




Innovative work behavior and turnover intention: A conceptual model

Section:
HR management

Hendryadi 

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Indonesia Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia

Abstract

This article develops a conceptual framework to examine the dual effect of Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) on Turnover Intention (TI), recognizing that innovation can both reduce and increase employees' desire to leave an organization depending on contextual conditions. Drawing on multiple theoretical perspectives—including Social Exchange Theory, the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model, Self-Determination Theory, Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory, Affective Events Theory, and Organizational Justice Theory—the proposed framework identifies key mediating mechanisms (LMX, work engagement, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction) that explain how IWB influences turnover intention, as well as critical moderating factors (perceived organizational support, distributive fairness, and organizational culture) that shape the strength and direction of this relationship. The framework acknowledges that while IWB can enhance employee retention when supported and recognized, it may also increase turnover intention in contexts characterized by hierarchical cultures, low support, or unfair reward systems. By integrating both the bright and dark sides of innovation, this conceptual paper contributes to a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between IWB turnover intention. It provides a foundation for future empirical testing. The framework offers practical implications for public service organizations and other contexts seeking to balance innovation promotion with employee satisfaction and stability.

Received: 9/13/2023
Revised: 12/8/2023
Accepted: 12/22/2023
Online: 12/30/2023

JRMB
Jurnal Riset
Manajemen dan Bisnis

Vol. 8, No. 2, 2023
pp. 117-130

Keywords:

Innovative Work Behavior, Turnover Intention, Dual Effect, Mediators, Moderators, Conceptual Framework

Corresponding author

Hendryadi

Email: hendryadi@stei.ac.id

© The Author(s) 2023

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36407/jrmb.v8i2.1153>



CC BY: This license allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format, so long as attribution is given to the creator. The license allows for commercial use.

Abstrak

Artikel ini mengembangkan kerangka kerja konseptual untuk meneliti efek ganda Perilaku Kerja Inovatif (IWB) terhadap Niat Berhenti Kerja (TI), dengan mengakui bahwa inovasi dapat mengurangi dan meningkatkan keinginan karyawan untuk meninggalkan organisasi tergantung pada kondisi kontekstual. Dengan mengacu pada berbagai perspektif teoretis—termasuk Teori Pertukaran Sosial, Model Tuntutan-Sumber Daya Pekerjaan (JD-R), Teori Penentuan Diri, Teori Pertukaran Pemimpin-Anggota (LMX), Teori Peristiwa Afektif, dan Teori Keadilan Organisasi—kerangka kerja yang diusulkan mengidentifikasi mekanisme mediasi utama (LMX, keterlibatan kerja, komitmen organisasi, dan kepuasan kerja) yang menjelaskan bagaimana IWB memengaruhi niat berhenti kerja, serta faktor moderasi penting (dukungan organisasi yang dirasakan, keadilan distributif, dan budaya organisasi) yang membentuk kekuatan dan arah hubungan ini. Kerangka kerja ini mengakui bahwa meskipun IWB dapat meningkatkan retensi karyawan ketika didukung dan diakui, IWB juga dapat meningkatkan niat berhenti kerja dalam konteks yang dicirikan oleh budaya hierarkis, dukungan rendah, atau sistem penghargaan yang tidak adil. Dengan mengintegrasikan sisi terang dan gelap inovasi, makalah konseptual ini berkontribusi pada pemahaman yang lebih bernuansa tentang hubungan antara niat berhenti kerja dan kesejahteraan karyawan. Makalah ini memberikan landasan untuk pengujian empiris di masa mendatang. Kerangka kerja ini menawarkan implikasi praktis bagi organisasi layanan publik dan konteks lain yang berupaya menyeimbangkan promosi inovasi dengan kepuasan dan stabilitas karyawan.

Kata Kunci: Perilaku Kerja Inovatif, Niat Berhenti Kerja, Efek Ganda, Mediator, Moderator, Kerangka Konseptual

INTRODUCTION

The dynamics of the contemporary business environment, characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity, have positioned innovation as an absolute necessity for organizational survival and growth. An organization's ability to innovate no longer rests solely on its research and development department; it now requires the active contributions of employees at all levels. In this context, Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) has emerged as a key construct that has received considerable attention in the management and organizational behavior literature. IWB is defined as the intentional creation, introduction, and application of new ideas, processes, products, or solutions within a work role, group, or organization to benefit organizational performance (Al-Omari et al., 2019; Cingöz & Akdoğan, 2011; Gkontelos et al., 2022; Salessi, 2021). This behavior is a multifaceted process encompassing four key stages: idea generation, idea promotion, idea realization, and idea sustainability, reflecting the complexity and dynamics of innovation in the workplace (Gkontelos et al., 2022; Salessi, 2021).

