

Role of AMO Framework, Knowledge Sharing, and Intra-Firm Value Co-Creation in Promoting Innovative Work Behavior

Raheela Haque¹, Sarwar Mehmood Azhar², Saifullah Shaikh³, Yusra Jamil Memon⁴,
Qamaruddin Maitlo⁵

1st Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Sukkur IBA University, Pakistan

2nd Professor, Department of Business Administration, Sukkur IBA University, Pakistan.

*3rd Assistant Professor, Institute of Commerce & Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Shah Abdul Latif University
Khairpur Sindh, Pakistan*

4th Research Scholar, Sukkur IBA University, Pakistan

5th Lecturer, Department of Business Administration, Sukkur IBA University, Pakistan.

Received: 07th August 2021

Revised: 06st September 2021

Accepted: 25th October 2021

Abstract: This study intends to establish the link between the associated components of HR practices such as employee's ability, motivation, and opportunity (AMO) with employees' desired behavioral outcome i.e., knowledge sharing, as the key inputs of the intra-firm value co-creation activities and processes. Nevertheless, this study also looks at the factors that motivate organizational internal actors i.e., employees working in different departments of an organization either as a supplier or consumer, to engage in co-creation activities that encourage them to strategically manage their co-creation relationships in the form of increased intra-functional coordination that ultimately help develop their encouraging behavior towards innovation. The conceptual paper thus argues that the core drivers of a value co-creating organization that further leads to employees' innovative work behavior cannot be assumed to occur automatically in the organization, but needs to be cultivated using the AMO framework of HR practices and employees' knowledge sharing behavior.

Keywords - Value co-creation, Knowledge sharing, AMO framework, Innovative work behavior

Introduction

Today's unprecedented challenges in the form of technological and global advancements have changed the customers' demands and preferences, thus increased competition among firms. To encounter these challenges as well as to maintain a competitive edge, organizations today having an increased focus on innovation that is to come up with up new ideas and incorporate the same in their products formation to service delivery, which makes them unique from competitors. For this, organizations attempt to enhance the employees' innovative work behavior as they understand that this is one of the best ways to meet customers' demands and makes their survival possible in this turbulent and complicated market environment.

Consequently, scholars and researchers of the field have an increasing interest in analyzing the factors which influence employees' innovative work behavior (Li & Zheng, 2014; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Siregar, Suryana, & Senen, 2019). So far, several studies have examined a variety of factors as predictors that influence employees' innovative behavior at work. A few of them are self-efficacy (Hsiao, Chang, Tu, & Chen, 2011); high-commitment work system (Schimansky, 2014); organizational climate (Imran, Saeed, Anis-Ul-Haq, & Fatima, 2010); empowering leadership (Jada, Mukhopadhyay, & Titiyal, 2019); leadership styles (Alheet, Adwan, Areiqat, Zamil, & Saleh, 2021); organizational justice (Akram, Lei, Haider, & Hussain, 2020); and psychological capital (Purwanto, Asbari, Hartuti, Setiana, & Fahmi, 2021).

However, this study has highlighted the role of intra-firm value co-creation as one of the useful tools that help develops interaction among organizational internal employees, resulting in the form of their innovative work behavior. The notion of value co-creation becomes more significant and remained the point of discussion among researchers as the new paradigm of the service-dominant (S-D) logic starts to dominate the shift of organizational focus from value creation inherent in the goods-dominant (G-D) logic to value co-creation in the S-D logic. The G-D logic is personified in the linear transformation of value along the value chain (Porter, 1985). While in the value co-creation framework of S-D logic, it will require a more dyadic orientation resulting in competencies within the organizational structure and processes. Farther, in its current configuration, the S-D logic involving the value co-creation orientation has shifted the G-D logic of value creation from a micro-level producer-consumer interaction (Vargo & Lusch, 2004), to a macro level ecosystem orientation (Pera, Occhiocupo, & Clarke, 2016; Vargo, Wieland, & Akaka, 2015). However, this study conceptualizes value co-creation within the organizations' internal processes and positions it as an integral part of an organization's various operational expedencies and treats internal suppliers and consumers the same as external suppliers and consumers of value. For example, within the organization, every functional unit is an interaction point between two operatives: the 'supplier' of value and the 'consumer' of value. The supplier of value would be a department or an employee who offers value in the form of tangible or and embed the concept of value co-creation within the organizations' internal processes intangible inputs to the receiving

department or an employee who is the consumer and who uses this input in furthering the process of co-creating value internally.

