

“Strategic Human Resources Practices: Role in Organizational Innovation and Knowledge Management Capacity”

Corresponding Author: ¹Ms. Neeru Gupta

Assistant Professor, Maharaja Agrasen University, Baddi, Himachal
neerugupta01@gmail.com

²Ms. Shailja Thakur

Assistant Professor, Maharaja Agrasen University, Baddi, Himachal
Shailjathakur68@gmail.com

Abstract

Dynamic and non-dynamic sets of today's businesses make companies move to innovation. In particular, companies must take part in a variety of innovation activities in order to increase their competitive advantage and lead to long-term survival. Exploring and exploiting a variety of innovations attracted the attention of many people in the field of literature. Previous research found that organizational innovation was related to firm performance, corporate strategic targeting, productivity, and organizational culture. The purpose of this research was to examine how strategic HR policies affect the ability of businesses to explore and utilize new areas of knowledge (knowledge sharing and knowledge application). All of the different types of businesses in India were surveyed (N = 109). Regression analysis showed that only specific strategic human resources strategies were predictive of creativity in the workplace.

Keywords: Strategic approaches to human resources, knowledge management, and organizational innovation capacity.

1. Introduction

The world is industrializing at a rapid pace. Therefore, it is more important than ever for businesses to be creative, adaptable, productive, and accountable if they want to succeed in today's market (Kohli and Jaworski, 1990). With a glance at the performance of various organizations in the country, it can be seen that none of these organizations have been able to meet the expectations of customers in a desirable manner in the current prevailing and challenging age. Therefore, in order to get rid of this chaos, serious measures must be taken for scientific management. New ideas have emerged, such as "knowledge management

capacity," with the aim of enhancing businesses' efficiency. The term "knowledge management capability" is used to describe an organization's prowess in using and assimilating new forms of information and resources from outside the company. This notion was first brought to the realm of organizational theories by Cohen and Levintel in 1990. They act as a stand-in for managerial proficiency, which is defined as the capability of an organization to assess the economic worth of fresh information gleaned from external sources. Management capacity is not an end itself, but it can create important organizational outcomes such as innovative performance

(Kostopoulos, Papalexandris, Papachroni and Ioannou, 2011). Innovation does not necessarily mean using the latest technology, but focusing on the ways to think and find innovative solutions within the company rather than addressing the issue of technology. Innovation occurs when the workforce shares knowledge with the organization. Thus, a common and new insight is created in the process of conflict and reconciliation (divergence and convergence) and is a new guide for the capabilities of the organization that increases innovation (Imani, Gaskari, and Qeitani, 2015). Several factors affect organizational knowledge management capacity, including strategic human resource practices and approaches (Findikli, Yozgat and Rofcanin, 2015). That is because strategic human resource approaches help the success of processes and activities by facilitating knowledge management in order to encourage the sharing of knowledge through rewards systems and improving knowledge through education and development (Kase, Paauwe and Zupan, 2009; Turner, Huemann, and Keegan, 2008). Thus, human resources strategic approaches and approaches are expected to positively affect the capacity to absorb knowledge and organizational innovation (Findikli, Yozgat and Rofcanin, 2015). Since human resources are a very important factor in the success of the organization's processes and operations, the significant role of strategic human resources approaches to managing organizational processes should be considered.

2. Literature Review

Zahira, Gurab, Karaboujk and Kold (2016), a research entitled Strategic human Resources Management and

Company Performance: The entrepreneurial mindset is a moderating factor. In order to do this, a questionnaire was developed and data were gathered from Istanbul-based businesses across a wide range of sectors. Both SPSS and AMOS were used to examine the data. The analyses revealed that an entrepreneurial mindset mediates the connection between HR strategy and firm success (both financially and in terms of employee satisfaction).