The existing literature has consistently highlighted the positive impacts of IWB, including enhanced organizational adaptability, improved process efficiency, and increased employee engagement (Al-Omari et al., 2019; Jaingam & Na-Nan, 2023; Swaroop & Dixit, 2018). IWB is considered essential for helping organizations maintain a competitive advantage and foster long-term sustainability, particularly in fast-paced and competitive environments. However, the paradigm that views innovation as inherently positive—the "innovation-as-always-positive" bias—has come under increasing criticism. Several scholars are calling for more nuanced research to explore the potential negative consequences of innovation demands on individual well-being. This call is based on the premise that the innovation process, while offering positive stimuli, also imposes its own distinct demands. Activities such as creative problem-solving, experimentation, and risk-taking fall outside routine tasks and can represent a significant additional workload (Deng et al., 2022). In other words, IWB can be viewed as a "double-edged sword" with a dual effect: on the one hand, it drives competitive advantage, but on the other, it can trigger negative consequences such as exhaustion, role conflict, and stress.

This dual-effect phenomenon aligns with recent research trends that have begun to examine the "dark side" of constructs previously considered uniformly positive. For example, high-performance work systems designed to foster innovation may inadvertently trigger obsessive

passion, ultimately hindering the very behavior they aim to foster. Similarly, the conflicting demands between exploration (innovation) and exploitation (productivity) can deplete employees' psychological resources, leading to increased fatigue. This suggests that the organizational benefits of IWB may come at a certain cost to employee well-being—a trade-off that has yet to be systematically explored.

Despite the growing body of research on IWB and its consequences, significant gaps remain in our understanding of its dual effect on turnover intention. Although the literature on the antecedents of IWB has grown substantially, understanding of its consequences—particularly those that are paradoxical or dual in nature—remains limited and fragmented. Crucial questions about how and under what conditions IWB can generate both positive and negative effects on turnover intention, and how organizations can manage this tension, have not been adequately addressed. Specifically, the mediating mechanisms that explain *how* IWB influences turnover intention—such as LMX, work engagement, organizational commitment, and job satisfaction—and the moderating factors that determine *under what conditions* this relationship is strengthened or weakened—such as perceived organizational support, distributive fairness, and organizational culture—require systematic integration into a coherent framework.

Therefore, this article aims to conduct an in-depth conceptual review of the dual effect of Innovative Work Behavior on Turnover Intention. Drawing on multiple theoretical perspectives—including Social Exchange Theory, the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model, Self-Determination Theory, Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory, Affective Events Theory, and Organizational Justice Theory—this article integrates findings from existing studies to build a comprehensive understanding of the IWB-TI relationship. The analysis focuses on identifying mediating mechanisms and contextual moderating factors that shape this relationship. By clearly specifying these mediating and moderating variables, this article provides a roadmap for researchers to empirically validate the dual-effect model of IWB on turnover intention across different organizational contexts. The proposed framework offers both theoretical contributions to the IWB literature and practical implications for organizations seeking to balance innovation promotion with employee satisfaction and stability.

METHODS

This study adopts a theory synthesis approach, as outlined by Jaakkola (2020), which aims to achieve conceptual integration across multiple streams of literature. The primary objective is to connect previously isolated or fragmented findings concerning the positive and negative consequences of IWB. By applying the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model as an overarching theoretical lens, this article offers a novel perspective on how IWB functions as both a job resource (leading to engagement) and a job demand (leading to burnout), depending on contextual factors.

Literature identification and synthesis

A narrative review of the literature guided the development of the proposed framework. Key terms such as "innovative work behavior," "employee innovation," "creativity at work," "side effects of innovation," "dark side of creativity," "job demands," "job resources," "work engagement," and "employee well-being" were used to explore existing studies. The literature was sourced from major academic databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. The selection of literature was based on theoretical relevance rather than systematic exhaustion. Priority was given to seminal works that define the core constructs (e.g., IWB, JD-R model), as well as recent studies that explore the paradoxical or dual consequences of workplace innovation. This approach allows for the identification of patterns, tensions, and gaps in the current understanding of IWB.

Analytical Procedure

The analysis was conducted in several stages. First, the core dimensions of IWB were delineated to ensure conceptual clarity. Second, the JD-R model was examined to understand its applicability in explaining both the motivational and health-impairment pathways associated with IWB. Third, the literature was critically examined to identify proposed mediators (e.g., work engagement and burnout) and moderators (e.g., organizational support and innovation climate) that may explain the dual effects of IWB. Finally, the insights from each stage were integrated into a cohesive theoretical framework that maps the relationships between IWB, mediating mechanisms, moderating factors, and individual and organizational outcomes.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) is a dynamic process characterized by the deliberate creation, introduction, and application of new ideas within a specific work role, team, or organization. This behavior is aimed at enhancing performance, benefiting the group, or improving the organization as a whole. IWB is a multidimensional construct comprising four essential stages, each playing a critical role in the innovation process (Al-Omari et al., 2019; Cingöz & Akdoğan, 2011; Gkontelos et al., 2022; Salessi, 2021).

