

***HRM AND PRODUCT INNOVATION: DOES INNOVATIVE WORK  
BEHAVIOUR MEDIATE THAT RELATIONSHIP?***

---

*Accepted manuscript*

Sanz-Valle, R. and Jiménez-Jiménez, D. (2018), "HRM and product innovation: does innovative work behaviour mediate that relationship?", *Management Decision*, Vol. 56 No. 6, pp. 1417-1429. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-04-2017-0404>

---

**Purpose:** The purpose of this paper is to empirically analyse the mediator effect of innovative work behaviour (IWB) between the firm's human resource management system and product innovation.

**Design/methodology/approach:** Data are collected from 225 Spanish manufacture companies. Hypotheses are tested using structured equation modelling. The structural model was estimated through partial least squares modelling.

**Findings:** The results provide strong evidence about the effect of the system of human resource management practices on both, employee's IWB and product innovation. Furthermore, findings support the idea that employee's IWB mediates the relationship between human resource management and product innovation.

**Research limitations/implications:** Although the study counts with the limitations of cross-sectional studies, its findings suggest that employees' IWB fosters product's innovation and that the adoption of a high-performance work system is positively associated to such behaviour.

**Practical implications:** This paper shows that companies seeking to foster product innovation should pay attention to their employees' behaviour. In particular, they should

promote that employees engage in innovative behaviours, and that adopting high-performance human resource management practices can help in this line.

**Originality/value:** Although a number of studies suggest that innovative work behaviour is a key determinant of innovation and a mediator in the link between human resource management and innovation, there is not empirical research examining these relationships. This paper covers this gap detected in the literature and provides evidence supporting them.

**KEYWORDS:** High performance work systems, innovative work behaviour, product innovations.

## 1. Introduction

There is a broad consensus in the literature that innovation is one of the key sources of competitive advantage for the firms (Anderson *et al.*, 2014; Damanpour & Gopalakrishnan, 2001; Kim *et al.*, 2012; Tellis *et al.*, 2009). As a consequence, previous research has tried to identify the main determinants of firm's innovation (Anderson *et al.*, 2014; Damanpour, 1991; Galende & De la Fuente, 2003; Keupp *et al.*, 2012). Recent literature highlights the role that human resources play in innovations' development (Anderson *et al.*, 2014; Keupp *et al.*, 2012) arguing that human resources are who can generate new ideas and who can transform these ideas into new working methods, systems, processes or products and services (Carmeli *et al.*, 2006; Goepel *et al.*, 2012; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Van de Ven, 1986; Yuan & Woodman, 2010). Recent research under an open innovation approach, which is understood as the management of internal and external knowledge to accelerate innovation (Chesbrough & Vanhaverbeke, 2006), also points out that relevance of human resources in as determinants of this type of innovation (Podmetina, 2013) since they are key elements in the acquisition of such knowledge.

Based on that assumption and in the idea that human resources management (HRM) practices are the main mechanisms by which firms can exert an influence on their human resources (Collins & Smith, 2006; Jiang *et al.*, 2012; Laursen & Foss, 2003;

Shipton *et al.*, 2006; Wright *et al.*, 1994), researches in the HRM field have recently explored the effect that HRM practices have on firm's innovation (Chen & Huang, 2009; Chowhan, 2016; De Saa-Perez & Diaz-Diaz, 2010; De Winne & Sels, 2010; Donate *et al.*, 2016; Jimenez-Jimenez & Sanz-Valle, 2008; Laursen & Foss, 2003; Lopez-Cabrales *et al.*, 2009; Shipton *et al.*, 2006). Up to now, the empirical studies in this line has focused on the direct relationship between HRM practices and innovation (Chowhan, 2016; De Saa-Perez & Diaz-Diaz, 2010; Laursen & Foss, 2003). In general, their findings support such a relationship.

However, recently, the literature highlights the need of studying the mechanisms through which HRM practices influence innovation (Seeck & Diehl, 2016). According to some authors, HRM practices help to increase the firm's human capital, that it to say, its employees' knowledge and skills. Some empirical studies find evidence that supports this idea (Cabello-Medina *et al.*, 2011; De Winne & Sels, 2010; Donate *et al.*, 2016; Lopez-Cabrales *et al.*, 2009).

Other scholars argue that the impact of HRM practices on innovation (or any other measure of performance) is mainly due to the effect that these practices have, not on employees' knowledge and skills, but on employees' behaviour (Paauwe & Boselie, 2005). In particular, these scholars defend that HRM practices foster employee's innovative work behaviour (IWB), which in turns has a positive effect on firm's innovation (Escribá-Carda *et al.*, 2012; Fu *et al.*, 2015; Jiménez-Jimenez and Sanz-Valle, 2008; Prieto and Perez-Santana, 2014). However, the empirical research on this issue is very scarce. As far as we known, only Fu *et al.* (2015) has examined whether IWB mediates the relationship between HRM practices and firm's innovation. This study focused on a sample of Irish firms. In the context of Spanish's companies, we have not found any empirical study examining such an effect, in spite of the fact that this is the main assumption of some recent researches on the link between HRM practices and employee's innovative behaviour (Escribá-Carda *et al.* 2017; Prieto and Perez-Santana, 2014).