In other words, to us, an understanding of how the internal operators that belong to the ecosystem interact to create value is paramount in conceptualizing the value co-creation orientation in the firm. In expanding this thought, this study believes that on a broader level value is co-created through the combined efforts of firms, employees, customers, stockholders, government agencies, and other entities, which form an ecosystem (Vargo et al., 2015) or network (Reinholt, Pedersen, & Foss, 2011), and who are collectively called the 'actors'. Further, given this approach, this study believes that an isolating mechanism that specifically focuses on the behaviors of intra-organizational actors (supplier and consumer of value inside the firm) will enable the organization to remodel the idea of value creation within the organizational value chain from a linear and unidirectional set of activities to a more dynamic and open system based on the iterative interactions between actors involved in the process. Keeping in view this ecosystem orientation, where multiple operators interact resulting in complexities that call for higher than normal knowledge sharing and inter-functional coordination behaviors to meet the challenges of a dynamic competitive environment. This ecosystem conceptualization of interactive behavior in the HRM literature is reflected as 'networks' (Reinholt et al., 2011), where organizations' internal members or units, e.g., teams, departments, business units, or subsidiaries (*ibid*) being internal stakeholders are connected to develop a value co-creating organization. Moreover, the necessity to introduce rests on the belief that for an effective value co-creation process to take place in an externalized frame, organizations should learn to co-create value within the organization's boundaries first.

Nevertheless, this study also looks at the factors that motivate organizational internal actors i.e, employees working in different departments of an organization either as a supplier or consumer, to engage in co-creation activities in the form of increased intra-functional coordination that ultimately helps develop their encouraging behavior towards innovation. In this connection, this study intends to use the competency perspective to establish the link between the associated components of HR practices such as employee's ability, motivation, and opportunity (AMO)(Batra & Ray, 1986; Jiang, Lepak, Hu, & Baer, 2012; Purcell & Kinnie, 2007), and employees' desired behavioral outcome i.e., knowledge sharing (Cabrera & Cabrera, 2005; Fong, Ooi, Tan, Lee, & Yee-Loong Chong, 2011), as key inputs of the value creation process (Chen & Huang, 2009).

To summarize, the focus of this conceptual study is to look at the factors that motivate organizational internal actors to engage in activities that encourage them to strategically manage the co-creation relationships which in turn enhances their innovative behavior at work. This study, therefore, has used the AMO framework as an antecedent to employees' knowledge sharing behavior, a desired behavioral outcome as well as a key input to the intra-firm value co-creation process that further encourages employees to engage in innovative work behavior.

Literature Review

Innovative Work Behavior

As per De Jong (2006), innovative work behavior is “Individuals’ behaviors directed toward the initiation and intentional introduction of new and useful ideas, processes, products or procedure within a work role, group or organization” (p.19). Innovative work behavior is typically seen to encompass a broad set of behaviors needed to develop and implement ideas that help in proposing new solutions to existing working methods, fulfilling customer demands, and sharing knowledge with others, etc., which aims at improving individual as well as organizational performance (Farr & Ford, 1990; Janssen, 2000, 2005). Furthermore, these set of behaviors related to the creation and application of novel ideas challenge past practices and standard operating procedures and are designed to generate innovative output, that not just benefit an organization but to wider society as a whole (Janssen, 2000).

Intra-Firm Value Co-Creation

The concept of value co-creation as it stands today is driven by the S-D logic (Lusch & Vargo, 2006), and forms a differentiating focus away from the older G-D logic (Vargo & Lusch, 2004; Vargo & Morgan, 2005). Briefly, in the G-D logic, the organization is a value delivering entity where the consumer is a passive receiver of the said value. On the other hand, in S-D logic, the growing emphasis is on the exchange of value between the various actors involved in the value creation process, where the receiver of the value is envisaged as an operant resource and collaboratively partners in the value co-creation process (Vargo & Lusch, 2004; Vargo, Maglio, & Akaka, 2008). In other words, as the previous process of goods transformation through the chain remains the same, this needs to be superimposed by a complementary process of value co-creation involving an open dialogue while exchanging knowledge and coordination along each step. This transformation of a linear value co-creating process to a network systems framework is predicated on the reciprocal flow of information, and feedback with the consequential impact on value co-creation activities, behaviors, and capabilities of actors to the transaction especially within the organizational boundaries.