Ferreira (2016) conducted a research on organizational innovation, re-purchasing, service cost, customer loyalty. With the chance of re-purchasing, how much will it tolerate against rising prices, with the assumption that there is no willingness to re-sell, the price reduction is to create a degree of willingness.

Ugur Yozgat et al. (2015), One study examined how strategic HRM affected an organization's ability to innovate and manage knowledge. Regression research shows that only certain strategic human resources activities may foresee innovative new products or processes in a business. It was also found that the knowledge management capabilities of a corporation followed a similar pattern to those of its strategic human resource operations. We find that in general, service remuneration, training methods, and performance assessment are all significant predictors of their respective dependent variables.

Junali (2014), a research entitled Innovation by the organization Satisfaction from the comparison of service performance with customer expectations has provided satisfaction from the comparison of the product or service performance received with the customer's ideal product or service. The

success of a post-sales organization's innovation is affected by the comparison of service performance with customer expectations, but the satisfaction of comparing the performance of the product or service received with the customer's product or service is not affected.

Taleghani et al. (2017), a research study on the impact of strategic Human Resources Management tools on improving organizational performance among Tehran University staff. The statistical population of this research is Tehran University staff. Using Cochran's formula, 384 people were selected as samples. The result of the analysis of hypotheses shows that: Strategic HR management tool has a positive and significant effect on organizational performance in Tehran University.

Ahmad Pour Dariyani (2016), a research entitled Identifying the Success Factors of Strategic Human Resource Management in Small Businesses. The statistical population of this research includes two groups of owners and managers of small and medium sized agricultural enterprises in Zanjan province.

3. Research Methodology

A large number of businesses in India participated in this poll. There are many different types of businesses shown here, such as those dealing with ready-made clothing, food, pharmaceuticals, HVAC, and more. Our main objective was to cover a broad variety of sectors to provide a balanced view of the economy. This viewpoint is crucial in the context of rising economies, where many industries are experiencing rapid expansion. We had productive conversations with our points of contact at the chosen firms and informed them on the nature of our

research. We submitted the translated questionnaires to the approved contact individuals in order to get the buying managers' prior consent to take part in the research. Our conceptions are interdependent in terms of their purposes and results, thus we used the approach advocated by Morgeson and Hofmann (1999: 253) to operationalize them. Morgeson and Hofmann (1999) suggest that overall constructs indicate the overarching organizational roles, tactics, or processes that are incorporated in a collection of talents at the individual level. Our questionnaire also measured knowledge acquisition and knowledge sharing as knowledge management ability, as well as exploration and exploitation as constructs assessing organizational innovation; these are all examples of strategic human resources strategies.

Five-point Likert-scale questions were used throughout (1 stands for strongly disagree and 5 stands for strongly agree). To mitigate the effects of any technique bias, questions assessing distinct constructs were randomly combined. (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

3.1 Research Hypothesis

H₁: The strategic human resources practices (SHRPs) of organizations will be positively associated with the exploration and exploitation types of innovations.

H₂: The strategic human resources practices (SHRPs) of organizations will be positively associated with the knowledge management capacity of companies.

4. Data Analysis and Interpretation

Descriptive results are shown in Table 1. As a whole, participants gave ratings

between 3.09 (for remuneration) to 3.72 (for all other aspects of the study) (for training). Both the strength and the significance of correlations between different concept measures varied. The majority of the observed correlation coefficients were just fair. Both the trend and statistical weight of the association patterns were consistent with what had been seen before. Exploration and exploitation were shown to have the strongest association ($r = .85^{**}$). There was a weakest association found between exploration and staff training. ($r = .25^*$).

Table 1. Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations among the Variables

	M	S	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Training	3.72	.969	(.969)								
Compensation	3.09	.742	(.742)								
Performance Appraisal	3.68	.49	(.49)								
Staffing	3.44	.61	(.61)								
Participation	3.62	.49	(.49)								

Knowledge Acquisition	3.51	.081	(.081)								
Knowledge Application	3.55	.265	(.265)								
Exploration	3.43	.294	(.294)								
Exploitation	3.15	.285	(.285)								

Note. Diagonal values represent the Cronbach Alpha values. Note. $N = 106$
 $* p < .05$, $** p < .01$, $*** p < .001$.

