

Boosting Innovative Work Behavior in Organizations Through Absorptive Capacity

Elif BAYKAL¹

Abstract

The knowledge-based economies created by the ever globalizing world have created new needs for companies. Extreme competition has made companies more demanding and more ambitious in terms of reaching and new using information. At this point, absorptive capacity, which means the capacity of organizations to recognize, acquire and use new external information, has gained great importance. Companies with high absorptive capacities can access external information sources more easily, and they can more easily assimilate their acquired knowledge and work more effectively, efficiently and innovatively. In this study, it has been predicted that the innovative work behavior of the employees will be greatly affected by the absorptive capacity. And the effects of the sub-dimensions of this capacity on the innovative business behavior were examined. In order to test this research model, a field research is applied in Istanbul on 190 whitecollar workers with face-to-face surveys. Results of the survey have been analyzed by SPSS 22.0. Results of the study showed that all subdimensions of absorptive capacity positively effect innovative work behavior.

Keywords: Absorptive Capacity, Innovative Capacity, Innovative Work Behavior

Örgütlerde Emilim Kapasitesi ile İnovatif İş Davranışını Arttırma Özet

Her geçen gün daha da küreselleşen dünyanın yarattığı bilgiye dayalı ekonomiler, şirketler için yeni ihtiyaçlar yarattı. Aşırı rekabet, şirketleri bilgiye ulaşma ve yeni kullanım açısından daha zorlu ve iddialı hale getirmiştir. Bu noktada, kuruluşların yeni dış bilgileri tanıma, edinme ve kullanma kapasitesi anlamına gelen özümleme kapasitesi büyük önem kazanmıştır. Emici kapasiteleri yüksek olan şirketler dış bilgi kaynaklarına daha kolay erişebilir ve edindikleri bilgileri daha kolay özümseyebilir, daha verimli ve yenilikçi bir şekilde çalışabilirler. Bu çalışmada, çalışanların yenilikçi iş davranışlarının emilim kapasitesinden büyük ölçüde etkileneceği tahmin edilmiştir. Bu kapasitenin alt boyutlarının yenilikçi iş davranışına etkileri incelenmiştir. Bu araştırma modelini sınamak için İstanbul'da 190 beyaz yakalı çalışanla yüz yüze anketle saha araştırması yapılmıştır. Anket sonuçları SPSS 22.0 ile analiz edilmiştir. Çalışmanın sonuçları, emilim kapasitesinin tüm alt boyutlarının, yenilikçi iş davranışını olumlu yönde etkilediğini göstermiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Emilim Kapasitesi, İnovatif Kapasite, İnovatif İş Davranışı

Introduction

Technological developments and latest improvements in management gave way to a higher need for quick and updated information. Owing to these developments,

¹ Assist. Prof. Dr. İstanbul Medipol University, Business and Management Sciences Faculty- Business Administration (English) Department enarcikara@medipol.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4966-8074>

highthened focus in knowledge management gave way to an increased attention in innovation management in organizations (Zieba and Zieba, 2014: 458). In this new era, continuous innovation and the ability to improve existing products, services and business processes are quiet significant for organizations to keep up with the latest developments in the markets (Jong and Hantog, 2008: 5) and gain competitive advantage. But collaboration of organizational members and the company is very important in creating this competitive advantage. According to Jannsen (2000) organizational members should be both willing to and capable of innovating in order to obtain an innovative organizations. In fact, innovativeness and knowledge management are strictly related concepts (Palacios Marques et al., 2013; Zhou & Li, 2012; Wang and Wang, 2012). That is why, many organizations prefer to implement knowledge management methods realizing the importance of knowledge as an important intangible asset (Nowacki and Bachnik, 2015).

The innovation processes in organizations requires allocation of resources and capabilities including external knowledge in order to be successful. In this point, absorptive capacity of organizations is the ability of absorbing external knowledge and can be considered as an important aspect of innovation process (Ferreira and Ferreira, 2017) in understanding the differences in the utilization of knowledge in innovation processes (Zahra & George, 2002). In other words, the methods organizations get use of new knowledge designates the extent to which new knowledge contributes to innovative activities or not.

In this point understanding the term absorptive capacities is important. According to Zahra and George (2002) absorptive capacity is a multidimensional concept that can be considered as a dynamic capability through which organizations acquire, assimilate, transform, and exploit external information. That is why, it is considered as an essential prerequisite for implementing innovation processes. And mere exposure to a variety of potential sources activating innovation does not necessarily help organizations gain the capacity to acquire and assimilate information and transform the acquired knowledge to innovation (Zahra & George, 2002). According to Vinding (2006), as education level and training of people increases, their ability to absorb and use new knowledge also increases. Namely innovative work behaviors of individuals in organizational settings are affected by their own absorptive capacities which is in fact affected by absorptive capacities of their

organizations. That is why, absorptive capacity can be considered as cumulative in nature (Zahra & George, 2002).