Within the context of value co-creation, Prahalad and Ramaswamy (2004), suggested the necessity of a priori presence of the building blocks of interactions of value co-creation to exist that includes dialog, access, risk benefits, and transparency, which have come to be known by its acronym DART. This study, in turn, draws on the open dialogue aspect of the model as a required antecedent to the organization’s internal interactions involving knowledge sharing and coordination for the development of the intra-organizational value co-creation process. However, without an appropriate structure of behaviors, the efficacy of the system will be suspect and prone to erosion, even if instituted, unless a behavioral transformation is achieved to foster the desired behaviors. In proposing the internal framework for fostering value co-creation, therefore, this study

defines intra-organizational value co-creation as an iterative process of dialogue held transparently between organizational internal actors and functional units to internally co-create value through desired behavior of knowledge sharing.

Knowledge Sharing

Knowledge is considered as one of the strategic organizational resources that have the potential to create a competitive advantage (Lengnick-Hall & Lengnick-Hall, 2006; Rahimli, 2012). Seeing today's increased competition, changes in customers' demands, and the impact of globalization, firms have increased their attention towards knowledge management practices to meet customer demands, improve organizational productivity and sustain a competitive advantage (Elda, Patrisia, & Linda, 2021; Wilson & Campbell, 2020). Also, as various researchers, to leverage knowledge effectively to gain competitive advantage, it must be shared among key actors of the value creation process (Argote & Ingram, 2000; Paswan, D'Souza, & Rajamma, 2014). For this, organizations need their employees to involve in knowledge sharing activities by which they involve in continuous interaction with each other for exchanging their valuable ideas, information, and experience. Knowledge sharing, therefore, refers to the process of communication whereby two or more parties are involved in the knowledge transfer activities, which results in the creation of their new knowledge (Roth, 2003; Wang, Wang, & Zhang, 2019).

Ability–Motivation–Opportunity (AMO) Framework

This paper as discussed above proposes the ability, motivation, and opportunity (AMO) framework as an antecedent in encouraging employees' desired behavioral outcomes at work such as their knowledge sharing behavior. Within the HRM context, different explanatory frameworks have been used to explain how HRM practices truly work. Rooting from this, just such a comprehensive framework is that of the AMO (Appelbaum, Bailey, Berg, Kalleberg, & Bailey, 2000; Bartel, 2004; Harney & Jordan, 2008). Underlying the AMO framework is the assumption that employees perform well when they have the appropriate abilities to do their work (Demortier, Delobbe, & El Akremi, 2014; Subramony, 2009); have enough motivation that enhances their discretionary behavior (Jiang et al., 2012; Marin-Garcia & Tomas, 2016); and have also opportunities that provide them with the necessary support to reach the organizational goals or performance outcomes (Appelbaum et al., 2000; Sarikwal & Gupta, 2013).

Up till now, AMO has been studied and applied in various disciplines, for instance, social science (Van Rhee & Dul, 2017); human resource management (Obeidat, Mitchell, & Bray, 2016); information processing (MacInnis & Jaworski, 1989); marketing (Clark, Abela, & Ambler, 2005); entrepreneurship and innovation (Turner & Pennington, 2015), etc. In the current paper, this framework provides a focus for high-performance HR practices to positively affect the desired employee behavior which ultimately helps creates a successful intra-firm value co-creation ecosystem. In line with this thinking, the study proposes certain HR practices, which will singly

or collectively contribute to employee behavior in the shape of developing and enhancing the ability and capability of employees, motivate them and improve opportunities for them to foster their knowledge sharing behavior.

Proposed Propositions

The next section will underpin propositions highlighting the role of AMO and then explain how each dimension of the AMO framework impacts the knowledge sharing behavior that will further create a successful intra-firm value co-creation ecosystem leading to employees' innovative work behavior.