The first stage, idea generation, involves the creative production of novel and useful ideas across various domains. This stage emphasizes not only the originality of concepts but also their potential applicability and utility (Salessi, 2021). The second stage, idea promotion, focuses on socializing these ideas by actively sharing them with others and building a coalition of supporters. This support network is vital, as it provides the necessary power, resources, and encouragement for the idea to gain traction within the organization (Salessi, 2021). The third stage, idea realization, is where theoretical concepts begin to take tangible form. It involves developing a prototype or model of the innovation that can be experienced and tested. This stage is crucial for assessing viability and identifying necessary adjustments before full implementation (Salessi, 2021). Finally, the fourth stage, idea sustainability, focuses on ensuring that the implemented ideas have a lasting impact. This involves continuous monitoring, refinement, and improvement of the ideas to adapt to changing circumstances and maintain relevance (Gkontelos et al., 2022). Given its comprehensive nature, IWB is considered essential for helping organizations maintain a competitive advantage and foster long-term sustainability, especially in fast-paced and competitive environments. By embracing innovative work behaviors, organizations can unleash creativity and adaptability, ultimately leading to greater success in their fields.

Determinants of innovative work behavior

IWB)is influenced by a diverse array of factors, including leadership styles, the work environment, human resource strategies, and the flexibility of roles within an organization. Leadership plays a pivotal role in fostering IWB. Ambidextrous leadership, which integrates exploratory behaviors (such as seeking out new ideas and approaches) with execution-oriented behaviors (focused on implementing strategies effectively), has been shown to influence innovative work practices positively. This effect is particularly pronounced in environments that foster a supportive innovation climate, where team members feel encouraged to propose and experiment with novel ideas. Furthermore, transformational leadership that emphasizes innovation can further enhance IWB through targeted pathways. Transformational leaders inspire and motivate employees, boosting their intrinsic motivation to innovate, while those focused on innovation leverage well-structured human resource practices to cultivate an organizational culture that embraces creativity (Akıncı et al., 2022). In addition to effective leadership, a supportive work environment is essential for promoting innovation and creativity. Such an environment is characterized by the availability of adequate resources—both material and psychological—while also fostering motivation through recognition and rewards. Effective management practices that encourage collaboration and communication among employees are also critical. Within these supportive settings, key elements such as teamwork, leadership support, and even constructive work pressure have been associated with higher levels of IWB.

Human resource practices are another critical determinant of IWB. Organizations that provide opportunities for skill development, encourage team collaboration, and implement group-based incentives can create a foundation of interpersonal trust among employees. This trust is essential as it not only facilitates the sharing of ideas but also stimulates a collective effort towards organizational innovation. When employees feel secure in their roles and confident in their team's capabilities, they are more likely to engage in and contribute to innovative activities (Bulińska-Stangrecka & Bagieńska, 2019; Marnoto & Sousa, 2021; Yang & Wu, 2021). Role flexibility is also an essential factor in enhancing IWB. The ability of employees to adapt their roles to the dynamic needs of their projects or teams empowers them to fully engage in knowledge acquisition, idea generation, and solution implementation. When coupled with clearly defined operational process guidelines, this flexibility enables the seamless integration of diverse ideas and approaches, ultimately driving innovation (Kessel et al., 2012).

Innovative work behavior and its impact

Innovative work behavior is crucial for organizations for a multitude of interconnected reasons, spanning competitive positioning, performance outcomes, employee dynamics, and organizational adaptability. Primarily, IWB is essential for achieving a competitive edge and ensuring long-term organizational sustainability, as it enables organizations to develop unique products, services, and processes that differentiate them from competitors (Al-Omari et al., 2019). (Gašić et al., 2024) This is particularly evident in sectors such as the hospitality industry, where IWB is highly valued for enhancing competitive advantage by creating unique customer experiences and improving operational efficiency (Eliyana & Christiananta, 2020).

As a primary driver of organizational innovation, IWB is critical for survival and growth in a competitive economy, with numerous studies demonstrating its positive impact on organizational performance and business success (Al-Omari et al., 2019; Jaingam & Na-Nan, 2023; Swaroop & Dixit, 2018). Beyond organizational-level outcomes, IWB is deeply intertwined with employee engagement and motivation; factors such as work autonomy and perceived organizational support not only enhance IWB but also contribute to higher job satisfaction among employees (Saraih et al., 2019; Swaroop & Dixit, 2018). This reciprocal relationship is further strengthened by transformational leadership and ethical behaviors, which foster IWB by creating a supportive and motivating work environment (Jameel et al., 2025; Khorakian et al., 2019). Additionally, IWB thrives in contexts where knowledge sharing is prevalent, as it serves as a critical mediator that enhances innovation by facilitating better idea generation and implementation (Eliyana & Christiananta, 2020; Huang & Li, 2021). Such processes are supported by an innovation-friendly climate that encourages employees to engage in IWB by providing the necessary resources, autonomy, and support (Huang & Li, 2021; Lukoto & Chan, 2017).

Finally, IWB equips organizations with the adaptability and resilience required to navigate changes in the digital age, helping them maintain core competitiveness by generating, introducing, and implementing innovative ideas that keep the organization relevant and efficient. In this context, resilience and the ability to recover from setbacks are equally important, as they enable employees to persist in their innovative efforts despite challenges (Deng et al., 2022; Jaingam & Na-Nan, 2023). Collectively, these reasons underscore that IWB is not merely an individual-level behavior but a strategic imperative that permeates all facets of organizational functioning.

