker, J. W. (1990). Human resources strategy: Focusing on issues and actions. *Organizational Dynamics*, 19(1), 5–19. doi:10.1016/0090-2616(90)90045-Q

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.

Seeck, H., & Diehl, M. R. (2017). A literature review on HRM and innovation-taking stock and future directions. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(6), 913–944. doi:10.1080/09585192.2016.1143862

Shipton, H., West, M. A., Dawson, J., Birdi, K., & Patterson, M. (2006). HRM as a predictor of innovation. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 16(1), 3–27. doi:10.1111/j.1748-8583.2006.00002.x

Teece, D. J. (2007). Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 28(13), 1319–1350. doi:10.1002/mj.640

Truss, C., & Gratton, L. (1994). Strategic human resource management: A conceptual approach. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5(3), 663–686. doi:10.1080/09585199400000053

Tyson, S. (1995). *Strategic prospects for HRM*. Institute of personnel and development IPD House Camp Road.

Uen, J. F., Chien, M. S., & Yen, Y. F. (2009). The mediating effects of psychological contracts on the relationship between human resource systems and role behaviors: A multilevel analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 24(2), 215–223. doi:10.1007/10869-009-9101-9

Ürü, F. O. (2009). *Örgütsel öğrenmenin çalışan yaratıcılığına etkisi İSO 500'de yer alan demir-çelik, otomotiv ve tekstil sektörlerindeki işletmelerde bir araştırma* [The effect of organizational learning on employee creativity (A quantitative research in Turkey's top 500 industrial enterprises in iron and steel, automotive and textile industries)] (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Ürü, F. O., & Yozgat, U. (2009). Creativity for gaining and sustaining competitive advantage: The role of leadership styles. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, 3(2), 136–157. doi:10.20460/JGSM.2009318466

Veenendaal, A. A. R. (2015). *Enhancing innovation at work through human resource management*. Enschede, The Netherlands: University of Twente.

Wright, P. M., & McMahan, G. C. (1992). Theoretical perspectives for strategic human resource management. *Journal of Management*, 18(2), 295–320. doi:10.1177/014920639201800205

Wright, P. M., McMahan, G. C., & McWilliams, A. (1994). Human resources and sustained competitive advantage: A resource-based perspective. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 5(2), 301–326. doi:10.1080/09585199400000020

Xu, Q., Chen, J., Xie, Z., Liu, J., Zheng, G., & Wang, Y. (2007). Total innovation management: A novel paradigm of innovation management in the 21st century. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 32(1-2), 9–25. doi:10.1007/10961-006-9007-x

KEY TERMS AND DEFINITIONS

AMO Model: A model claiming that employee performance is a function of ability, motivation, and opportunity to participate.

Contingency Approach: It refers to external harmony with organizational goals, environment, and strategies as a whole, the human resource management system, which is formed by the internal compatibility of all individual human resource applications and individual human resource management practices and policies.

Complementarities: If the return obtained by applying any of the HR functions increases the return to be obtained by the application of others, this practice can be said to unite other HR practices.

Extra Role Behavior: With this kind of behavior, volunteerism in the behavior of the individual is emphasized apart from the the formal duty definition of these behavior.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Refers to the extra role behaviors that go beyond the formal job descriptions and expectations which the employees are willing to Show in order to contribute to the organization.

Organizational Commitment: It is the psychological condition that reflects the relationship between individuals and organizations, which is necessary for employees to go beyond what is defined in the contract and to demonstrate discretionary behaviors that will benefit the organization in achieving its goals.

Psychological Contract: It is defined as an official and non-written contract that can affect the occupational behavior of the occupation and the employer regarding the expectations, perceived commitments, and obligations between the employer and the workplace in organizations.

Universalistic Perspective of HRM: It is an approach that claims that some HRM activities are always superior to others, and that these practices generate the best organizational output in any organization, creating more effective results on organizational performance.