Linking Ability, Motivation and Opportunity (AMO) Enhancing HR Practices with Knowledge Sharing

The ability-enhancing HR practices focus on comprehensive and innovative recruitment and selection (staffing) process along with effective training and development practices (Cabello-Medina, López-Cabrales, & Valle-Cabrera, 2011; Kroon, Van De Voorde, & Timmers, 2013; Youndt & Snell, 2004). In an organization when qualified employees are hired, they sometimes lack appropriate behaviors, which need to be addressed if the desired change has to be incorporated in the organization. One such method is to provide them with multi-functional or cross-functional training. This form of training is geared to help employees communicate and coordinate with other functional areas in terms of reducing knowledge gaps thus creating symmetrical knowledge available to all (Chang, Gong, & Peng, 2012; Griffin & Hauser, 1996; Szulanski, 1996). These practices collectively impact the ability of the employees to engage in appropriate behaviors required for knowledge sharing (Fong et al., 2011; Reinholt et al., 2011).

Proposition 1a: Ability-enhancing HR practices are required to enhance employees' knowledge sharing behavior within the firm.

Motivation-enhancing HR practices generally include result-oriented performance appraisal as well as a performance-contingent compensation system (Huselid, 1995; Kinnie, Hutchinson, Purcell, & Swart, 2006; Kundu & Gahlawat, 2016). The use of these performance appraisal measures serves as a feedback mechanism that provides employees with direction for their performance-oriented behaviors and required competencies. This performance-oriented or result-oriented appraisal system enables firms to identify the gaps between actual and desired performance behaviors of their employees and accordingly use training and development procedures to cover those gaps and thus provide employees with positive motivation for enacting appropriate behaviors. Furthermore, it is considered desirable that the appraisal process should be perceived as fair for which organizations normally use a multi-source appraisal process where employees receive their performance ratings from multiple sources rather than any single one

(London & Smither, 1995; McCarthy & Garavan, 2007). This multi-source appraisal process, in the first instance, involves the organizational internal actors in the process which adds a valuable feature in terms of improving their particular motivation and sense of commitment towards their organization. Secondly, employees who receive ratings through this process are also more satisfied and perceive fairness in the system when compared with the traditional supervisory appraisal method (Narcisse & Harcourt, 2008; Selvarajan & Cloninger, 2012). Overall, the process of appraisal encourages individuals' commitment towards their job, in terms of added value to the team effort, through effective knowledge sharing (Fong et al., 2011), and enhanced coordination in terms of responsiveness (Narver & Slater, 1990).

This study further purposes competitive compensation and believes that organizations can influence their employees' motivational behavior in the form of incentives and rewards such as profit or gain-sharing bonuses, extensive benefits, promotions, and career & development opportunities, etc (Ladley, Wilkinson, & Young, 2015; Park & Sturman, 2016). For example, the distribution of an organization's profit sharing or gain sharing bonuses can result in the enhancement of employees' motivation level as well as induce their cooperation among teams, when they perceive that their organizations value their contribution indicated through reward distribution tied to the organization's overall profitability.

Proposition 1b: Motivation-enhancing HR practices are required to enhance employees' knowledge sharing behavior within the firm.

The literature on HRM suggests that even if employees have the ability to perform assigned tasks and are motivated to do so, these on their own may still not foster the desired behaviors unless the organizations provide employees with appropriate opportunities to engage in such behaviors (Jiang et al., 2012; Lepak, Liao, Chung, & Harden, 2006). To pursue the opportunity dimension of the AMO framework, employees need various jobs and career-related opportunities that tend to boost their confidence and encourage them to participate in joint task performance and decision making (Jiang et al., 2012). Within the organizations, creating these opportunity-enhancing practices will largely depend on how well the job designs and teamwork are conceptualized.

In terms of job design, employees are more likely to exploit opportunities by taking advantage of the job designs that include appropriate job descriptions involving job rotation and internal transfers, and appropriate working conditions, etc (Marin-Garcia & Tomas, 2016; Minbaeva, 2013) that will encourage employees to coordinate with each other for an effective contribution to knowledge exchange. Teamwork, on the other hand, creates an environment that enables a broader communion of knowledge among members who work closely for the attainment of a common goal (Lim & Klein, 2006; Zárraga & Bonache, 2003). Within organizations, members of cohesive teams with similar norms and values work through an iterative process of dialogue thus creating an environment that encourages trust and coordination where they will willingly share their ideas and experiences (Fong et al., 2011; Goh, 2002). Likewise, cross-functional teams help

organizations in the integration of diverse skills and act as an efficient means to deal with work complexities (Griffin & Hauser, 1996; Pinto, Pinto, & Prescott, 1993).