Innovative work behavior and turnover intention

Turnover intention refers to an employee's voluntary desire or willingness to leave their current organization within a specific timeframe. It is a significant predictor of actual employee turnover, which can adversely affect organizational stability and productivity (Hendryadi, 2022; Lazzari et al., 2022; Trichayadinata et al., 2020). The relationship between IWB and turnover intention is

complex and paradoxical: IWB can both decrease and increase an employee's desire to leave an organization, depending on the surrounding context. On the positive side, IWB can reduce turnover intention when facilitated by supportive organizational conditions (Achmadi et al., 2022). For instance, transformational leadership and a supportive work environment enhance innovative behavior, which, in turn, decreases the likelihood that employees will want to leave (Hendryadi et al., 2019). When employees feel their innovative efforts are valued and supported, their organizational commitment increases, strengthening their attachment to the organization and reducing turnover intentions (Shih & Susanto, 2011).

Conversely, IWB can also increase turnover intention under less favorable conditions. In environments characterized by strong hierarchical cultures or high workplace conflict, innovative behavior may clash with established practices and norms, leading to frustration and a heightened desire to leave. Additionally, when employees perceive high personal costs or risks associated with voicing innovative ideas—such as fear of social exclusion or professional repercussions—this perceived cost can lead to emotional exhaustion and burnout, which, in turn, increases turnover intention. Several organizational and relational factors moderate the relationship between IWB and turnover intention. Organizational culture plays a significant role; a hierarchical culture can buffer negative effects by maintaining stability and reducing conflict, whereas a strong innovation climate can enhance job interest and engagement, thereby reducing turnover intention (Demircioglu & Berman, 2019; Kansoy, 2023; Schyns et al., 2007). The quality of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) is also influential: high-quality LMX, characterized by trust and support, enhances employee commitment and mitigates turnover risk. Furthermore, perceived distributive fairness in reward allocation can reduce coworker conflict and prevent feelings of inequity that might otherwise drive turnover (Shih & Susanto, 2011). Finally, job security and work engagement serve as critical safeguards; job insecurity can increase turnover intention even when employees are innovative, whereas ensuring security and fostering engagement helps retain innovative employees (Tricahyadinata et al., 2020). Collectively, these moderators demonstrate that the impact of IWB on turnover intention is highly contingent on the broader organizational and relational context.

Theoretical framework

Several theoretical perspectives and mechanisms explain how Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) influences Turnover Intention, with leadership dynamics playing a particularly central role. Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory suggests that the quality of the relationship between leaders and employees shapes various workplace outcomes, including turnover intention. High-quality LMX relationships, characterized by trust, support, and open communication, enhance employee commitment and reduce the likelihood of leaving. Evidence indicates that IWB positively affects LMX, which in turn has a significant, albeit modest, effect on reducing turnover intention. Similarly, Transformational Leadership theory posits that leaders who inspire and support their employees can foster IWB while simultaneously reducing turnover intention by enhancing job satisfaction and organizational commitment. Empirical findings confirm that transformational leadership negatively impacts turnover intention, with IWB serving as a mediating mechanism in this relationship. Social Learning Theory further extends this leadership perspective by suggesting that responsible leadership styles, which balance instrumental and integrative behaviors, enhance IWB and reduce turnover intention by fostering organizational citizenship behavior and meaningful work (Kansoy, 2023).

Organizational context and structural factors also shape the relationship between IWB turnover intention and various moderating mechanisms. Hierarchical Organizational Culture presents a paradoxical effect: while IWB may conflict with established practices in strongly hierarchical environments—potentially increasing turnover intention—the stability and predictability inherent in such cultures can also buffer this negative effect. This duality suggests that the same cultural feature can both exacerbate and mitigate turnover risk depending on how it

interacts with innovative behaviors. Perceived Distributive Fairness offers another moderating mechanism, as the fair distribution of rewards and recognition can offset the negative interpersonal consequences of IWB, such as conflicts with coworkers, thereby reducing turnover intention. Research confirms that perceived distributive fairness negatively moderates the relationship between IWB and turnover intention, meaning that when fairness is high, the likelihood of innovative employees leaving diminishes.

Finally, individual-level theories illuminate the motivational and cognitive pathways linking IWB to turnover intention. Self-Determination Theory (SDT) emphasizes that fulfilling employees' basic psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness enhances job satisfaction and reduces turnover intention. However, when organizational changes—such as technological innovations—threaten job security, these needs are undermined, leading to heightened turnover intention. Evidence from the hotel industry shows that technological innovations increase job insecurity, which, in turn, elevates turnover intention. The Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) and Innovation Diffusion Theory (IDT) provide complementary cognitive perspectives, suggesting that personal innovativeness and the alignment between individual values and organizational culture influence IWB and, consequently, turnover intention. When employees perceive that their innovative orientation is congruent with organizational values, they are more likely to engage in IWB and less likely to consider leaving; conversely, misalignment can foster disengagement and increase turnover risk. Collectively, these theories and mechanisms underscore that the relationship between IWB and turnover intention is mediated by relational quality and individual motivation and moderated by organizational culture, fairness, and value alignment.