We checked our data for typical issues with technique variance before testing our hypotheses. We made an effort to gather information from both respondents' own experiences and information provided by businesses, as proposed by Podsakoff and colleagues (2003). To evaluate the presence and explanatory structure of constructs, we used the Harmon-One-Factor test (Podsakoff and Organ, 1986) to all constructs in the research. Our findings confirmed that items loaded appropriately on the intended construction. Overall, results indicated that a single component accounted for 24.12 percentage points of the total variation in the data. Consequently, the common method bias issue did not significantly reduce the explanatory power

of linkages across our constructs, despite its existence. (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

Measurement of the Model with Exploratory Factor Analyses

In order to see the factorial structure of our constructions, we used Principal Components Factor Analysis with Varimax rotation. Barlett's test of sphericity (2=3750) was significant at p .000, and the sample size (.88) met the criteria for the study to proceed to exploratory factor analysis. All measures had communality values more than .50, as shown by our results; this implies a good match with other measures in the same construct (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). All of our measures loaded as expected in their designated constructs, and the rotated factors accounted for 81% of the total variation in the data. It was also revealed that all multi-item structures had Cronbach's Alpha values greater than 0.70. (Nunnally and Bernstein, 1994). Table 2 displays the results of our fit indices.

Measurement of the Model with Confirmatory Factor Analyses

We conducted an investigation using M-plus's evaluation technique as a corroboration factor. Key HR practices were budgeted for, including planning, staffing, execution evaluation, compensation, and support; information security, information sharing, and information application; information limitation of the board; and investigation and abuse of power in the context of organizational growth. The objects that belonged to the different constructions could only be stacked on the components that had been eliminated a priori. We used the SRMR (normalized root mean square

leftover worth) and RMSEA (root mean square blunder of guess) measures to assess the quality of the fit files, both of which should be as small as possible. We also used the Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) and the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) measures, both of which should be as high as possible. The 22/df examination mean, which we also used, must be less than 2, 3, or 5 to pass. As our fit lists extended beyond the eliminated features, we proceeded with hypothesis testing of our suggested model.

Table 2. Fit Indices of the Present Model

Eval uati on Para met ers	X ²	df	P V al ue	χ^2 / df	RM SEA	SRMR	CFI	TLI	AI C	Adjusted BIC
Rec om men ded Val ues	1120.61	115	<.0001	9.74	0.06	0.06	0.99	0.99	115.5	115.5
Val ues	1120.61	115	0.0001	9.74	0.06	0.06	0.99	0.99	115.5	115.5

Note. $N= 109$. RMSEA = Root Mean Square of Estimation. SRMR = Standardized Root Mean Square Residual. CPI = Comparative Fit Index. TLI = Tucker Lewis Index. AIC = Akaike's Information Criterion. BIC = Bayesian Information Criterion. X^2 significant at * $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$, *** $p<.001$.

Hypotheses Testing

We used several regression analyses to check the validity of our assumptions. First, we hypothesized that there would be a link between HRM policies and the two forms of innovation (exploration and exploitation) that are often seen at the level of a company. Only pay ($=.10^{***}$, $p.001$) and education ($=.11^{**}$, $p.005$) were shown to be related to the exploitation type of innovation at the organizational level. Overall, the model's explanatory power was 36% (R^2). Only compensation was shown to be statistically significant in relation to exploration ($=.49$, *** with $p.000$). The model has an overall explanatory power of 23% (R^2). So, it seems that our first theory was somewhat correct. Our second hypothesis postulated that firms' ability to manage their knowledge would be indicative of the extent to which they adopted strategic human resource strategies. Both performance evaluation and pay were shown to be significantly associated to learning ($=.54^{***}$, $p.000$ and $=.16^{**}$, $p.005$, respectively). Roughly half (R^2) of the variation in information dissemination may be attributed to the relationship between performance evaluation and pay. Our research showed that just three strategic human resources strategies had substantial influence on knowledge application: performance evaluation ($=.33^{***}$, $p.000$), remuneration ($=.29^{***}$, $p.000$), and training ($= -.19^{**}$, $p.05$). We were able to account for 39% (R^2) of the variability in effective knowledge use using our metrics. That is why the second hypothesis we tested holds water to a certain extent.