1. Absorptive Capacity

Absorptive capacity is the ability of an organization to understand the value of a new or external information and assimilate it to the organizations' extant knowledge, and be able to create commercial ends with this information. This capacity is effective on innovativeness of the organization and it can be conceived as the function of the firm's level of prior related external knowledge (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). In this point external knowledge can be considered as the knowledge that is adopted through a firm's interorganizational relationships (Gulati, 1999) which is an important antecedent of innovativeness (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). That is why, many scholars consider absorptive capacity, an important capacity of organizations utilizing both internal and external knowledge, as a dynamic capacity fostering innovation (Zahra and George, 2002). Generally, the prior knowledge of organizations encompasses basic knowledge, and even shared languages in a specific technical realm often including knowledge of the most recent developments. That is why, in organizational contexts, this prior knowledge gives the ability to understand and estimate the value of novel information, assimilate it to the organizational realities, and use it in practical ends. These abilities collectively make up what is called "absorptive capacity."

Extant literature on memory development supports the view that accumulating previous know-how and information contribute to the capability to put stock this new knowledge in memory, and to recall it when necessary (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). The memory development is self-reinforcing, namely, the more something is stored in memory, the more the capability to store more information increases and the more the individual become capable of using the extant in different settings increases with the help of associative learning wherein cases are recoded in memory through linkages with existing concepts. This is also relevant regarding problem solving capabilities. Problem-solving methods encompasses prior knowledge that permits individuals gain new problem-solving abilities (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). The relevant knowledge's prior possession increases creativity by permitting associations that may have never been considered before (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990).

At firm level the absorptive capacity of organizations can be generated in different ways; as a byproduct of an organization's own R&D investment or as a byproduct of its manufacturing operations or through getting advanced technical training (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). In order to develop an effective absorptive capacity, intensity of effort is critical as well as being exposed to relevant prior knowledge (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990), that is to say, learning is a cumulative process, and learning and learning is often difficult in novel areas.

Absorptive capacity is also related to the total of absorptive capacities of each individual organizational member in an organization. As in the case with individual absorptive capacities, absorptive capacities of organizations tend to develop cumulatively. Nonetheless, it is not the sum of the absorptive capacities of its employees. It refers to both acquisition/ assimilation of new knowledge and also exploitation of it (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). Absorptive capacity is not its direct exposure with its external environment. Rather it is closely related to the ability of the organization to transfer this novel knowledge across the organization (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990).

When absorptive capacity of organizations are considered as a whole, a trade-off between to assimilate and exploit information originating from other subunits or environmental factors can be seen. In fact, this shows the differences between inward-looking absorptive capacities and outward-looking absorptive capacities of the organization (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). Although both of these components are significant for organizational learning, too much dominance of one of these components can be harmful for the organization (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). Beyond efficiency of interior communication channels and the ability of the subsystems of the organization the necessity to have diverse knowledge structures, having the sort of knowledge needed to increase the organizational absorptive capacity is also significant. Critical knowledge includes being aware of important knowledge and its location within and outside the organization (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990). In other words, this is the knowledge of who knows what, who can solve a specific problem and who can exploit novel information (Cohen and Levinthal, 1990).

According to Zahra and George (2002) absorptive capacity encompasses the kind of organizational routines wherein companies acquire, assimilate, transform, and exploit

novel information. In this point, acquisition explains capacity of the company to detect and acquire knowledge from outside that is critical to its own operations (Zahra and George, 2002: 189). For instance, it refers to a firm's capability to detect most relevant external information over the the bulk of information that surrounds the organization. Namely, it is about knowing where to find the relevant knowledge. Namely, in this process the company identifies and acquires external knowledge and it evaluates the intensity, quality and rate of a company's efforts to identify and adopt the externally generated knowledge. Acquisition is the path and direction dependent element of the knowledge acquisition stage (Zahra and George, 2002 : 189). Previous knowledge and intensity, speed, and direction of acquiring that knowledge is considered as the main elements of acquisition stage (Patterson and Ambrosini, 2015: 78). On the one hand, assimilation is "a firm's routines and mechanisms allowing interpreting, and understanding the external knowledge (Zahra and George, 2002: 189). When the ideas and discoveries which fall outside a firm's search zone or awareness, the firm cannot easily appreciate or comprehend them. Furthermore, transformation is the act of developing and refining old routines and newly acquired knowledge. Namely, it is adding or deleting some information and interpreting the same knowledge in a different manner" (Zahra and George, 2002:190). Thus it includes recodification and bisociation (Patterson and Ambrosini, 2015: 78). And lastly, exploitation is the ability "to refine and leverage existing capabilities and knowledge in order to create new ones. For instance, it reflects the ability to harvest and incorporate information into the organization's daily operations. On the other hand, assimilation is about an organization' routines and job processes allowing it to analyze and interpret the relevant knowledge taken from external sources. Transformation encompasses ability to adapt the external knowledge and uniting it with existing internal knowledge. And lastly, exploitation describes the ability of the organization to transform the novel knowledge into competitive advantage in the market.