This paper seeks to contribute to this research line. Next section summarizes previous research on the link between HRM practices, IWB and innovation and proposed the hypotheses that derive from that review. Then, details of the empirical study

methodology and the findings are provided. The last section presents the main contributions of the paper, its implications for practitioners, the research limitations, and some future research lines.

## **2. Theoretical framework**

Innovation can be defined as “the introduction of a new or significantly improved product (good or service), process, marketing method or new organizational method in the internal practices of the business, workplace organization or external relations” (OECD, 2005).

This paper focus on product innovation, that is to say, on the introduction in the market of new products or services, or the modification of the existing ones to satisfy an external use or a market need (Damanpour, 2010; Utterback & Abernathy, 1975). The literature highlights the strategic relevance of product innovation for firms to survive and improve their overall performance in the current dynamic and competitive market (Ardito & Messeni Petruzzelli, 2017; Gaia Rubera & Kirca, 2012; Kyriakopoulos *et al.*, 2016).

### *2.1. HRM practices and product innovation*

In the last decades, the literature highlights that HRM practices can have an important impact on firm’s innovation and a number of empirical studies have examined the relationship between these two variables (Cabello-Medina *et al.*, 2011; Chen & Huang, 2009; Chowhan, 2016; De Saa-Perez & Diaz-Diaz, 2010; De Winne & Sels, 2010; Donate *et al.*, 2016; Fu *et al.*, 2015; Jimenez-Jimenez & Sanz-Valle, 2008; Laursen & Foss, 2003; Lopez-Cabrales *et al.*, 2009; Shipton *et al.*, 2006). The recent research developed by Seeck and Diehl (2016) provides a systematic review of the research on this field until 2015.

Previous studies differ in the sample they used and, also, in how they measure both, HRM practices and product innovation. Regarding HRM practices, some of them examine some isolated practices (Cabello-Medina *et al.*, 2011; Chen & Huang, 2009; De Winne & Sels, 2010; Shipton *et al.*, 2006) while other focus on HRM systems (De

Saa-Perez & Diaz-Diaz, 2010; Donate *et al.*, 2016; Fu *et al.*, 2015; Jimenez-Jimenez & Sanz-Valle, 2008; Laursen & Foss, 2003).

Nevertheless, the HRM practices they suggest to foster product innovation are those that the literature on Strategic Human Resource Management labels Commitment-oriented HRM practices or High Performance Work Systems (HPWS). According to these studies, the reason is that these practices increase human capital (Cabello-Medina *et al.*, 2011; Donate *et al.*, 2016), employee's orientation to learning (Chen & Huang, 2009; Laursen & Foss, 2003) and employee's innovative work behaviour (Fu *et al.*, 2015; Jimenez-Jimenez & Sanz-Valle, 2008). In general, these studies found support for the positive relation between HPWS and product innovation. Thus, we propose:

*H<sub>1</sub>: The adoption of HPWS is positively related to product innovation*

## *2.2. IWB as a mediator in the relationship between HRM practices and product innovation*

There are a number of definitions of IWB in the literature. In general, literature conceives IWB as a set of employees' behaviours, which are discretionary or extra-role behaviours (Abstein & Spieth, 2014; Janssen, 2000; Ramamoorthy *et al.*, 2005), that are oriented to the generation of ideas, their promotion within the firm, and their implementation (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010; De Spiegelaere *et al.*, 2014; Janssen, 2000; Kleysen & Street, 2001; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Yuan & Woodman, 2010). IWB is considered to be a multidimensional concept comprising different employees' behaviours: the identification of problems or opportunities, the generation of ideas to solve problems or to take advantage of opportunities, the evaluation of these ideas, their promotion, the search for supporters and the funds the implementation of the ideas requires; and also the development of implementation's plans.

Some scholars have related IWB with the concept of learning (Escribá-Carda *et al.*, 2017 and Park *et al.*, 2014), suggesting that IWB requires an organizational context that supports learning (Park *et al.*, 2014), that is a context that foster knowledge acquisition, reconsideration or unlearning of established ideas, experimentation, collaboration among employees, etc. According to other scholars (Escribá-Carda *et al.*, 2017), IWB is mainly associated to exploratory learning. Exploratory learning has to do with the ability to identify, evaluate and incorporate new knowledge and new competences into

the firm (Danneels, 2002). The link between exploratory learning and IWB is clear since, this last variable means the engagement in behaviours like the reconsideration of establish ideas, the search for new ideas and perspectives, or the generation of new approaches and solutions to problems. In this line, a learning orientation is considered to be positively related to employee creativity (Giustiniano *et al.*, 2016; Gong *et al.*, 2009)).