Moderating factors

Several key factors have been identified as influencing the complex relationship between Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) and Turnover Intention (TI), spanning leadership styles, organizational culture, and the work environment. Leadership plays a particularly critical role in shaping this dynamic. Transformational leadership significantly reduces turnover intention while simultaneously enhancing innovative work behavior, as transformational leaders inspire and support their employees, thereby decreasing their desire to leave the organization (Gyensare et al., 2017). Similarly, high-quality Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) positively influences work engagement, which in turn mediates the relationship between LMX, IWB, and TI; when employees experience better exchanges with their leaders, they exhibit higher engagement, which fosters IWB and ultimately reduces turnover intention (Agarwal et al., 2012; Kansoy, 2023).

Organizational culture and the broader work environment further moderate the IWB-TI relationship. An innovative culture negatively impacts turnover intention by fostering an environment where innovative behaviors are encouraged and valued, making employees less likely to consider leaving (Yeun & Han, 2016). In contrast, a strong hierarchical culture can buffer the negative impact of IWB on turnover intention, though this may occur because hierarchical norms conflict with innovative behaviors, potentially leading to frustration and higher turnover intention under certain conditions. Additionally, a positive psychological climate strengthens the negative relationship between affective commitment and turnover intention, suggesting that employees' perceptions of their work environment significantly influence their decisions to stay or leave. Work engagement also serves as a critical mechanism, as engaged employees are more likely to exhibit innovative behaviors and less likely to intend to leave their jobs, with engagement mediating the effects of factors such as LMX and transformational leadership on turnover intention (Gyensare et al., 2017).

Individual and perceptual factors add further layers of complexity to the IWB-TI relationship. Job satisfaction mediates the relationship between work stress, work discipline, and turnover intention, indicating that satisfied employees are less likely to leave even when facing workplace challenges. Organizational commitment, influenced by factors such as organizational justice and innovative work behavior, also reduces turnover intention by strengthening employees'

psychological attachment to their organization. At the individual level, competence and self-efficacy influence IWB, which in turn affects turnover intention; employees with higher competence and self-efficacy engage in more innovative behaviors and report lower turnover intention. Conversely, perceived organizational politics can increase turnover intention and reduce innovative work behavior, a relationship that is partially mediated by work engagement, as political environments drain the motivational resources necessary for both innovation and retention (Agarwal, 2016; Siregar et al., 2019; Sugiono & Vitaloka, 2019).

Table 2. Contextual factors

Factor	Influence on IWB	Influence on TI	Mediating/Moderating Variables
Transformational Leadership (Gyensare et al., 2017)	Positive	Negative	Work Engagement
Leader-Member Exchange (Kansoy, 2023)	Positive	Negative	Work Engagement
Innovative Culture (Yeun & Han, 2016)	Positive	Negative	None
Psychological Climate (Gyensare et al., 2017)	Positive	Negative	Affective Commitment
Job Satisfaction (Sugiono & Vitaloka, 2019)	Positive	Negative	Work Stress, Work Discipline
Competence and Self-Efficacy (Siregar et al., 2019)	Positive	Negative	None
Perceived Organizational Politics (Agarwal, 2016)	Negative	Positive	Work Engagement

MODEL AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Building on the theoretical frameworks and empirical research discussed in the earlier sections, this chapter formulates a detailed conceptual framework that elucidates the dual impact of Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) on Turnover Intention (TI). The suggested model incorporates various theoretical perspectives—including Social Exchange Theory, the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model, Self-Determination Theory (SDT), and Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory—to encompass the intricacies of the IWB-TI connection. Notably, the framework highlights both mediating factors that clarify how IWB affects turnover intention and moderating variables that influence the strength or weakness of this relationship under different circumstances.

Mediating Factors

Mediators are elements that clarify the process or mechanism by which an independent variable (IWB) influences a dependent variable (Turnover Intention). Based on the reviewed literature, several critical mediators are identified: LMX theory suggests that the quality of the relationship between employees and their supervisors influences workplace attitudes and behaviors. High-quality LMX is defined by trust, mutual respect, and obligation, which contribute to employee commitment and lower turnover intentions. Employees who demonstrate innovative work behavior are likely to create stronger exchanges with their leaders, as innovation reflects initiative, competence, and commitment to the organization. Consequently, this improved LMX promotes a sense of obligation and loyalty, curtailing the intention to leave the organization. Hence, LMX functions as a relational mechanism connecting IWB to reduced turnover intention.

H1: Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) mediates the negative connection between Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) and Turnover Intention (TI).

Work Engagement

The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model (Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, 2016) indicates that job resources (such as autonomy, support, and opportunities for innovation) enhance work engagement, a positive, fulfilling work-related state marked by vigor, dedication, and absorption. Engaged employees are more committed to their organizations and are less likely to resign. Innovative work behavior may serve as a job resource, boosting work engagement by offering employees autonomy, challenges, and a sense of meaningful contribution. Highly engaged employees, in turn, forge a stronger psychological attachment to their organization, diminishing their turnover intention. Accordingly, engagement acts as a motivational pathway connecting IWB to employee retention.