Zahra and George (2002) describes absorptive capacity as a multidimensional concept that has the potential to impinge on different capabilities and routines. Emphasizing the existence of two subsets of absorptive capacity, they claim that potential and realized absorptive capacities are both very significant capacities of organizations. Potential absorptive capacity increases an organization's receptiveness to external knowledge whereas realized absorptive capacity refers to an organization's capability to absorb knowledge and transform it into novel innovations. Absorptive capacity is

composed of two complementary and interconnected constructs that are potential absorptive capacity and realized absorptive capacity thus making it clear that potentials are more meaningful when they are realised.

2. Innovation and Absorptive Capacity

In contemporary organizations absorptive capacity can be considered as a dynamic capability influencing organization's ability to get, absorb and use the external data required to nourish the internal innovation processes thus contributing to competitive advantage in the market (Fosfuri and Tribo, 2006). For instance; The exposure of organizations to external knowledge affects the level of experiential learning accumulated to manage and generate value from outside information (Fosfuri and Tribó, 2008).

Innovation is a complex activity in wherein novel organizational knowledge is applied to commercial ends (Fosfuri and Tribo, 2006). Without doubt, companies with higher absorptive capacities can more easily benefit from external knowledge compared to the ones with lower absorptive capacities that is why they can outperform their rivals regarding innovativeness. And in order to absorb external knowledge companies should be successful in learning process. Unfortunately, while learning all external knowledge cannot be comprehended easily and sometimes some details can be overlooked. To prevent this from happening companies should be careful and act with full awareness.

On the one hand, absorptive capacity of a company should not be conceived as an end itself. However, it has the potential to give way to important organizational outcomes (Fosfuri and Tribó, 2008). In fact, when absorptive capacity of companies reach a satisfactory level, this capacity mostly result in higher innovativeness performance customer orientedness, and avoidance of competency traps (Zahra and George, 2002). Companies with high levels of absorptive capacity do not afraid of investing on changing external and internal situations. They combat with unknown factors by being more innovative and meeting the needs of new markets and clients.

According to Kostopoulos et al. (2011) absorptive capacities of organizations contribute to value creation from external knowledge which will be purposeless despite this capacity. Namely, organizations can only identify, assimilate, and utilize new knowledge incase they have the ability to transform external information to a more usable

one. In fact, Even the most “ready to use” external iknowledge necessitates going through a process in which this knowledge, modified and turned into a more usable knowledge with the aim of obtaining tangible organizational outcomes. Since, absorptive capacity is determined by entrepreneurship and firm-level attributes, entrepreneurship is widely seen as the most important determinant of absorptive capacity in SME’s (Fransen, 2013).

3. Innovative Capacity

Innovative capacity is a unique type of capacity through which organizations match inventions with the related final markets in their specific sector(Lichtenthantler and Lichtenthantler, 2009: 1321). Due to the fact that, knowledge may be an external resource that can be acquired from outer sources, innovative capacity explains the exploitative element of absorptive capacity (Zahra and George, 2002). In other words, it describes organization’s ability to exploit information internally (Lichtenthantler and Lichtenthantler, 2009: 1321).

In fact, especially in saturated markets, companies can gain competitive advantage through sales and success in higher sales numbers come from both being capable of offering lower prices but also through non-price elements encompassing higher quality, more appealing design, higher brand value and higher customization of the products. That is why, the ability of companies to produce innovative products and services has become more significant in constantly and rapidly changing business atmosphere (Prajago and Ahmed, 2006).

In this point it is important to understand description of innovation. According to Hansen et al. (2006)’s innovation is creating or adopting new ideas, models, products or services in order to increase value to the customer and contributing to the overall performance of the company. Innovativeness is bit different in comparison to innovation in the point that innovativeness is a characteristic of an individual or organization (Johsan, Dibrell and Hansen, 2009: 88).

We can talk about two main streams of thought regarding antecedents of innovation. First, emphasizing technology, the latter emphasizing social factors. For many scholars, technology acts as the main driver of innovation. Not only, it is important in creating new products or processes, but also it functions as an important figure in changing

the essentials of market structure by comprehensively changing the rules of the game regarding competition (Prajago and Ahmed, 2006).