However, IWB does not only include employee's behaviours associated to explorative learning and the generation of ideas, but it also comprises behaviours associated to the other stages of the innovation process. In this line, for instance, (Escribá-Carda *et al.*, 2017) define IWB as "the ability of individuals to generate new ideas and viewpoints, which are subsequently transformed into innovation".

As it was previously mentioned, the assumption of some studies on the link between HRM practices and innovation is that IWB mediates such a relationship (Fu *et al.*, 2015; Jimenez-Jimenez & Sanz-Valle, 2008). However, the research on that mediation effect is very scarce. This study examines it based on the review of previous research on, on the one hand, the link between IWB and product innovation and, on the other, the relationship between organizational HRM practices and IWB.

Regarding the first relationship, IWB is widely claimed to be a key determinant of the product innovation (Abstein & Spieth, 2014; Carmeli *et al.*, 2006; De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010; Goepel *et al.*, 2012; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Stock, 2015; Yuan & Woodman, 2010). However, as far as we known, empirical investigation of the relationship between IWB and innovation is lacking. The study developed by Fu *et al.* (2015) is one exception. Using a sample of 120 Irish accounting firms, this paper shows that there is a positive association between IWB and on the revenues per person generated from new services and new clients, which they use as a measure of innovation. Based on this paper and on the general consensus in previous research, it is reasonable to suggest that employee's IWB will be positively related to firm's innovation, including product innovation.

Regarding the link between HRM practices and IWB, some models of determinants of IWB proposed in the literature include one or two HRM practices (Ramamoorthy *et al.*, 2005). There are also some papers that have examined the relationship between one

isolated HRM practice, or a small number of them, on IWB (Battistelli *et al.*, 2014; De Spiegelaere *et al.*, 2014; Janssen, 2000; Zhou *et al.*, 2011). This research has provided evidence the positive relationship between IWB and some HRM practices, mainly, job autonomy (Battistelli *et al.*, 2014; De Spiegelaere *et al.*, 2014; Ramamoorthy *et al.*, 2005), employee's participation in decision-taking (Janssen, 2005), providing feed-back to employee about his/her performance (Battistelli *et al.*, 2014), or the perception of effort-reward fairness (Janssen, 2000). All these studies are developed from an individual perspective, that is, their analysis unit is the employee and, therefore, they measure his/her perception of the HRM practices adopted by the firm and measure employee's IWB.

In the last years, there is a progress in the study of the link between HRM and IWB. Recent studies highlight that HRM practices are the main mechanisms through which firms can foster IWB and examine, from an empirical perspective, the effect of HRM system on IWB (Alfes *et al.*, 2013; Dorenbosch *et al.*, 2005; Prieto & Perez-Santana, 2014; Sanders *et al.*, 2010).

Some of them are developed at individual level (Dorenbosch *et al.*, 2005; Fu *et al.*, 2015; Sanders *et al.*, 2010) and others at organization level (Alfes *et al.*, 2013; Dorenbosch *et al.*, 2005; Fu *et al.*, 2015; Prieto & Perez-Santana, 2014; Sanders *et al.*, 2010) but they show an agreement regarding what HRM practices can foster IWB, again what the literature labels High Performance Work Systems (HPWS), or Commitment-oriented HRM practices. Furthermore, most of them defend that the social exchange theory is a framework that explained why HPWS have a positive effect on IWB (Alfes *et al.*, 2013; Dorenbosch *et al.*, 2005; Prieto & Perez-Santana, 2014; Sanders *et al.*, 2010). In this line, they suggest that the adoption of HPWS is perceived by the employees as a signal of the organization's commitment to them, and, that in this situation the employees will respond reciprocally, that is, increasing their own commitment to the organization what will lead them to make an effort to improve their performance, including the development of innovative behaviours. Finally, in spite of some exceptions for some of the commitment-oriented HRM practices previous studies focus on (Prieto & Perez-Santana, 2014; Sanders *et al.*, 2010), the findings from these studies, in general, provide support to the idea that HPWS are positively related to IWB.

In sum, based on previous research, we can conclude that the adoption of HPWS is expected to have an impact on employees' IWB and, in turn, that IWB fosters innovation, including product innovation. This suggests a likely mediator effect of IWB in the relationship between HPWS and innovation. Thus, we propose:

H<sub>2</sub>: IWB mediates the relationship between the adoption of HPWS and product innovation

### **3. Methodology**

#### *3.1. Sample*

The study population comprised Spanish industrial firms with more than 50 employees according to the SABI (Sistema de Análisis de Balances Ibéricos) database. This size guarantee well developed innovation and human resource management systems in companies. The study also covers a variety of manufacture sectors (codes 10 to 32 of group C from Spanish Clasificación Nacional de Actividades Económicas-CNAE 2009) which facilitates the extrapolation of findings. The final population was 3922 companies.

Data were collected via a structured questionnaire using telephone interviews. An expert firm managed the survey process. Various meetings and contacts with the staff of this company were used to communicate the objectives of the study, explain the objective of the work and how to solve any incidents that arose. The company contacted with HRM manager. Otherwise, R&D manager was interviewed.