H2: Work Engagement mediates the negative relationship between Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) and Turnover Intention (TI).

Organizational Commitment

Organizational Commitment Theory (Meyer & Allen, 1997) identifies three components of commitment—*affective*, *continuance*, and *normative*—that bond employees to their employers. *Affective* commitment, in particular, reflects emotional attachment and identification with the organization. When employees participate in innovative behavior and perceive that their contributions are recognized, their affective commitment to the organization intensifies. This increased commitment fosters a psychological connection that deters turnover. In contrast, if innovative efforts are disregarded or rejected, commitment may decline, raising turnover intention. Thus, organizational commitment functions as an affective mechanism within the IWB-TI relationship.

H3: Organizational Commitment mediates the negative connection between Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) and Turnover Intention (TI).

Job satisfaction

Affective Events Theory (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996) suggests that workplace events elicit emotional responses that affect job satisfaction, which, in turn, influences behaviors and intentions, including turnover intentions. Positive experiences linked to IWB—such as successful idea implementation, recognition from peers, or appreciation from supervisors—boost job satisfaction. Satisfied employees are less inclined to consider leaving their organization. However, negative experiences associated with innovation, such as failure, criticism, or lack of support, may lower satisfaction and elevate turnover intention. Consequently, job satisfaction serves as an affective-evaluative pathway connecting IWB to turnover choices.

H4: Job Satisfaction mediates the relationship between Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) and Turnover Intention (TI), such that favorable IWB experiences enhance satisfaction and reduce TI, while unfavorable IWB experiences diminish satisfaction and increase TI.

Moderating Factors: Identifying Boundary Conditions

Moderators are variables that influence the strength or direction of the relationship between an independent variable (IWB) and a dependent variable (Turnover Intention). According to existing literature, several important moderators are identified:

Perceived Organizational Support (POS)

Social Exchange Theory (Emerson, 1976) posits that employees reciprocate the support they perceive from their organization by demonstrating heightened commitment and lower turnover intentions. POS indicates the degree to which employees feel their organization values their contributions and cares for their well-being. When perceived organizational support is high, employees who participate in IWB are more likely to view their innovative efforts as valued and acknowledged, thus reinforcing the negative association between IWB and turnover intention. In contrast, when POS is low, innovative employees might feel their contributions are overlooked or unappreciated, thereby diminishing (or potentially reversing) the negative IWB-TI relationship and increasing turnover intention.

H5: Perceived Organizational Support (POS) acts as a moderator in the relationship between Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) and Turnover Intention (TI), with the negative relationship becoming stronger when POS is high and weaker (or positive) when POS is low.

Perceived Distributive Fairness

Organizational justice theory differentiates between distributive fairness (the perceived justness of outcomes, such as rewards and acknowledgment) and procedural fairness. Fair treatment is crucial for sustaining positive employee attitudes and actions. Innovative employees exert extra effort to generate and implement ideas. When they believe that rewards and recognition are shared justly—that their innovative efforts are sufficiently recognized and rewarded—they are less inclined to contemplate leaving. However, when distributive fairness is perceived as low, innovative employees may feel exploited or undervalued, leading to frustration and increased turnover intention. Thus, perceived distributive fairness moderates the IWB-TI relationship by influencing employees' equity assessments.

H6: Perceived Distributive Fairness moderates the IWB-TI relationship, meaning that the negative relationship is stronger when fairness is perceived to be high and weaker (or positive) when fairness is perceived to be low.

Organizational Culture (Innovative vs. Hierarchical)

Organizational culture theory categorizes various cultural types that influence employee behavior and attitudes. Innovative cultures foster experimentation and risk-taking, while hierarchical cultures prioritize stability, regulations, and established procedures. In organizations with a robust, innovative culture, employees engaged in IWB find their efforts resonate with organizational values and norms, and they receive support and resources. This congruence enhances the negative IWB-TI relationship, creating a sense of belonging and appreciation among innovative employees. Conversely, in organizations with a strong hierarchical culture, innovative behavior may conflict with existing practices and expectations. This misalignment can lead to frustration, conflict, and a higher intention to turnover, potentially flipping the IWB-TI relationship from negative to positive.

H7: An Innovative Organizational Culture moderates the IWB-TI relationship, such that the negative relationship is more pronounced in highly innovative cultures.

H8: A Hierarchical Organizational Culture moderates the IWB-TI relationship, such that the negative relationship is weaker (or turns positive) in strongly hierarchical cultures.

CONCLUSION

This article establishes a conceptual framework to explain the dual effect of Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) on Turnover Intention (TI). It incorporates various theoretical perspectives, such as Social Exchange Theory and the Job Demands-Resources Model, to illustrate the complex mechanisms by which IWB influences employees' decisions to stay or leave an organization. Key mediating factors include Leader-Member Exchange (LMX), which strengthens employee-supervisor relationships and loyalty; Work Engagement, in which IWB enhances motivation and psychological attachment; Organizational Commitment, which deepens emotional bonds; and Job Satisfaction, where positive innovation experiences foster retention. Collectively, these mediators highlight IWB's potential to reduce turnover intention when innovation is valued.