According to Gölgeci and Ponomarov (2015) organizational innovativeness encompasses constant influx of novel ideas, information and practices. Since potential absorptive capacity and realized absorptive capacity can be viewed as enablers of ability to turning knowledge into new methods of doing business or new products (Leal-Rodríguez et al. 2014); they can be regarded as antecedents of innovativeness.

Organizational innovativeness is organisation's capacity and inclination to innovate to create and adopt innovations and apply them perfectly (Gölgeci, et al. 2016). It is both distinct from and embedded in its cultural settings. In order to be capable of engaging in successful innovations companies should have proper baselines, that is to say a proper climate that serves innovative ideas and implementation of them. According to Wallace et al. (2016) innovativeness at work mostly stems from high employee involvement climate. In the extant literature, the source of innovative climate is explained by many factors including individual traits of organizational members, motivation of both the owners and the employees, and the task identity and job context etc. In the literature these factors are often investigated separately. In this point, Anderson et al., (2014) examined the factors and situations that lead to more innovative work climates, they found that general work environment is useful providing development-oriented organizational members with high levels of self-determination, courage, and freedom to innovate (Deci & Ryan, 2000). According to Ryan & Deci (2000) if organizational members can meet their basic needs like autonomy, self-efficacy, and relatedness, they can engage in agentic attempts that results in greater individual growth and engage in higher levels of risk taking that is important in an innovative work climate. Supporting this point of view, Wallace et al. (2016) claims that involvement work climate can be created when organizational members in a company can participate in decision making processes, when they have access to related information, when they have the opportunity to update their knowledge, and when their effectiveness at work is rewarded. Thus in this atmosphere we can talk about a more proper baseline work innovative work behavior.

4. Innovative Work Behaviour

IWB can be explained as individuals' deliberate efforts to create, develop, and realize innovative attempts to attain higher performance. According to Welbourne et al (1998) employees prefer to resort to innovative work behaviors in order to improve effectiveness and efficiency while carrying out their jobs. According to King and Anderson (2002) innovation is broader concept in comparison to creativity since it includes implementation of ideas. Innovative work behavior refers to the state of searching for new opportunities and creating new ideas. It includes acts directed towards implementing change, transmitting new knowledge or regenerating processes with the aim of enhancing individual and/or organizational performance (Jong and Hantog, 2008:5). And it includes tactics aiming implementing change through implementation oriented behavior. According to Schuh et al., (2017) employees perform better in case they can innovate new products and processes and when they have high-quality relationships with their leaders. Moreover, unlike creativity, innovative work behavior provides a clear vision that gives way to innovative outputs (Jong and Hantog, 2008:5). Innovative work behavior includes implementation of creative ideas resulting in more proactive and modern organizations nourished by updated knowledge and creates novelties in its own environment.

Kanter (1988) was one of the first scholars proposing a model on innovativeness of companies. His model encompassed three main stages about building innovative work behavior. These stages are; idea generation, coalition building and implementation. In this model, innovation in an organization is triggered by individuals' idea generation. As a second stage, innovative members of the organization seek sponsorship for their ideas and they build coalition to gain support for their ideas. And lastly, innovative organizational members contribute to idea implementation. For example they produce a model of the innovation or they find alternative ways of executing some critical task etc. In fact, the first important point of the innovation process is frequently discovered with the help of an opportunity or coincidental occurrence of an adversity or problem necessitating to be solved (John and Hartog, 2008: 6). Without doubt, for innovating, some special occasions should happen that go beyond awareness of a requirement about a certain topic is needed. In innovation process, their ability of organizations and their members to build new ways to meet requirements, the capabilities to create ways to find solutions to problems and their capacity to reorganize new data and prevalent information are very

significant (John and Hartog, 2008: 6). According to Kanter (1988), establishing coalitions in the organization is important in implementing innovations; and that coalition building process includes gaining power by selling an innovative idea to colleagues. In most cases, the potential allies of the innovation process may have doubts about the innovation's value, that is why the father of the idea should try hard to convince them. In fact, innovative people are those kind of people who feel strong commitment to a specific innovative idea and they have the capacity and inclination to sell it to other people (Kanter, 1988). And as the last step, the innovative idea must be put into practice if we will call it as an innovation.