To summarize, it is therefore expected that employees will be strongly motivated to avail such opportunities and repeated application of such positive behaviors will embed these in the organization's collective psyche with a concomitant impact on knowledge sharing and coordination behaviors (Kundu & Gahlawat, 2016; Mohsen & Eng, 2016; Parker, Williams, & Turner, 2006). In other words, by effective implementation of job design and teamwork practices, organizations provide their employees with an environment of learning and collaboration where they can effectively coordinate and share knowledge with other members to ensure a steady flow of value creating solutions.

Proposition 1c: Opportunity-enhancing HR practices are required to enhance employees' knowledge sharing behavior within the firm.

Linking Knowledge Sharing with Intra-firm Value Co-creation

In this increasingly competitive environment, organizations are taking efforts to engage their employees and motivate them to participate in value co-creation activities by sharing knowledge with each other (Paswan et al., 2014). As per various practitioners and researchers, knowledge sharing is a valuable source of value co-creation (Bhatti, Glowik, & Arslan, 2020; Bu, Yin, Barry, & Kong, 2020). In the context of Intra-firm value co-creation, organizations' internal actors' ability to engage in continuous interaction can optimize the effectiveness of knowledge sharing based on their knowledge, ideas, and experience with each other thus increases their potential for co-creation activities.

Proposition 2: Employees' knowledge sharing behavior is required to enhance intra-firm value co-creation activities and processes.

Linking Intra-firm Value Co-creation with Innovative Work Behavior

Through intra-firm value co-creation, value is co-created through the combined efforts and collaboration of organizational internal actors. This collaboration leads to the distinctive combination of insights and ideas directly from various internal stakeholders relating to improvement in the product development or service delivery as per the customers' demands (Janteng & Tan, 2017). Therefore, the influence of value co-creation on employees' innovative work behavior can be seen through their active coordination and interaction with other internal actors involved in the process through sharing of their ideas, insights, and experiences.

Proposition 3: Intra-firm value co-creation activities and processes are required to enhance employees' innovative work behavior.

Discussion

This conceptual paper establishes inter-linkages of various concepts and thus establishing a framework for developing an intra-firm value co-creation ecosystem or orientation. With the help of intra-firm value co-creation activities and processes, this study aims to strengthen the organizational internal processes in a manner that will facilitate the organization to create an enhanced value co-creating system for its external environment. Moreover, this intra-firm value-creation must be viewed as an integrated and well-orchestrated contribution of the organizational internal actors in the network, and that each actor can be a significant contributor to the intra-firm value creation activities and processes if they were provided with adequate ability, motivation, and opportunity practices that not only encourage their knowledge sharing behavior but also help them to co-create value-oriented solutions that further promote their innovative work behavior.

Implications

Intra-firm value co-creation will enable managerial practices as well as formulating necessary capabilities to be geared towards incorporating the latest shifts that are driving many new formulations which are dominating management thought of creating value in the value chain. From a pragmatic stance, this study implies that to reach a higher level of performance and sustainable competitive advantage, organizations, and practitioners must respond to shifting business paradigms endeavor to develop a value co-creation orientation first within the organization's boundaries. This requires not only a significant institutionalized mechanism for knowledge sharing but also for inter-functional coordination as the desired behaviors that motivate and encourage them to strategically manage their employees' co-creation relationships by engaging them in intra-firm co-creation activities and processes. Moreover, organizations should offer systems, provide motivation and opportunities, and create environments that encourage their employee's knowledge sharing and innovative work behavior across the value chain.

Conclusion

In modern-day competition, because of changing trends and customer demands, environments become more complex and dynamic. Organizations, therefore, for their long-term success and survival are more attentive and focused to find out ways by which they can meet their customers' demands as well as to bring improvements in their existing working methods. Keeping this in view, organizations attempt to enhance their employees' innovative work behavior, which is the only way that makes their survival possible and gives them a competitive edge in this increasingly turbulent business environment. To promote innovative work behavior, therefore, this paper has highlighted the significance of value co-creation from the organizational perspective and explained how it can be understood in the internal context of the organization distinct from its external orientation. Moreover, one should also keep in view that the core drivers of a value co-creating organization encouraging employees' innovative work behavior cannot be assumed to occur automatically in the organization but needs inter-linkages of various concepts. Consequently, the AMO framework has

been used in this study as a model for categorizing HR practices which are further aimed at encouraging employees' knowledge sharing behavior by which a firm can harness the value co-creating orientation within the domain of organizational practices for promoting employees' innovation work behavior.