5. Discussion and Conclusions

Our overarching objective in this research was to learn how strategic HR policies affect both the exploratory and exploitative innovation of organizations and their ability to manage their knowledge. In order to achieve our goals, we gathered information from all of India's major economic sectors. Our research showed a correlation between certain strategic HR practices and an organization's ability to innovate and effectively manage its knowledge resources. Organizational innovation was shown to be significantly influenced by both pay and education. Companies' ability to manage their knowledge effectively was mostly explained by how they evaluated and rewarded employees' performance. Our findings provided convincing evidence of the independent influence of individual strategic human resources strategies on the innovative and knowledge-management capabilities of their respective organizations. Successful organizational innovations are fueled by intangible resources and social capital, as shown by O'Reilly and Tushman (2008). The resource oriented perspective of companies (Priem & Butler, 2001a; 2001b) is consistent with this line of thought since it recognizes the importance of intangible assets as a source of competitive advantage. Using this understanding as a foundation, we demonstrated that pay and education are critical factors in the adoption of new practices inside an organization. In a similar vein, we found that an organization's performance assessment and remuneration practices were indicators of its ability to manage knowledge effectively. These results

have important consequences, most notably that information sharing and knowledge application are more important than performance appraisals and employee remuneration (Gold et al., 2001).. It is important to mention the constraints we experienced when conducting our research. The sample environment was the source of our initial challenge. However, the study's limitations and context depend on the breadth of the businesses it drew its participants from. Considering the small number of people we were able to help, this restriction became even more severe. The second caveat is related to the actual components of the research itself. All three components of this study's research approach relied on participants' perceptions and self-reflections. It would be interesting to further explore the similar study approach with innovation outcomes. Despite these obstacles, we made an effort to develop a comprehensive model of how strategic human resource practices, organizational innovation, and the ability to manage information affect the competitiveness of businesses. The findings of this research should help the general public and further our knowledge about businesses.

References

1. Adner, R. and Kapoor, R. (2010), "Value creation in innovation ecosystems: How the structure of technological interdependence affects firm performance in new technology generations", *Strategic Management Journal*, 31: 306-333.
2. Allameh, S.M.; Abbas, S.K. (2010), "The Relationship between Knowledge Management Practices and Innovation Level In Organizations: Case Study Of Sub- Companies Of Selected Corporations in the City of Esfahan", *Journal of Business Case Studies* – January/February, 6(1), pp. 89-98.
3. Argote L.; McEvily B.; Reagans R. (2003), "Managing knowledge in organizations: an integrative framework and review of emerging themes". *Management Science*, 49(4), pp. 571–82.
4. Barney, J.; Wrijht, M.; Ketchen, JR. D.J. (2001), "The resource-based view of the firm: Ten years after 1991", *Journal of Management*, 21, pp. 625-641.
5. Benner, M. J. and Tushman, M. L. (2002), "Process management and technological innovation: A longitudinal study of the photography and paint industries", *Administrative Science Quarterly* 47: 676–706.
6. Bharadwaj, S.; Bhushan S.; Saxena, C. (2005), "Knowledge Management in Global Software Teams", *Vikalpa*, 30(4), pp. 65-75.
7. Boxall, P. (1992), "Strategic Human Resource Management and the Performance of Western Firms in China", *International Journal Of Human Resource Management*, South- Eastern College Publishing, Cincinnati, pp. 40-50.
8. Chang, W.A.; Huang, T.C. (2005), "Relationship between Strategic Human Resource Management and Firm Performance", *International Journal of Manpower*, XXXVI (5), pp. 434-449.
9. Chen, Chung-Jen; Huang, Jing-Wen (2009), "Strategic Human Resource Practices and Innovation Performance - The Mediating Role of Knowledge Management Capacity", *Journal of Business Research*, 62, pp. 104–114.
10. Cohen, W. M.; Levinthal D. A., (1990), "Absorptive Capacity: A New Perspective On Learning And Innovation", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 35, pp.128–153.
11. Collins C.J. ; Clark K.D. , (2003), "Strategic Human Resource Practices,