According to Henderson and Clark (1990), we can talk about four main types of innovation and these innovation styles are, incremental innovation, radical innovation, modular innovation and architectural innovation. According to their typology, incremental innovation is a kind of innovation wherein an existing design is improved, namely nothing novel is created. In incremental innovation gradual improvements occur leading enhanced quality or user-friendliness in products over time. In incremental innovations slight developments are largely in the form of small refinements in sub elements of products or services rather than integrative changes in the whole system. On the one hand, incremental innovations are the most common type of innovation since they are easy to implement and less costly. The second innovation type, namely radical innovation involves creation of novel components, novel designs or novel products with new types of architecture linking sub elements of products and services together in novel ways. They are rarely seen in the market since implementation of it is very difficult. In radical innovation breathtaking new developments are actualized that create a sensational effect in the markets. On the other hand, the third type, namely, modular innovation refers to the employment of new components with different designs. Modular innovation encompasses some new or at least significantly different components. In this innovation type use of new components is the key feature of innovation process, especially if the innovation necessitates a new technology. In this innovation style, the novel technology changes the way in which one or more components within the overall system operate, but the overall system remains largely the same. Moreover, in architectural innovation, the components and designs remain the same but the components can change. In this type of innovation, mostly changes are minor, so that most components can function as they have previously, but with a new design or

configuration. In this innovation model configuration of the whole system is altered when new linkages are added. In all these innovation methods organizations can benefit from refining and improving the existing system either incrementally or radically. In fact, generally innovative work behavior needs organizational members to challenge the status quo and change the existing manners and working style (Frese and Fay, 2001).

5. Hypothesis

In our research model we wanted to see the effects of absorptive capacity of companies on their innovativeness in the organization. In fact in the extant literature there are enough number of studies confirming the effect of absorptive capacity on firm level innovativeness. For example; Chang et al. (2012) found that flexibility oriented human resources management systems are closely related with firm-level absorptive capacity and this capacity affects firm level innovativeness, namely an innovative organizational climate. Ali, Kan and Sarstedt (2016) study also confirmed the positive effects of absorptive capacity on organizational innovation and performance. Rangus and Slavec (2017) also examined the relationship between organizational characteristics and firm's innovativeness on a sample of 421 firms. Results suggest that organization's innovativeness performance positively affect their performance. In another study, Naqshbandi and Tabsche (2018) developed a model for explaining the way leadership affects absorptive capacity and organizational learning cultures of organizations and open innovation attempts. However, in spite of the fact that organizational members strongly affect absorptive capacity of organizations, this role has been mostly ignored by the researchers (Hart, Gilstrap & Bolino, 2016). In this study we suggested that in case absorptive capacity increases in the organization generally, individuals' innovative work behaviors can also increase in parallel to these positive developments. That is why, we wanted to see the positive effects of absorptive capacity on innovative work behaviour of employees in companies. In the extant literature although scarce in numbers there are some studies supporting this absorptive capacity-innovative work behavior relationships. For example; Kang and Lee (2017) explored the relationship of absorptive capacity and knowledge sharing on 138 R&D employees, they found that employees' absorptive capacity and knowledge sharing among them increase their innovative behaviour. Similarly in Wang, Yang and Xue's (2017) study in Chinese context, the moderator effect

of absorptive capacity in the mediated relationships between well-being of employees and innovative work behavior via knowledge sharing has been found. Being inspired by these studies we suggested that absorptive capacities of companies can positively affect innovative work behaviour of organizational members. Thus our hypothesis is:

H₁: Absorptive capacity has a positive effect on innovative work behaviors of individuals.

6. METHODOLOGY

6.1. Data Collection and Scales

With the aim of collecting related data, easy sampling methodology has been used. And in the related field research, face to face surveys have been preferred in collecting data from the applicants. And exploratory factor analysis has been preferred in testing whether the observed variables have been loaded in the related sub dimensions. Moreover, correlation and regression analysis have been used for testing the hypothesis. Surveys of the field research have been designed with five-point Likert Scale. The sample data of the study is composed of white color workers from different Turkish companies. About, 500 surveys have been delivered to employees from different Turkish companies, 190 usable surveys have been obtained. In our sample, more than 71% of applicants were male, 23% were younger than 30 years old, 58% were between the ages of 30-40 and 15% were between the ages of 40- 50. On the other hand 88% were university graduates.

On the one hand, in order to measure innovative work behavior, Janssen's (2000) 9 item innovative work behavior scale has been used. And for absorptive capacity scale 14-item scale of Flatten et al. (2011) has been used. The absorptive capacity scale four subdimensions including; acquisition, assimilation, transformation and exploitation.

6. 2. Factor Analysis and Hypothesis Tests

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin test has been applied in order to test if the data was sufficient for further analysis or not. KMO result was found to be 0,918 and and Barlett score was found to be under 0,000 that can be considered as proper values for continuing with the factor analysis.