References

- Akram, T., Lei, S., Haider, M. J., & Hussain, S. T. (2020). The impact of organizational justice on employee innovative work behavior: Mediating role of knowledge sharing. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 5(2), 117-129.
- Alheet, A., Adwan, A., Areiqat, A., Zamil, A., & Saleh, M. (2021). The effect of leadership styles on employees' innovative work behavior. *Management Science Letters*, 11(1), 239-246.
- 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.
- Argote, L., & Ingram, P. (2000). Knowledge transfer: A basis for competitive advantage in firms. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 82(1), 150-169.
- Bartel, A. P. (2004). Human resource management and organizational performance: Evidence from retail banking. *ILR Review*, 57(2), 181-203.
- Batra, R., & Ray, M. L. (1986). Situational effects of advertising repetition: The moderating influence of motivation, ability, and opportunity to respond. *Journal of Consumer research*, 12(4), 432-445.
- Bhatti, W. A., Glowik, M., & Arslan, A. (2020). Knowledge sharing motives and value co-creation behavior of the consumers in physiotherapy services: a cross-cultural study. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.
- Bu, N. T., Yin, Z., Barry, N., Jay, & Kong, H. (2020). *Research on the Influence of Big Data Knowledge Transfer on Value of Co-creation and Competitive Advantage of Smart Tourism Destinations*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Computer Science and Application Engineering.
- Cabello-Medina, C., López-Cabrales, Á., & Valle-Cabrera, R. (2011). Leveraging the innovative performance of human capital through HRM and social capital in Spanish firms. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 22(04), 807-828.
- Cabrera, E. F., & Cabrera, A. (2005). Fostering knowledge sharing through people management practices. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(5), 720-735.
- Chang, Y.-Y., Gong, Y., & Peng, M. W. (2012). Expatriate knowledge transfer, subsidiary absorptive capacity, and subsidiary performance. *Academy of Management journal*, 55(4), 927-948.

- Chen, C.-J., & Huang, J.-W. (2009). Strategic human resource practices and innovation performance—The mediating role of knowledge management capacity. *Journal of business research*, 62(1), 104-114.
- Clark, B. H., Abela, A. V., & Ambler, T. (2005). Organizational motivation, opportunity and ability to measure marketing performance. *Journal of Strategic Marketing*, 13(4), 241-259.
- De Jong, J. (2006). Individual Innovation: The connection between leadership and employees' innovative work behavior: EIM Business and Policy Research.
- Demortier, A.-L. P., Delobbe, N., & El Akremi, A. (2014). *Opening the black box of hr practices-performance relationship: Testing a three pathways AMO model*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Proceedings.
- Elda, R. P., Patrisia, D., & Linda, M. R. (2021). *The Impact of Intellectual Capital and Knowledge Management on Competitive Advantage*. Paper presented at the Sixth Padang International Conference On Economics Education, Economics, Business and Management, Accounting and Entrepreneurship (PICEEBA 2020).
- Farr, J. L., & Ford, C. M. (1990). Individual innovation.
- Fong, C.-Y., Ooi, K.-B., Tan, B.-I., Lee, V.-H., & Yee-Loong Chong, A. (2011). HRM practices and knowledge sharing: an empirical study. *International journal of Manpower*, 32(5/6), 704-723.
- Goh, S. C. (2002). Managing effective knowledge transfer: an integrative framework and some practice implications. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 6(1), 23-30.
- Griffin, A., & Hauser, J. R. (1996). Integrating R&D and marketing: a review and analysis of the literature. *Journal of product innovation management*, 13(3), 191-215.
- Harney, B., & Jordan, C. (2008). Unlocking the black box: line managers and HRM-performance in a call centre context. *International Journal of productivity and performance management*, 57(4), 275-296.
- Hsiao, H.-C., Chang, J.-C., Tu, Y.-L., & Chen, S.-C. (2011). The impact of self-efficacy on innovative work behavior for teachers. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 1(1), 31.
- 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.
- Imran, R., Saeed, T., Anis-Ul-Haq, M., & Fatima, A. (2010). Organizational climate as a predictor of innovative work behavior. *African Journal of Business Management*, 4(15), 3337-3343.
- Jada, U. R., Mukhopadhyay, S., & Titiyal, R. (2019). Empowering leadership and innovative work behavior: a moderated mediation examination. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.
- Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 73(3), 287-302.