- Top Management Team Social Networks, And Firm Performance: The Role Of Human Resource In Creating Organizational Competitive Advantage”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(6), 21. pp. 740–51.
12. Darroch, J.; McNaughton, R., (2002), “Examining the link between knowledge management practice and types of innovation”, *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, Vol.3, No.3, pp. 210-222.
13. Davenport, T.; Laurence, P. , (2000), *Working Knowledge*. Boston: Harward Business School Press.
14. Davenport, T.H.; Völpel, S.V., (2001), “The Rise of Knowledge Towards Attention Management”, *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 5, pp. 212-221
15. Delaney, J. T.; Huselid, M. A., (1996), “The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Perceptions of Organizational Performance,” *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), pp. 949-969.
16. Delery, J. E., (1998), “Issues of Fit in Strategic Human Resource Management: Implications for Research,” *Journal of Management*, 8(3), pp. 289-309.
17. Delery, J. E.; Doty, D. H., (1996), “Modes of theorizing in strategic human resource management: Tests of universalistic, contingency, and configurational performance predictions”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), pp. 802-835.
18. Dyer, J.H., (1997), “Effective Interfirm Collaboration: How Firms Minimize Transaction Costs and Maximize Transaction Value”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 18, pp. 535-556.
19. Filippini, R.; Güttel, W.H.; Nosella, A., (2012), “Ambidexterity and the evolution of knowledge management initiatives”, *Journal Of Business Research*, 65(3), pp. 317-324.
20. Fornell, C.; Larcker, D.F., (1981), “Evaluating Structural Equations Models With Unobservable Variables And Measurement Error”, *The Journal of Marketing Research*, 18, pp. 39-50.
- Grant R. M., (1996), “Toward A Knowledge-Based Theory Of The Firm”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, pp. 109–22.
22. Gold, H.A.; Malhotra, A.; Segars, A.H., (2001), “Knowledge Management: An Organizational Capabilities Perspective”, *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 18, pp.185-214.
23. Gupta, A., Smith, K. and Shalley, C. (2006), “The Interplay between exploration and exploitation”, *Academy of Management Journal* 49(4): 693-706.
24. Hall, B., (2001), “Learning management and knowledge management: Is the holy grail of integration close athand?”, Brandon-Hall Publication.
25. He, Z.-L.; Wong, P.-K., (2004), “Exploration vs. exploitation: An empirical test of the ambidexterity hypothesis”, *Organization Science*, 15: pp. 481–494.
26. Holmqvist, M. (2004), “Experiential Learning Processes of Exploitation and Exploration. An Empirical Study of Product Development”, *Organization Science* 15(1): 70-81.
27. Hu, L.; Bentler, P. M. (1995), *Evaluation model fit.*, In R. H. Hoyle (Eds), *Structural equation modeling: Concepts, issues, and applications* (pp. 76–99). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
28. Hu, L.-T.; Bentler, P. M. (1999), “Cutoff criteria for fit indices in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives”, *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), pp. 1–55.
29. Huselid, M. A., (1995), “The Impact of Human Resource Management Practices on Turnover Productivity and Corporate