In order to test our hypotheses, the number of sample companies required should be between 200 and 250 companies. With this target, the specialized company started to call randomly to the population companies. 1068 companies were contacted. 11.6% of companies refused the invitation, in the 66.3% of the cases it was impossible to locate the manager and 7.0% of the companies agreed, although they did not do the interview.

All the processes were supervised and the quality of data was tested by contacting a randomly selected sample of firms that had answered the questionnaire. The authors monitored the company specializing in surveys to confirm that they had followed the previously fixed protocol (contact firm's HRM manager -or R&D manager-; explain survey's purpose; get his/her participation in the survey (in the case the respondent



doesn't have time to answer the questionnaire at that moment, make an appointment); introduce the survey; make the filter question; make the rest of the questions; finally, offering the possibility of receiving a feedback report), as well as data quality. No problems were found.

The sample firms' characteristics are showed in table 1. The companies were drawn from different manufacturing sectors of the economy, which allows for a good representation of companies in general.

INSERT TABLE 1 AROUND HERE

A routine check for industry bias indicated no significant differences in the mean responses on any construct across firms from different industries. In addition, Chi-square distribution analysis revealed no significant differences between the sample and the population, in terms of industry distribution, the number of employees or sales volume.

### 3.2. Measures

Variables were measured with scales tested in the literature. 5-point Likert scales were used. The specific scales used were:

*High Performance Work Systems (HPWS)*. Based on previous literature on the link between, both HPWS and Innovation (Chen & Huang, 2009; Lepak & Snell, 2002), and HPWS and IWB (Fu *et al.*, 2015; Jimenez-Jimenez & Sanz-Valle, 2008), HPWS was measured using 25 HRM practices. The practices cover the most important areas (5 indicators per area) of HRM: Empowerment, Selection, Training, Appraisals and Compensation. Since these constructs measure different HRM practices that are not necessarily correlated, they were computed as formative variables. It is important when using a formative construct to build the index based on a large number of indicators, thereby ensuring that they have tapped into the multidimensional and multifaceted domain of the construct (Bollen & Lennox, 1991). Afterwards, a second order construct was created to measure the human resource system starting from each of the practices mentioned above.

*Product innovation*. Two measures of product innovation were used in this study. New products radicalness was measured from the scale developed by Gatignon *et al.* (2002),

analysing whether companies introduce new products that incorporate significant improvements over the previous technology, were based on revolutionary changes in technology, have very innovative technologies, are products that are difficult to replace using old technology and represent a great technological advance. New products originality was computed with five items from the Moldovan *et al.* (2011)'s study, focusing on whether the new products are original, novel, unusual, unique or out of the ordinary.

*Employee innovative work behaviour* was measured using the scale developed by Scott and Bruce (1994), which were complemented using some items from the scale created by Kleysen and Street (2001). Following these two studies, we measure employee innovative behaviour by asking the respondent whether their employees show the behaviours required by the different stages of innovation process: generation of new ideas, evaluation of these ideas, their promotion, search for supporters and funds for implementing these ideas, and development of implementation's plans.

Finally, our study has included two *control variables*: firm's size (number of employees) and firm's age (number of years of the company). These two variables are usually considered to be related with the degree of development of the firm's HRM practices (Guthrie, 2001; Huergo and Jaumandreu, 2004; Sun *et al.*, 2007) and, more important, they are considered to impact the dependent variable in this research, product innovation (Anderson *et al.*, 2014). Both variables have been recoded to the same scale as the other variables.

### 3.3. Analysis

The structural model was estimated through partial least squares (PLS) path model using the SmartPLS program 3.2.6. Previously, in order to analyse the relationships between the different paths of the model, the evaluation of the measured model is required (Barclay, Higgins, & Thompson, 1995). This analysis is performed in relation to the attributes of individual item reliability, construct reliability, average variance extracted (AVE), and discriminant validity of the indicators of reflective scales. The reliability of the measurement scales was verified with the Cronbach alpha coefficient and a value greater than 0.7 was returned in all cases, which is considered acceptable in the literature. The composite reliability index ranged from 0.953 to 0.965, above the

recommended threshold 0.7 (Nunnally, 1978). The mean extracted variance (AVE) ranged from 0.718 to 0.848 and revealed that all reflective constructs exceeded the 0.50 limit (Fornell and Larcker, 1981). On the other hand, the  $R^2$  value for the endogenous constructs ranged from 0.207 to 0.677 and exceeded the recommended minimum value of 0.1, which demonstrates that the model is suitable for testing the hypotheses (Table 2). The discriminant validity of the reflective measures was then evaluated. As Fornell and Larcker (1981) suggest, the mean variance extracted for each construct is greater than the corresponding correlations (see Table 2). Consequently, all variables had adequate discriminant validity. In summary, the model has good convergent validity, reliability and discriminant validity.