- Janssen, O. (2005). The joint impact of perceived influence and supervisor supportiveness on employee innovative behaviour. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 78(4), 573-579.
- Janteng, J., & Tan, C. L. (2017). *Effects of value co-creation on innovation capability: Knowledge sharing as a moderator*. Paper presented at the 14th International Conference on Intellectual Capital, Knowledge Management & Organizational Learning Conference Paper, Hong Kong.
- Jiang, K., Lepak, D. P., Hu, J., & Baer, J. C. (2012). How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Academy of Management journal*, 55(6), 1264-1294.
- Kinnie, N., Hutchinson, S., Purcell, J., & Swart, J. (2006). ESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND ORGANISATIONAL PERFORMANCE. *Contemporary Human Resource Management: Text and Cases*, 26.
- Kroon, B., Van De Voorde, K., & Timmers, J. (2013). High performance work practices in small firms: a resource-poverty and strategic decision-making perspective. *Small Business Economics*, 41(1), 71-91.
- Kundu, S. C., & Gahlawat, N. (2016). Ability-motivation-opportunity enhancing human resource practices and firm performance: Evidence from India. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 1-18.
- Ladley, D., Wilkinson, I., & Young, L. (2015). The impact of individual versus group rewards on work group performance and cooperation: A computational social science approach. *Journal of business research*, 68(11), 2412-2425.
- Lengnick-Hall, C. A., & Lengnick-Hall, M. L. (2006). HR, ERP, and knowledge for competitive advantage. *Human resource management*, 45(2), 179-194.
- 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 *Research in personnel and human resources management* (pp. 217-271): Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Li, X., & Zheng, Y. (2014). The influential factors of employees' innovative behavior and the management advices. *Journal of Service Science and Management*, 7(06), 446.
- Lim, B. C., & Klein, K. J. (2006). Team mental models and team performance: A field study of the effects of team mental model similarity and accuracy. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 27(4), 403-418.
- London, M., & Smither, J. W. (1995). Can multi-source feedback change perceptions of goal accomplishment, self-evaluations, and performance-related outcomes? Theory-based applications and directions for research. *Personnel psychology*, 48(4), 803-839.

- Lusch, R. F., & Vargo, S. L. (2006). Service-dominant logic: reactions, reflections and refinements. *Marketing Theory*, 6(3), 281-288.
- MacInnis, D. J., & Jaworski, B. J. (1989). Information processing from advertisements: Toward an integrative framework. *the Journal of Marketing*, 1-23.
- Marin-Garcia, J., & Tomas, J. M. (2016). Deconstructing AMO framework: a systematic review. *Intangible Capital*, 12(4), 1040-1087.
- McCarthy, A. M., & Garavan, T. N. (2007). Understanding acceptance of multisource feedback for management development. *Personnel Review*.
- Minbaeva, D. B. (2013). Strategic HRM in building micro-foundations of organizational knowledge-based performance. *Human Resource Management Review*, 23(4), 378-390.
- Mohsen, K., & Eng, T.-Y. (2016). The antecedents of cross-functional coordination and their implications for marketing adaptiveness. *Journal of business research*, 69(12), 5946-5955.
- Narcisse, S., & Harcourt, M. (2008). Employee fairness perceptions of performance appraisal: A Saint Lucian case study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19(6), 1152-1169.
- Narver, J. C., & Slater, S. F. (1990). The effect of a market orientation on business profitability. *the Journal of Marketing*, 20-35.
- Obeidat, S. M., Mitchell, R., & Bray, M. (2016). The link between high performance work practices and organizational performance: Empirically validating the conceptualization of HPWP according to the AMO model. *Employee relations*, 38(4), 578-595.
- Park, S., & Sturman, M. C. (2016). Evaluating form and functionality of pay-for-performance plans: the relative incentive and sorting effects of merit pay, bonuses, and long-term incentives. *Human resource management*, 55(4), 697-719.
- Parker, S. K., Williams, H. M., & Turner, N. (2006). Modeling the antecedents of proactive behavior at work. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 91(3), 636.
- Paswan, A. K., D'Souza, D., & Rajamma, R. K. (2014). Value co-creation through knowledge exchange in franchising. *Journal of Services Marketing*.
- Pera, R., Occhiocupo, N., & Clarke, J. (2016). Motives and resources for value co-creation in a multi-stakeholder ecosystem: A managerial perspective. *Journal of business research*, 69(10), 4033-4041.
- Pinto, M. B., Pinto, J. K., & Prescott, J. E. (1993). Antecedents and consequences of project team cross-functional cooperation. *Management science*, 39(10), 1281-1297.
- Porter, M. E. (1985). *Competitive advantage: creating and sustaining superior performance*. 1985. New York: FreePress.
- Prahalad, C., & Ramaswamy, V. (2004). Co-creation experiences: The next practice in value creation. *Journal of interactive marketing*, 18(3), 5-14.
- Purcell, J., & Kinnie, N. (2007). HRM and business performance. *Oxford Handbook of Human Resource Management, The*, 533.