- Financial Performance,” *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(3), pp. 635-672.
30. Jelenic, D., (2011), “The Importance Of Knowledge Management In Organizations – With Emphasis On The Balanced Scorecard Learning And Growth Perspective”, *Management Knowledge And Learning International Conference.*, www.issbs.si/press/ISBN/...
31. Kane, B.; Ian P., (1995), “Strategic HRM or Managing the employment relationship?”, *International Journal of Manpower*, 16(5/6), pp. 6-21.
32. Kang, S. C.; Snell, S. A., (2009), “Intellectual Capital Architectures and Ambidextrous Learning: A Framework for Human Resource Management”, *Journal of Management Studies*, 46(1), pp. 65-92.
33. Katila, R. and G. Ahuja (2002), “Something old, something new: a longitudinal study of search behavior and new product introduction”, *Academy of Management Journal* 45: 1183–1194.
34. Kivijarvi, H., (2004), “Knowledge Conversion in Organizational Context: A Framework and Experiments”, *Proceedings of the 37th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, 1-10, http://Csd12.Computer.org/comp/proceedings/hicss/2004/2056/08/2056_80_242a.pdf.
35. Lado, A.A.; Wilson, M., (1994), “Human Resource systems and sustained competitive advantage: a competence based perspective”, *Academy of Management Review*, 19, pp. 699-727.
36. Ling T. C.; Aizzat M. N., (2011), “Human Resource Management Practices and Organizational Innovation: Assessing the Mediating Role of Knowledge Management Effectiveness”, *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 9(2), pp. 155-167.
37. Lin H. F.; Lee G. G., (2005), “Impact of organizational learning and knowledge management factors on e-business adoption”, *Management Decision*, 43(2), pp. 171–88.
38. MacDuffie J.P., (1995), “Human resource bundles and manufacturing performance: Organizational logic and flexible production systems in the world auto industry”, *Industry Labor Relation Review*, 48(2), pp. 197–221.
39. Malhotra, Y. (2003). Is Knowledge the Ultimate Competitive Advantage? *Business Management Asia*. September, Q 3/4, pp. 66-69.
40. March, J. G. (1991), “Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning”, *Organization Science* 2: 71–87.
41. Miller, R.E. ve C.C. Snow (1994), “Designing strategic human resource systemes, organizational dynamics”, 13(1), 36-52.
42. Mohrman, S.A., Cohen, S.G. and Mohrman, A.M., Jr., (1995), *Designing Team-Based Organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
43. Montes, F.J.L; Moreno A.R.; Fernandez, L.M.M., (2004), “Assessing the organizational climate and contractual relationship for perceptions of support for innovation”, *International Journal of Manpower*, 25(2), pp. 167–80.
44. Morgeson, F. P.; Hofmann, D. A. (1999), “The structure and function of collective constructs: Implications for multilevel research and theory development”, *Academy of Management Review*, 24, pp. 249–265.
45. Nonaka I; Konno, N., (1998), “The concept of 'Ba': building a foundation for knowledge creation”, *California Management Review*, 40(3), pp. 40–54.
46. Nunnally, J.C.; Bernstein, I.H. (1994). *Psychometric theory* (3rd. ed.). New York:

- McGraw Hill.
47. O'Reilly, C. A., III, and Tushman, M. L. (2008), "Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma", *Research in Organizational Behavior* 28: 185-206.
48. Ostroff, C., Kinicki, A. J. and Tamkins, M. M. (2003) Organizational culture and climate. In W. C. Borman,
49. D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology. Industrial and organizational psychology* (565–593). Hoboken: Wiley.
50. Priem, R. L. and Butler, J. E. (2001a), "Is the resource-based "view" a useful perspective for strategic management research?" *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1): 22–40.
51. Priem, R. L. and Butler, J. E. (2001b), "Tautology in the resource-based view and the implications of externally determined resource value: Further comments", *Academy of Management Review*, 26(1): 57–66.
52. Podsakoff, P. M.; Organ, D. W. (1986), "Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects", *Journal of Management*, 12(4), pp. 531–544.
53. Podsakoff, P. M.; MacKenzie, S. B.; Lee, J.-Y.; Podsakoff, N. P. (2003), "Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, pp. 879-903.
54. Salisbury, M. W. (2003), "Putting theory into practice to build knowledge management systems", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 7(2), pp. 128-141.
55. Schuler, R.S.; Macmillan, I.C. (1984), "Gaining competitive advantage through human management practices", *Human Resource Management*, 23(3), pp. 241-256.
56. Schuler R.S.; Jackson, S.E. (1987), "Linking competitive strategies with human resource management practices", *Academy Of Management*, 18(3), pp. 11-35.
57. Schuler, R.S. (1992), " Strategic human resource management: Linking the people with the strategic needs of the business", *Organizational Dynamics*, 2(1), pp. 18-33.
58. Schuler, R. S.; Jackson, S. E., (1987), "Linking competitive strategies with human resource management practices", *Academy of Management Executive*, 1(3), pp. 207-219.
59. Snell, S. A. (1992), "Control Theory in Strategic Human Resource Management: The Mediating Effect of Administrative Information", *Academy of Management Journal*, 35, pp. 292-327.
60. Soliman, F.; Spooner, K. (2000), "Strategies for Implementing Knowledge Management: Role of Human Resource Management", *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 4(4), pp. 337-345.
61. Ulrich, D. (1991), "Employee and customer attachment: synergies for competitive advantage", *Human Resource Planning*, 14(2), pp. 89-103.
62. Spender J.C., (1996), "Making knowledge the basis of a dynamic theory of the firm", *Strategic Management Journal*, 17(10), pp. 45–62.
63. Spender, J. C.; Grant, R. M. (1996), "Knowledge and the firm: Overview", *Strategic Management Journal*, 17, pp. 5–9.
64. Swart, J.; Nicholas, K. (2009), "Organisational learning, knowledge assets and HR practices in professional service firms", *Human Resources Research Management Journal*, 20(1), pp. 64-79.
65. Tannenbaum S.I.; Dupuree-Bruno L.M.,

- (1994), “ The relationships between organizational and environmental factors and the use of innovative human resource practices”, *Group Organization Management*, 19(2), pp. 171–202.
66. Uhlaner, L.; Stel, V.A.; Meijaard, J.; Folkeringa, M., (2007) , “The relationship between knowledge management, innovation and firm performance: evidence from Dutch SMEs”, <http://www.ondernemerschap.nl/pdf-ez/h200704.pdf>
67. Uriarte, Filemon, A., (2008), *Introduction to knowledge Management*, ASEAN Foundation, Jakarta, Indonesia., http://www.aseanfoundation.org/documents/knowledge_management_book.pdf
68. Wang, S.; Raymond A. N., (2010), “Knowledge sharing: A review and directions for future research”, *Human Resource Management Review*, 20 , pp. 115–131.
69. Wright, M. P.; Benjamin B. D.; Scott A. S. (2001), “Human resources and the resource based view of the firm”, *Journal Of Management*, 27, pp. 701-721.
70. Wright, P. M.; Snell, S. A., (1998), “Toward A Unifying Framework for Exploring fit and Flexibility in Strategic Human Resource Management,” *Academy of Management Review*, 23(4), pp. 756-772.
71. Yli-Renko H; Autio E; Sapienza H.J., (2001), “Social capital, knowledge acquisition, and knowledge exploitation in young technology-based firms”, *Strategic Management Journal*, 22(6/7), pp. 587–613.
72. Youndt, M.A.; Snell S.A.; Dean J.W.; Lepak D.P., (1996), “Human resource management, manufacturing strategy, and firm performance”, *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(4), pp. 836–66.