However, the framework recognizes that, under certain conditions, such as job insecurity, IWB may inadvertently increase turnover intention. It also identifies moderating factors that influence the IWB-TI relationship, such as Perceived Organizational Support and Organizational Culture. Supportive environments strengthen the positive impact of IWB, while unsupportive ones may reverse it. The framework emphasizes the nuanced nature of IWB, showing it can be both a retention aid and a potential turnover risk. Organizations must encourage IWB while ensuring adequate support, fair recognition, and a culture that fosters innovation to maximize employee retention and well-being.

REFERENCES

- Achmadi, A., Hendryadi, H., Siregar, A. O., & Hadmar, A. S. (2022). How can a leader's humility enhance civility climate and employee voice in a competitive environment? *Journal of Management Development*, 41(4), 257–275. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-11-2021-0297>
- Agarwal, U. A. (2016). Examining perceived organizational politics among Indian managers: Engagement as mediator and locus of control as moderator. *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 24(3), 415–437. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOA-07-2014-0786>
- Agarwal, U. A., Datta, S., Blake-Beard, S., & Bhargava, S. (2012). Linking LMX, innovative work behaviour and turnover intentions: The mediating role of work engagement. *Career Development International*, 17(3), 208–230. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620431211241063>
- Akıncı, G., Alpkın, L., Yıldız, B., & Karacay, G. (2022). The Link between Ambidextrous Leadership and Innovative Work Behavior in a Military Organization: The Moderating Role of Climate for Innovation. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 14(22). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142215315>
- Al-Omari, M. A., Choo, L. S., & Ali, M. A. M. (2019). Innovative work behavior: A review of literature. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 23(2), 39–47. <https://doi.org/10.37200/IJPR/V23I2/PR190268>
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2016). Job Demands-Resources Theory : Taking Stock and Looking Forward Job Demands – Resources Theory : Taking Stock and Looking Forward. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(September 2018), 273–285.
- Bulińska-Stangrecka, H., & Bagieńska, A. (2019). HR practices for supporting interpersonal trust and its consequences for team collaboration and innovation. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 11(16). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11164423>
- Cingöz, A., & Akdoğan, A. A. (2011). An empirical examination of performance and image outcome expectation as determinants of innovative behavior in the workplace. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 24, 847–853. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.09.099>
- Demircioglu, M. A., & Berman, E. (2019). Effects of the Innovation Climate on Turnover Intention in the Australian Public Service. *American Review of Public Administration*, 49(5), 614–628. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074018808914>
- Deng, J., Liu, J., Yang, T., & Duan, C. (2022). Behavioural and economic impacts of end-user

- computing satisfaction: Innovative work behaviour and job performance of employees. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107367>
- Eliyana, A., & Christiananta, B. (2020). Enhancing innovative work behavior in the hospitality industry: Empirical research from East Java, Indonesia. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 21(1), 96–110. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85085073308&partnerID=40&md5=005c955650ee24c227ac19e192b3e2ba>
- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social Exchange Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 335–362. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1146%2Fannurev.so.02.080176.002003>
- Gašić, D., Berber, N., Slavić, A., Strugar Jelača, M., Marić, S., Bjekić, R., & Aleksić, M. (2024). The Key Role of Employee Commitment in the Relationship Between Flexible Work Arrangements and Employee Behavior. *Sustainability*, 16(22), 10067. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su162210067>
- Gkontelos, A., Vaiopoulou, J., & Stamovlasis, D. (2022). Teachers' Innovative Work Behavior Scale: Psychometric Properties of the Greek Version and Measurement Invariance across Genders. *Social Sciences*, 11(7). <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci11070306>
- Gyensare, M. A., Kumedzro, L. E., Sanda, A., & Boso, N. (2017). Linking transformational leadership to turnover intention in the public sector: The influences of engagement, affective commitment and psychological climate. *African Journal of Economic and Management Studies*, 8(3), 314–337. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJEMS-07-2016-0099>
- Hendryadi. (2022). Encouraging employees' voice behavior through Islamic work ethics and civility climate: The role of organizational identification. *Jurnal Manajemen Strategi Dan Aplikasi Bisnis*, 5(2), 353–366. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.36407/jmsab.v5i2.710>
- Hendryadi, Suratna, Suryani, & Purwanto, B. (2019). Bureaucratic culture, empowering leadership, affective commitment, and knowledge sharing behavior in Indonesian government public services. *Cogent Business and Management*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2019.1680099>
- Huang, H., & Li, F. (2021). Innovation climate, knowledge management, and innovative work behavior in small software companies. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 49(4). <https://doi.org/10.2224/SBP.9780>
- Jaingam, W., & Na-Nan, K. (2023). The mediating effect of resilience on the relationship between perceived organizational support and innovative work behavior. *International Journal of Advanced and Applied Sciences*, 10(9), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.21833/ijaas.2023.09.006>
- Jameel, A., Guo, W., Hussain, A., & Kanwel, S. (2025). Enhancing innovative work behavior through transformational leadership in tourism and hospitality employees: the mediating role of intrinsic motivation and employee creativity. *BMC Psychology*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-025-03305-8>
- Kansoy, S. U. (2023). Moderating role of leader-member exchange in the effect of innovative work behavior on turnover intention. *Zbornik Radova Ekonomskog Fakulteta u Rijeci / Proceedings of Rijeka Faculty of Economics*, 41(1), 183–204. <https://doi.org/10.18045/zbefri.2023.1.183>
- Kessel, M., Hannemann-Weber, H., & Kratzer, J. (2012). Innovative work behavior in healthcare: The benefit of operational guidelines in the treatment of rare diseases. *Health Policy*, 105(2–3), 146–153. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2012.02.010>
- Khorakian, A., Mohammadi Shahroodi, H., Jahangir, M., & Nikkhah Farkhani, Z. (2019). Innovative Work Behavior in Public Organizations: The Roles of Ethical and Knowledge Sharing Behaviors. *Creativity Research Journal*, 31(2), 164–173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10400419.2019.1607444>
- Lazzari, M., Alvarez, J. M., & Ruggieri, S. (2022). Predicting and explaining employee turnover intention. *International Journal of Data Science and Analytics*, 14(3), 279–292. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41060-022-00329-w>
- Lukoto, K., & Chan, K.-Y. (2017). The perception of innovative organisational culture and its influence on employee innovative work behaviour. *PICMET 2016 - Portland International Conference on Management of Engineering and Technology: Technology Management For Social Innovation, Proceedings*, 972–977. <https://doi.org/10.1109/PICMET.2016.7806707>
- Marnoto, S., & Sousa, C. A. A. (2021). The Role of HRM for Innovation: A Conceptual and Analytical