INSERT TABLE 2 AROUND HERE

The five formative constructs used for measuring HRM practices do not report indicators of reliability, internal consistency reliability or discriminant validity. In general, formative indicators can have positive, negative or even no correlations among each other. However, it is necessary to develop collinearity analysis of the 25 items that form these constructs. This analysis showed that the maximum Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) value for the aggregated multidimensional constructs is below the threshold of 3.3. Likewise, all the loadings are positive and significant. Therefore, weights provide information about how each item contributes to each HRM construct.

At last, with the aim of testing the mediation effects, several authors suggest the consideration of new procedures (Nitzl *et al.*, 2016; Preacher & Hayes, 2008). These studies have PROCESS v2.16 applied (Hayes & Scharkow, 2013) to estimate indirect effects. By using the latent variables scores obtained from the PLS analysis, with 5000 resamples, PROCESS generates 95% bias-corrected bootstrap confidence intervals for the indirect effects. When an interval of a mediating effect contains not zeros, then the indirect effect is significantly different from zero with a 95% confidence level.

#### **4. Results**

In order to test our hypotheses we used SmartPLS with bootstrapping resampling (Chin, 1998), due to, among other reasons, PLS is recommended for studies where there are fewer than 250 observations and also use formative constructs (Reinartz *et al.*, 2009). PLS calculates the amount of explained variance of the construct of the predictive

variables, as well as the structural relations of the coefficients and their statistical significance.

As Table 3 shows, the results support of the relations hypothesized. The first hypothesis suggests a positive relationship between HPWS and product innovation, which findings support for the two measures of product innovation we used, new products radicalness ( $\beta = 0.217, p < 0.01$ ), and new products originality ( $\beta = 0.308, p < 0.001$ ).

INSERT TABLE 3 AROUND HERE

We also proposed that innovative work behaviour mediates the relationship between HPWS and product innovation. According to the findings, showed in table 3, there is a positive relationship between HPWS and IWB ( $\beta = 0.601, p < 0.001$ ) and IWB is positively related to both new products radicalness ( $\beta = 0.257, p < 0.01$ ) and new products originality ( $\beta = 0.203, p < 0.01$ ). Furthermore, our results show positive indirect effects of HPWS on the two measures of products innovations we used ( $\kappa = 0.155, p < 0.01$ ;  $\kappa = 0.122, p < 0.05$ ). In order to test the mediation effect of IWB, this paper (see Table 4) has also used PROCESS v2.16 software (Hayes, 2013). Following Preacher and Hayes (2008) mediation requires that  $\beta_{\text{HPWS} \rightarrow \text{IWB}} \times \beta_{\text{IWB} \rightarrow \text{radical}}$  or  $\beta_{\text{HPWS} \rightarrow \text{IWB}} \times \beta_{\text{IWB} \rightarrow \text{original}}$  are significant. Our results show that IWB partially mediates the relationship between HPWS and both new products radicalness ( $\beta = 0.162, p < 0.001$ ) and new products originality ( $\beta = 0.128, p < 0.01$ ). These results support H<sub>2</sub>.

INSERT TABLE 4 AROUND HERE

## 5. Discussion

The purpose of this paper has been to examine the relationship between HPWS and product innovation and whether employees' IWB mediates such a relationship.

Consistently with previous research (De Saa-Perez & Diaz-Diaz, 2010; Donate *et al.*, 2016; Fu *et al.*, 2015; Laursen & Foss, 2003), this paper finds that adopting high-performance HRM practices is positively related to product innovation. Although this result is interesting, the main contribution of this paper to the literature is that it provides evidence supporting the idea that IWB mediates the positive relationship between HPWS and product innovation. Although some authors had suggested it (Fu *et*

*al.*, 2015; Jimenez-Jimenez & Sanz-Valle, 2008), up to now, empirical research on this mediation is very scarce (Fu *et al.*, 2015).

These paper's findings do not only imply contributions to the literature. They also have relevant implications for practitioners. The first contribution is clear. It shows to firms seeking to foster product innovation that a key element for achieving this goal is to have employees who engage in an innovative behaviour at work. That is to say, employees who seek ways to improve existing processes and products, which are able to reconsider established ideas and to unlearn old methods, who propose creative ideas and who promote the implementation of such ideas. Second, this paper also shows that HRM practices are an instrument than can be used to promote employees' innovative work behaviour. In particular, according to this paper findings, IWB will benefit from the adoption of the set of HRM practices the literature labels as high-performance work system or commitment-oriented HRM system, which includes practices such as empowerment, continual training, or the use of incentives for new ideas.

This study has some limitations that need to be considered. First, a limitation is the cross-sectional design of this research. Secondly, only subjective measures have been used for all constructs, without using information obtained from other sources. Finally, data were collected from the same respondent, the HRM manager or R&D manager. Although both of them usually participate in the management board and are well informed about all the variables this paper examines, it would have been more appropriate to have answers from different managers.