Exploratory factor analysis is used with Principal Component Analysis and Promax Rotation methods for investigating if the related items are loaded to the supposed factor structure. The reason of preferring Principal Components Analysis was the fact that it is widely accepted as the most suitable method in exploratory factor analysis. Similarly, Promax rotation is preferred since it is preferred in cases with high levels of relationship between variables (Hair et al., 2010). The lower limit of factor loadings and communality values were accepted as 0,5 (Hair et al., 2010). The variables matching these were excluded from the scale to prevent them from disturbing the factor structure. On the other hand, Cronbach's Alpha values were used to measure the internal consistency of the factors and since the values of each factor was found to be over 0.7 we can infer that our scales have internal consistency. The relevant factor structure is given in the table below.

Table 1. Factor Analysis

	Component				Cronbach Alfa Values
	1	2	3	4	
Acquire_1			0,837		0.844
Acquire_2			0,775		
Acquire_3			0,715		
Assimilate_4		0,693			0.903
Assimilate_5		0,752			
Assimilate_6		0,752			
Assimilate_7		0,72			
Transform_8	0,779				0.942
Transform_9	0,786				
Transform_10	0,805				
Transform_11	0,838				
Exploitation_13				0,672	
Exploitation_14				0,665	
IWB_1	0,652				0.894
IWB_2	0,746				
IWB_3	0,691				
IWB_4	0,776				
IWB_5	0,728				
IWB_6	0,821				
IWB_7	0,794				
IWB_8	0,768				
IWB_9	0,643				

Moreover, we applied correlation analysis in order to see whether there is a multicollinearity between variables. As seen in the Table 2 below, there is not multicollinearity between variables.

Table 2. Correlation Analysis

Correlations						
		Acquisition	Assimilation	Transformation	Exploitation	IWB
Acquisition	Pearson Correlation	1				
Assimilation	Pearson Correlation	0,677**	1			
Transformation	Pearson Correlation	0,602**	0,766**	1		
Exploitation	Pearson Correlation	0,678**	0,779**	0,762**	1	
IWB	Pearson Correlation	0,273**	0,224*	0,204*	0,224**	1

β standardized beta weights, ***P<0001, **P<0,01, *P<.05

And in order to test our hypothesis we applied regression analysis. As mentioned before in our research model we tested three main hypothesis that are trying to confirm whether there are positive relationships between sub dimensions of absorptive capacity and innovative work behavior. Namely, we wanted to see whether subdimensions of absorptive capacity have positive effects on IWB. In regression analysis norms of Baron and Kenny (1986) have been accomodated in this analysis. As seen in Table 3 analysis results showed that analysis examined our hypothesis suggesting that absorptive capacity has a positive effect on innovative work behavior has been accepted (R^2 : 0, 080, F:4,336) Since all the relationships between subitems of absorptive capacity and innovative work behavior have P values smaller than 0,5 our hypothesis is accepted. Access to information can be considered as the strongest subdimension of absorptive capacity in explaining the effects of absorptive capacity on innovative work behavior.

Table 3. Regression Analysis

Independent Variable	Innovative Work Behavior	
	Beta	T
Constant	4.079	17.192***
Acquisition	0,156	2,542*
Assimilation	0.155	2,098*
Transformation	0.079	1,101*
Exploitation	0.078	1,119*
F	4.336	
Adjusted R Square	0.080	
Sign.	0.000	

β standardized beta weights, ***P<0001, **P<0,01, *P<.05

7. Discussion

Newly emerged knowledge-intensive work atmosphere promoted new business methods and companies began to depend upon external knowledge more frequently in promoting innovation and increasing their organizational performance (Morgan and Berthon, 2008). External knowledge received from outer partners is significant and pervasive among companies that prefer engaging in innovative attempts, however managing these external knowledge is a difficult task. In getting use of external knowledge, besides experiencing problems related to finding the right source of information, companies live difficulties in assimilating and exploiting the information (Lund, 2006: 3).

As March and Simon (1958) suggests in organizations most innovative activities come about through creation of new ideas by using external knowledge and data rather than internal information. Companies that are successful at managing the process about absorbing and managing this external data, gain the ability to innovate more successfully and more often. In this point, absorptive capacity is considered as an important potential of companies since in this capacity internal capability and external collaboration is viewed as complementary to one another (Lund, 2006:1). According to Kostopoulous et al. (2011) absorptive capacity generates value from and give a direction to external knowledge. With the help of absorptive capacity, companies can identify, assimilate, and apply new external knowledge efficiently.