- Study. In *Research Anthology on Human Resource Practices for the Modern Workforce* (pp. 1965–1989). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-3873-2.ch099>
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1997). Commitment in the workplace: theory, research, and application. *Choice Reviews Online*, 35(02), 35-0996-35-0996. <https://doi.org/10.5860/CHOICE.35-0996>
- Salessi, S. (2021). Innovative work behavior: Confirmatory factorial analysis of Janssen's Scale. *Interdisciplinaria*, 38(1), 7–21. <https://doi.org/10.16888/interd.2021.38.1.1>
- Saraih, U., Wei, O. C., Razali, R., Amlus, M., & Abd Razak, N. A. (2019). Factors affecting innovative work behavior: A case of manufacturing company in Malaysia. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 28(8 Special Issue), 645–652. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85081190308&partnerID=40&md5=1bf84f780db48f61b9af6e09a56b93c2>
- Schyns, B., Torcka, N., & Gössling, T. (2007). Turnover intention and preparedness for change: Exploring leader-member exchange and occupational self-efficacy as antecedents of two employability predictors. *Career Development International*, 12(7), 660–679. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620430710834413>
- Shih, H.-A., & Susanto, E. (2011). Is innovative behavior really good for the firm?: Innovative work behavior, conflict with coworkers and turnover intention: moderating roles of perceived distributive fairness. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, 22(2), 111–130. <https://doi.org/10.1108/10444061111126666>
- Siregar, Z. M. E., Ahman, E., & Senen, S. H. (2019). Factors influencing innovative work behavior: An individual factors perspective. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 8(9), 324–327. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85073428267&partnerID=40&md5=83a9c6fa9beab384eec77fb0c9f0e36d>
- Sugiono, E., & Vitaloka, D. S. (2019). Analysis the effect of work stress, work discipline and turnover intention on employees performance mediated by job satisfaction at pt. Epson indonesia, jakarta. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 8(12), 2574–2580. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85076758045&partnerID=40&md5=a9cda347feedb4bb2fb34fc6f79014ae>
- Swaroop, P., & Dixit, V. (2018). Employee engagement, work autonomy and innovative work behaviour: An empirical study. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 4(2), 158–176. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85070698238&partnerID=40&md5=036543547215df027afb2611dec24258>
- Tricahyadinata, I., Hendryadi, Suryani, Zainurossalamia ZA, S., & Riadi, S. S. (2020). Workplace incivility, work engagement, and turnover intentions: Multi-group analysis. *Cogent Psychology*, 7(1), 1743627. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2020.1743627>
- Weiss, H., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). AffectiveEventsTheory_WeissCropanzano.pdf. *Organizational Behavior*, 18, 1–74.
- Yang, S., & Wu, H. (2021). The Performance Impact of New Ventures in Working Environment and Innovation Behavior From the Perspective of Personality Psychology. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.734014>
- Yeun, Y.-R., & Han, J.-W. (2016). Effect of nurses' organizational culture, workplace bullying and work burnout on turnover intention. *International Journal of Bio-Science and Bio-Technology*, 8(1), 372–380. <https://doi.org/10.14257/ijbsbt.2016.8.1.33>

Declarations

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research and publication of this article.

Conflicts of interest/ Competing interests:

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

Data, Materials and/or Code Availability:

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no new data were created or analyzed in this study.