Future studies must overcome the limitations underlined in this paper. For example, longitudinal studies might help to a better understanding of the causal relationships between HPWS, IW and product innovation, and it will be interesting to incorporate informants from different levels of the company. In addition, we consider of interest to look more deeply into the relations proposed by the inclusion in the model of other variables. In particular, we suggest examining how organizational learning impact on the relationships between HPWS and IWB. Previous studies defend that HPWS foster employee's orientation to learning (Chen & Huang, 2009; Laursen & Foss, 2003). Furthermore, the recent study developed by (Escribá-Carda *et al.*, 2017) shows that explorative learning mediates the relationship between workers perception of the

implementation of HPWS and their IWB. This paper examines this link as an individual level. It would be also interesting analyse this link at organizational level, and, in addition, study also the relationship between exploitative learning, HPWS and IWB. Finally, another research line that can contribute to the literature is to study the model this paper proposes under an open innovation approach.

## 6. References

- Abstein, A. and P. Spieth (2014), "Exploring HRM meta-features that foster employees' innovative work behaviour in Times of Increasing Work-Life Conflict". *Creativity and Innovation Management*, vol. 23, no. 2, pp. 211-225.
- Alfes, K., K. Truss, E. Soane, C. Rees and M. Gatenby (2013), "The relationship between line manager behavior, perceived HRM practices, and individual performance: examining the mediating role of engagement". *Human Resource Management*, vol. 56, no. 6, pp. 839-859.
- Alpkan, L., Bulut, C., Gunday, G., Ulusoy, G. and Kilic, K. (2010), "Organizational support for intrapreneurship and its interaction with human capital to enhance innovative performance", *Management Decision*, Vol. 48 No. 5, pp. 732-755
- Anderson, N., K. Potočnik and J. Zhou (2014), "Innovation and Creativity in Organizations: A State-of-the-Science Review". *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 1297-1333.
- Ardito, L. and A. Messeni Petruzzelli (2017), "Breadth of external knowledge sourcing and product innovation: The moderating role of strategic human resource practices". *European Management Journal*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 261-272.
- Battistelli, A., F. Montani, C. Odoardi, C. Vandenberghe and P. Picci (2014), "Employees' concerns about change and commitment to change among Italian organizations: the moderating role of innovative work behavior". *The International Journal of Human, Resource Management*, vol. 25, no. 7, pp. 951-978.
- Barclay, D., Higgins, C. and Thompson, R. (1995), "The partial least squares (PLS) approach to causal modelling: personal computer adoption and use as an illustration", *Technology Studies, Special Issue on Research Methodology*, Vol. 2 No. 2, pp. 285-309.
- Bollen, K. A. and R. Lennox (1991), "Conventional wisdom on measurement: a structural equation perspective". *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 110, no. 2, pp. 305-314.
- Cabello-Medina, C., A. Lopez-Cabrales and R. Valle-Cabrera (2011), "Leveraging the innovative performance of human capital through HRM and social capital in Spanish firms". *The International Journal of Human, Resource Management*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 807-828.
- Carmeli, A., R. Meitar and J. Weisberg (2006), "Self-leadership skills and innovative behavior at work". *International Journal of Manpower*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 75-90.

- Chen, C.-J. and J.-W. Huang (2009), "Strategic human resource practices and innovation performance-The mediating role of knowledge management capacity". *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 62, no. 1, pp. 104-114.
- Chesbrough, H. and W. Vanhaverbeke (2006), *Open Innovation: Researching a New Paradigm*, Oxford University Press.
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2003), "The logic of open innovation: Managing intellectual property". *California Management Review*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp. 33-58.
- Chin, W. W. (1998), "The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling", in G. A. Marcoulides (ed), Lawrence Erlbaum Associate: Mahwah, NJ.
- Chowhan, J. (2016), "Unpacking the black box: understanding the relationship between strategy, HRM practices, innovation and organizational performance". *Human Resource Management Journal*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 112-133.
- Damanpour, F. (1991), "Organizational innovation: A meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators". *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 34, no. 3, pp. 550-590.
- Damanpour, F. (2010), "An Integration of Research Findings of Effects of Firm Size and Market Competition on Product and Process Innovations". *British Journal of Management*, vol. 21, p. 15.
- Damanpour, F. and S. Gopalakrishnan (2001), "The dynamics of the adoption of product and process innovations in organizations". *Journal of Management Studies*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 45-65.
- Danneels, E. (2002), "The dynamics of product innovation and firm competences". *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 23, no. 12, pp. 1095-1121.
- De Jong, J. and D. Den Hartog (2010), "Measuring innovative work behavior". *Creativity and Innovation Management*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 23-36.
- De Saa-Perez, P. and N. L. Diaz-Diaz (2010), "Human resource management and innovation in the Canary Islands: An ultra-peripheral region of the European Union". *The International Journal of Human, Resource Management*, vol. 21, no. 10, pp. 1649-1666.
- De Spiegelaere, S., G. Van Gyes, H. De Witte, W. Niesen and G. Van Hootegem (2014), "On the relation of job insecurity, job autonomy, innovative work behaviour and the mediating effect of work engagement". *Creativity and Innovation Management*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 318-330.
- De Winne, S. and L. Sels (2010), "Interrelationships between human capital, HRM and innovation in Belgian start-ups aiming at an innovation strategy". *The International Journal of Human, Resource Management*, vol. 21, no. 11, pp. 1863-1883.
- Donate, M. J., I. Peña and J. D. Sánchez De Pablo (2016), "HRM practices for human and social capital development: effects on innovation capabilities". *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 27, no. 9, pp. 928-953.
- Dorenbosch, L., M. L. Van Engen and M. Verhagen (2005), "On-the-job innovation: The impact of job design and human resource management through production ownership". *Creativity and Innovation Management*, vol. 14, no. 2.
- Engelman, R.M., Fracasso, E.M., Schmidt, S. and Zen, A.C. (2017), "Intellectual capital, absorptive capacity and product innovation", *Management Decision*, Vol. 55 No. 3, pp. 474-490.