In this paper taking into consideration the extant literature regarding positive effects of absorptive capacity on innovative work behavior, we hypothesized that absorptive capacity will have a positive effect on innovative work behaviors of organizational members. And our results confirmed the existence of this positive effect. Our results are parallel with the results of previous studies focusing on positive effects of absorptive capacity on innovativeness in organizations. for example, as in the case with the results of our study. Kang and Lee (2015) explored the relationships among absorptive capacity and knowledge sharing, that are innovation-specific antecedents of innovative behaviour. They applied their study on 138 employees. Results of the study confirmed that sub-dimensions of absorptive capacity directly affects innovative behaviour. however Knowledge sharing's effect is rather an indirect affect that is realised through realised absorptive capacity. In

another study, Kostopoulos et al. (2011) applied a study on 461 Greek enterprises, and this study demonstrated that absorptive capacity contributes, directly and indirectly, to innovative work performance in organizations and their financial performances. And in another example from China, Kotabe, Jiang and Murray 108 senior executives examined, it is found that absorptive capacity is an important antecedent of innovative work behavior.

8. Further Research Implications

In further studies a more comprehensive approach to examine the effects of absorptive capacity on innovative work behavior can be embraced. First of all a wider sample with a higher representativeness can be preferred. For instance research model of the study can be replicated on a wider geography. And effects of other Organizational capabilities such as resilience, agility or learning orientedness can be added to the model to obtain a more explanatory study.

REFERENCES

- Ali, M., Kan, K. A. S., & Sarstedt, M. (2016). Direct and configurational paths of absorptive capacity and organizational innovation to successful organizational performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(11), 5317-5323.
- Anderson, N., Potočník, K., & Zhou, J. (2014). Innovation and creativity in organizations: A state-of-the-science review, prospective commentary, and guiding framework. *Journal of Management*, 40: 1297-1333.
- Chang, S., Gong, Y., Way, S. A., & Jia, L. (2013). Flexibility-oriented HRM systems, absorptive capacity, and market responsiveness and firm innovativeness. *Journal of Management*, 39(7), 1924-1951.
- Chen C-J, Huang J-W. Strategic human resource practices and innovation performance— the mediating role of knowledge management capacity. *J Bus Res* 2009;62(1): *Creativity Research Journal*, 15(2&3): 107-120.
- De Jong, J. P., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Innovative work behavior: Measurement and validation. *EIM Business and Policy Research*, 1-27.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. 2000. The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11: 227-268.
- Ferreira, G. C., & Ferreira, J. J. (2017). Absorptive Capacity: An Analysis in the Context of Brazilian Family Firms. *Revista de Administração Mackenzie*, 18(1), 174-204.
- Flatten, T. C., Engelen, A., Zahra, S. A., & Brettel, M. (2011). A measure of absorptive capacity: Scale development and validation. *European Management Journal*, 29(2), 98-116.
- Fosfuri, A., & Tribó, J. A. (2008). Exploring the antecedents of potential absorptive capacity and its impact on innovation performance. *Omega*, 36(2), 173-187.
- Frese, M., & Fay, D. (2001). Personal initiative (PI): An active performance concept for work in the 21st century. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 23, 133–187.
- Gölgüci, I., Swiatowiec-Szczepanska, J., & Raczkowski, K. (2017). How does cultural intelligence influence the relationships between potential and realised absorptive capacity and innovativeness? Evidence from Poland. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 29(8), 857-871.