Role of AMO Framework, Knowledge Sharing, and Intra-Firm Value Co-Creation in Promoting Innovative Work Behavior

- Purwanto, A., Asbari, M., Hartuti, H., Setiana, Y. N., & Fahmi, K. (2021). Effect of Psychological Capital and Authentic Leadership on Innovation Work Behavior. *International Journal of Social and Management Studies*, 2(1), 1-13.
- Rahimli, A. (2012). *Knowledge management and competitive advantage*. Paper presented at the Information and Knowledge Management.
- Reinholt, M., Pedersen, T., & Foss, N. J. (2011). Why a central network position isn't enough: The role of motivation and ability for knowledge sharing in employee networks. *Academy of Management journal*, 54(6), 1277-1297.
- Roth, J. (2003). Enabling knowledge creation: learning from an R&D organization. *Journal of Knowledge Management*.
- Sarikwal, L., & Gupta, J. (2013). The Impact of high performance Work practices and organisational citizenship Behaviour on Turnover Intentions. *Journal of Strategic Human Resource Management*, 2(3), 11.
- Schimansky, S. (2014). *The effect of a high-commitment work system on innovative behavior of employees*. University of Twente.
- 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.
- Selvarajan, T., & Cloninger, P. A. (2012). Can performance appraisals motivate employees to improve performance? A Mexican study. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 23(15), 3063-3084.
- Siregar, Z. M. E., Suryana, E. A., & Senen, S. H. (2019). Factors influencing innovative work behavior: an individual factors perspective. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 8(9), 324-327.
- Subramony, M. (2009). A meta-analytic investigation of the relationship between HRM bundles and firm performance. *Human resource management*, 48(5), 745-768.
- Szulanski, G. (1996). Exploring internal stickiness: Impediments to the transfer of best practice within the firm. *Strategic management journal*, 17(S2), 27-43.
- Turner, T., & Pennington, W. W. (2015). Organizational networks and the process of corporate entrepreneurship: how the motivation, opportunity, and ability to act affect firm knowledge, learning, and innovation. *Small Business Economics*, 45(2), 447-463.
- Van Rhee, H., & Dul, J. (2017). *The Limiting-Factor Theory: AMO-factors Individually Necessary and Jointly Sufficient for Behavior*. Paper presented at the Academy of Management Proceedings.
- Vargo, S. L., & Lusch, R. F. (2004). Evolving to a new dominant logic for marketing. *Journal of marketing*, 68(1), 1-17.
- Vargo, S. L., Maglio, P. P., & Akaka, M. A. (2008). On value and value co-creation: A service systems and service logic perspective. *European Management Journal*, 26(3), 145-152.
- Vargo, S. L., & Morgan, F. W. (2005). Services in society and academic thought: an historical analysis. *Journal of Macromarketing*, 25(1), 42-53.

- Vargo, S. L., Wieland, H., & Akaka, M. A. (2015). Innovation through institutionalization: A service ecosystems perspective. *Industrial marketing management*, 44, 63-72.
- Wang, X., Wang, J., & Zhang, R. (2019). The optimal feasible knowledge transfer path in a knowledge creation driven team. *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, 119, 105-122.
- Wilson, J. P., & Campbell, L. (2020). ISO 9001: 2015: the evolution and convergence of quality management and knowledge management for competitive advantage. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 31(7-8), 761-776.
- Youndt, M. A., & Snell, S. A. (2004). Human resource configurations, intellectual capital, and organizational performance. *Journal of managerial issues*, 337-360.
- Zárraga, C., & Bonache, J. (2003). Assessing the team environment for knowledge sharing: an empirical analysis. *International journal of human resource management*, 14(7), 1227-1245.