- Escribá-Carda, N., F. Balbastre-Benavent and M. Teresa Canet-Giner (2017), "Employees' perceptions of high-performance work systems and innovative behaviour: The role of exploratory learning". *European Management Journal*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 273-281.
- Fornell, C. and Larcker, D.F. (1981), "Evaluating structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error", *Journal of Marketing Research*, Vol. XXVII, February, pp. 39-50.
- Fu, M., P. C. Flood, J. Bosak, T. Morris and P. O'Regan (2015), "How do high performance work systems influence organizational innovation in professional service firms?". *Employee Relations*, vol. 37, pp. 209-231.
- Gaia Rubera and A. H. Kirca (2012), "Firm Innovativeness and Its Performance Outcomes: A Meta-Analytic Review and Theoretical Integration". *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 76, no. 3, pp. 130-147.
- Galende, J. and J. M. De La Fuente (2003), "Internal factors determining a firm's innovative behavior". *Research Policy*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 715-736.
- Gatignon, H., M. L. Tushman, W. Smith and P. Anderson (2002), "A structural approach to assessing innovation: Construct development of innovation locus, type, and characteristics". *Management Science*, vol. 48, no. 9, pp. 1103-1122.
- Giustiniano, L., S. Lombardi and V. Cavaliere (2016), "How knowledge collecting fosters organizational creativity". *Management Decision*, vol. 54, no. 6, pp. 1464-1496.
- Goepel, M., K. Hölzle and D. Zu Knyphausen-Aufseb (2012), "Individual's innovation response behavior: a framework of antecedents and opportunities for future research". *Creativity and Innovation Management*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 412-426.
- Gong, Y., J.-C. Huang and J.-L. Farh (2009), "Employee Learning Orientation, Transformational Leadership, and Employee Creativity: The Mediating Role of Employee Creative Self-Efficacy". *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 765-778.
- Guthrie, J. (2001), "High involvement work practices, turnover, and productivity: evidence from New Zealand", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 44 No. 1, pp. 180-192.
- Hayes, A. F. (2013), *Introduction to mediation, moderation and conditional process analysis*, The Guilford Press: New York.
- Hayes, A. F. and M. Scharkow (2013), "The Relative Trustworthiness of Inferential Tests of the Indirect Effect in Statistical Mediation Analysis: Does Method Really Matter?". *Psychological Science*, vol. 24, no. 10, pp. 1918-1927.
- Hotho, S. and K. Champion (2011), "Small businesses in the new creative industries: innovation as a people management challenge". *Management Decision*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 29-54.
- Huergo, E. and Jaumandreu, J. (2004), "How does probability of innovation change with firm age?", *Small Business Economics*, Vol. 22 No. 3, pp. 193-207.
- Janssen, O. (2000), "Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behavior". *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 73, no. 3, pp. 287-302.
- Janssen, O. (2005), "The joint impact of perceived influence and supervisor supportiveness on employee innovative behavior". *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 78, pp. 573-579.