- Gulati, R. (1999). 'Network location and learning: the influence of network resources and firm capabilities on alliance formation'. *Strategic Management Journal*, **20**, 397–420.
- Hansen, E., C. Dibrell, and Down, J (2006). "Market orientation, strategy, and performance in the primary forest industry." *Forest Science* 52(3), 209–220.
- Hart, T. A., Gilstrap, J. B., & Bolino, M. C. (2016). Organizational citizenship behavior and the enhancement of absorptive capacity. *Journal of Business Research*, 69(10), 3981-3988.
- Hogan, S. J., & Coote, L. V. (2014). Organizational culture, innovation, and performance: A test of Schein's model. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(8), 1609-1621.
- Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and organizational psychology*, 73(3), 287-302.
- Johnson, A. J., Dibrell, C. C., & Hansen, E. (2009). Market orientation, innovativeness, and performance of food companies. *Journal of Agribusiness*, 27(1/2), 85-106.
- Kang, M., & Lee, M. J. (2017). Absorptive capacity, knowledge sharing, and innovative behaviour of R&D employees. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, 29(2), 219-232.
- King N. & Anderson N. (2002), *Managing innovation and change: a critical guide for organizations*, Thomson, London.
- Kostopoulos, K., Papalexandris, A., Papachroni, M., & Ioannou, G. (2011). Absorptive capacity, innovation, and financial performance. *Journal of Business Research*, 64(12), 1335-1343.
- Kotabe, M., Jiang, C. X., & Murray, J. Y. (2017). Examining the complementary effect of political networking capability with absorptive capacity on the innovative performance of emerging-market firms. *Journal of Management*, 43(4), 1131-1156.
- Leal-Rodríguez, A. L., Ariza-Montes, J. A., Roldán, J. L., & Leal-Millán, A. G. (2014). Absorptive capacity, innovation and cultural barriers: A conditional mediation model. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(5), 763-768.
- Lichtenthaler, U., & Lichtenthaler, E. (2009). A capability-based framework for open innovation: Complementing absorptive capacity. *Journal of management studies*, 46(8), 1315-1338.
- Liu, F., Chow, I. H. S., Zhang, J. C., & Huang, M. (2017). Organizational innovation climate and individual innovative behavior: exploring the moderating effects of psychological ownership and psychological empowerment. *Review of Managerial Science*, 1-19.
- Lund Vinding, A. (2006). Absorptive capacity and innovative performance: A human capital approach. *Economics of innovation and New Technology*, 15(4-5), 507-517.
- March, James G., and Herbert Alexander Simon. 1958. *Organizations*. Oxford: Wiley.
- Martínez-Román, J. A., & Romero, I. (2017). Determinants of innovativeness in SMEs: disentangling core innovation and technology adoption capabilities. *Review of Managerial Science*, 11(3), 543-569.
- Morgan RE, Berthon P. Market orientation, generative learning, innovation strategy and business performance inter-relationships in bioscience firms. *J Manage Stud* 2008;45(8):1329–53.
- Naqshbandi, M. M., & Tabche, I. (2018). The interplay of leadership, absorptive capacity, and organizational learning culture in open innovation: Testing a moderated mediation model. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 133, 156-167.
- Palacios Marques, D., Peris Ortiz, M., & Merigo, J. M. (2013). The Effect of Knowledge Transfer on firm Performance: An Empirical Study in Knowledge-Intensive Industries. *Management Decision*, 51(5), 973–985. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/MD-08-2012-0562>
- Patterson, W., & Ambrosini, V. (2015). Configuring absorptive capacity as a key process for research intensive firms. *Technovation*, 36, 77-89.
- Prajogo, D. I., & Ahmed, P. K. (2006). Relationships between innovation stimulus, innovation capacity, and innovation performance. *R&D Management*, 36(5), 499-515.

- Rangus, K., & Slavec, A. (2017). The interplay of decentralization, employee involvement and absorptive capacity on firms' innovation and business performance. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 120, 195-203.
- Ren, F., & Zhang, J. (2015). Job stressors, organizational innovation climate, and employees' innovative behavior. *Creativity Research Journal*, 27(1), 16-23.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. 2000. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55: 68-78.
- Schuh, S. C., Zhang, X. A., Morgeson, F. P., Tian, P., & van Dick, R. (2018). Are you really doing good things in your boss's eyes? Interactive effects of employee innovative work behavior and leader-member exchange on supervisory performance ratings. *Human Resource Management*, 57(1), 397-409.
- 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.
- Shanker, R., Bhanugopan, R., Van der Heijden, B. I., & Farrell, M. (2017). Organizational climate for innovation and organizational performance: The mediating effect of innovative work behavior. *Journal of vocational behavior*, 100, 67-77.
- Van de Vrande, V., De Jong, J. P., Vanhaverbeke, W., & De Rochemont, M. (2009). Open innovation in SMEs: Trends, motives and management challenges. *Technovation*, 29(6-7), 423-437.
- Vinding, A. L. (2006). Absorptive capacity and innovative performance: a human capital approach. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 15(4-5), 507-517. DOI: 10.1080/10438590500513057.
- Wallace, J. C., Butts, M. M., Johnson, P. D., Stevens, F. G., & Smith, M. B. (2016). A multilevel model of employee innovation: Understanding the effects of regulatory focus, thriving, and employee involvement climate. *Journal of Management*, 42(4), 982-1004.
- Wang, J., Yang, J., & Xue, Y. (2017). Subjective well-being, knowledge sharing and individual innovation behavior: The moderating role of absorptive capacity. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 38(8), 1110-1127.
- Wang, Z., & Wang, N. (2012). Knowledge sharing, innovation and firm performance. *Expert systems with applications*, 39(10), 8899-8908.
- Zahra, S. A., & George, G. (2002). Absorptive capacity: a review, reconceptualization, and extension. *Academy of Management Review*, 27(2), 185-203. DOI: 10.5465/AMR.2002.6587995.
- Zhou, K. Z., & Li, C. B. (2012). How Knowledge Affects Radical Innovation: Knowledge Base, Market Knowledge Acquisition, and Internal Knowledge Sharing. *Strategic Management Journal*, 33(9), 1090-1102. doi:10.1002/smj.1959.
- Zieba, M., & Zieba, K. (2014). Knowledge management critical success factors and the innovativeness of KIBS companies. *Engineering Economics*, 25(4), 458-465.