- Jiang, J., S. Wang and S. Zhao (2012), "Does HRM facilitate employee creativity and organizational innovation? A study of Chinese firms". *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 23, no. 19, pp. 4025-4047.
- Jimenez-Jimenez, D. and R. Sanz-Valle (2008), "Could HRM support organizational innovation". *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 19, no. 7, pp. 1208-1221.
- Kesting, P. and J. P. Ulhøi (2010), "Employee-driven innovation: extending the license to foster innovation". *Management Decision*, vol. 48, no. 1, pp. 65-84.
- Keupp, M. M., M. Palmie and O. Gassmann (2012), "The strategic management of innovation: a systematic review and paths for future research". *International Journal of Management Review*, vol. 14, pp. 367-390.
- Kim, C., J. Song and A. Nerkar (2012), "Learning and innovation: exploitation and exploration trade-offs". *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 65, no. 8, pp. 1189-1194.
- Kleysen, R. F. and C. T. Street (2001), "Toward a multi-dimensional measure of individual innovative behavior". *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 284 - 296.
- Kyriakopoulos, K., M. Hughes and P. Hughes (2016), "The Role of Marketing Resources in Radical Innovation Activity: Antecedents and Payoffs". *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 398-417.
- Laursen, K. and N. Foss (2003), "New HRM practices, complementarities, and the impact on innovation performance". *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 243-263.
- Lepak, D. P. and S. A. Snell (2002), "Examining the human resource architecture: The relationships among human capital, employment, and human resource configurations". *Journal of management*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 517-543.
- Lopez-Cabrales, A., A. Pérez-Luño and R. Valle-Cabrera (2009), "Knowledge as a mediator between HRM practices and innovative activity". *Human Resource Management*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 485-503.
- Moldovan, S., J. Goldenberg and A. Chattopadhyay (2011), "The different roles of product originality and usefulness in generating word-of-mouth". *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 109-119.
- Nitzl, C., J. L. Roldán and G. Cepeda Carrión (2016), "Mediation Analysis in Partial Least Squares Path Modeling: Helping Researchers Discuss More Sophisticated Models". *Industrial Management & Data Systems*, vol. 116, no. 9, pp. 1849-1864.
- Nunnally, J.C. (1978), *Psychometric Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY.
- Oecd (2005), *Oslo Manual, The measurement of scientific and technological activities. Proposed guidelines for collecting and interpreting technological innovation data*, OECD EUROSTAT: Paris.
- Paauwe, J. and P. Boselie (2005), "HRM and performance: What next?". *Human Resource Management Journal*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 68-83.
- Park, Y.K., Song, J.H., Yoon, S.W. and Kim, J. (2014), "Learning organization and innovative behavior: the mediating effect of work engagement", *European Journal of Training and Development*, Vol. 32 Nos 1/2, pp. 75-94.
- Podmetina, D., Volchek, D., Dąbrowska, J. and Fiegenbaum, I. (2013), "Human resource practices and open innovation", *International Journal of Innovation Management*, Vol. 17 No. 6, pp. 1-22.

- Preacher, K. J. and A. F. Hayes (2008), "Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models". *Behavior Research Methods*, vol. 40, no. 3, pp. 879-891.
- Prieto, I. M. and M. P. Perez-Santana (2014), "Managing innovative work behavior: the role of human resource practices". *Personnel Review*, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 184-208.
- Ramamoorthy, N., P. C. Flood, T. Slattery and R. Sardesai (2005), "Determinants of innovative work behaviour: development and test of an integrated model". *Creativity and Innovation Management*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 142-150.
- Reinartz, W., M. Haenlein and J. Henseler (2009), "An Empirical Comparison of the Efficacy of Covariance-Based and Variance-Based SEM". *International Journal of Research in Marketing*, vol. 26, no. 4, pp. 332-344.
- Sanders, K., M. Moorkamp, N. Torke, S. Groeneveld and C. Groeneveld (2010), "How to support innovative behaviour? The role of LMX and satisfaction with HR practices". *Technology and Investment*, vol. 1, pp. 59-68.
- Scott, S. G. and R. A. Bruce (1994), "Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace". *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 580 - 607.
- Seeck, H. and M. R. Diehl (2016), "A literature review on HRM and innovation-taking stock and future directions". *The International Journal of Human Resource Management* vol. DOI: 10.1080/09585192.2016.1143862.
- Shipton, H., M. West, J. Dawson, K. Birdi and M. Patterson (2006), "HRM as a predictor of Innovation". *Human Resource Management Journal*, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 3-27.
- Stock, R. M. (2015), "Is boreout a threat to frontline employee's innovative work behavior?". *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, vol. 32, no. 4, pp. 574-592.
- Sun, L., Aryee, S. and Law, K.S. (2007), "High-performance human resource practices, citizenship behavior and organizational performance: a relational perspective", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 50 No. 3, pp. 558-577.
- Tellis, G. J., J. C. Prabhu and R. K. Chandy (2009), "Radical innovation across nations: The preeminence of corporate culture". *Journal of Marketing*, vol. 73, no. 1, pp. 3-23.
- Utterback, J. M. and W. J. Abernathy (1975), "A dynamic model of process and product innovation". *Omega*, vol. 3, pp. 639 - 656.
- Van De Ven, A. H. (1986), "Central problems in the management of innovation". *Management Science*, vol. 32, no. 5, pp. 590-607.
- Wright, P. M., G. C. McMahan and A. McWilliams (1994), "Human Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage: A Resource-based Perspective". *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 301-326.
- Yuan, F. and R. W. Woodman (2010), "Innovative behavior in the workplace: the role of performance and image outcome expectations". *Academy of Management Journal*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 323-342.
- Zhou, Y., Y. Zhang and A. Montoro-Sanchez (2011), "Utilitarianism or romanticism: the effect of rewards on employees' innovative behaviour". *International Journal of Manpower*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 81-98.