

Culture of Workplace Innovation and the role of Employees' demographic variables in Knowledge Based Organizations (KBOs) with reference to IT and ITeS companies in National Capital Region (NCR) of India

*¹Khan Mohsin, ²Raya R.Prabhakara & ³Ravikumar R.K.

¹Ph.D.Research Scholar, department of management studies-SOM, Pondicherry University Kalapet Puducherry (India)

²Professor, department of management studies-SOM, Pondicherry University Kalapet Puducherry (India)

³Ph.D.Research Scholar, department of management studies-SOM, Pondicherry University Kalapet Puducherry(India)

ARTICLE DETAILS

Article History

Published Online: 15April2019

Keywords

Workplace Innovation, Social Innovation, non-technical Innovation, Positive Culture.

*Corresponding Author

Email:mohsinkhan1118[at]gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In the wake of recent business competition, the national and international competition is leading organizations to continuously search alternatives to improve their organizational effectiveness. The mounting pressure on companies to develop latest technologies and survival menace requires adequate resource, creative employees and innovative ideas. The urge to be ahead, the firms must come up with new ideas and followed by appropriate actions that could develop a culture at workplace in which employees are self-directed and motivated towards achieving innovation by developing innovative ideas constantly and meanwhile employees are engaged and performing their jobs in the amicably and the employees are coming to the work with a believe that they can contribute to the organization by developing new ideas. Much research has been done to elaborate why some organizations are capable to do more innovations than the other organizations. The literature of previous works deals with ways to encourage creativity and innovation in the workplace and discuss many influential factors that affects employees' innovativeness or innovative behavior but not fully documented the specific role of workplace innovation to encourage employees' creativity and developing employee innovative behavior.

1. Introduction

All the related terms and concepts mentioned below are get together to form a family, since all try to record and predict the volatile nature of work and the workplace. These include terms such as: "workplace innovation, high performance work systems, high commitment workplace practices, high involvement workplace practices and alternative workplace practices. While each of these concepts is distinct from the others, they all represent alternative ways of organizing work that emphasize flexibility of work organization, empowerment and the autonomy of employees, with a focus on performance and outcomes (Miroslav Beblavý Ilaria Maselli Elisa Martellucci,2012)". Workplace Innovation is an essential social process. It is not a matter of applying knowledge codified by experts to the organization of work while it is about developing skills and competencies through flexibility, empowerment and the autonomy and creative collaboration. Therefore, when defining workplace innovation, it is important to recognize both the process and the results. The term describes the participatory process of innovation that results in results in the form of participatory practices in the workplace. These participatory practices based on continuous reflection, learning and improvement support the innovation process in management, work organization and technology implementation.

Workplace Innovation allows economies to prosper and improve well-being and well-being. It aims at "smart, sustainable and inclusive growth". The Innovation Union will present a broad concept of innovation; he who is not just technological. Social innovation will also be an important topic. This broader concept of innovation represents a step forward, if

not a change of political paradigm for European policy, because social innovation, alongside technological innovation, is now a key element of innovation.

1.1 Workplace Innovation and Organizational Culture

The study conducted by Geert Hofstede, however, with the supports of data establish that the common perceptions of everyday practices as core of an organization's culture. His measurement of employee values differed most from demographics criteria of nationality, age and education that according to the belonging to the organization itself. What we have called "practices" can also be called "conventions" "customs", "habits", "mores", "traditions" or "Usages". They have already been recognized as part of the culture by Edward B. Tylor in the last century: "Culture is the only one complex set that includes knowledge, beliefs, art, morality, law, customs and all other skills and habits acquired by man as a member of society "(Tylor, 1924).Since workplace innovation believes in bringing the positive changes in the employees work environment by introducing either some new set of practices or popular set of practices. Attention in this design addresses the role of institutions in the development of latest ideas and kind of social structures. "Renewal in this sense can be connected to technology, economic, regulative (law), Normative (social norms) and cultural innovations (Heiscale, 2007)".

1.2 The First Dimension: job design and work organisation (Organizing smarter);

- It deal with every day decision making regarding the task. Employees mutually decides how and when the task will be performed.

- Provide opportunity to solve the problems with cooperation of co-workers.
- Quick restructuring and response to the change in market.

➤ **The Second Dimension: structures and systems (Working flexible);**

The walls and organizational ceilings that influence people in departments, divisions, degrees, and occupations inevitably tend to limit the way people work together, creating separate silos that are obstacles to good work.

➤ **The Third Dimension: learning, reflection and innovation (People's practice);**

To sustain in the market and to counter the competition, the employees of the organization should constantly come forward with the new ideas, since it give an edge in continuous improvement in services and products. Strategically allotted place where all or most of the idea developers can be together and think over new ideas in distinguish manner.

➤ **The Fourth Dimension: workplace partnership (Use of technology);**

"The partnership between management, employees and unions can take many forms, but still requires openness, transparency and two-way communication. At the very least, it can be an effective tool for positive professional relationships, minimizing conflict and resistance to change. Employee representatives' involvement in the design and implementation of workplace innovation can help ensure ownership of the process and mitigate some of the problems of inertia and degradation of innovation observed elsewhere.

2. Review of Literature

Eurofound (2017) exhibited in its study that the Workplace Innovation process involves and involves employees when the organization develops or implements the renewal to change. This "bottom-up" approach means that employees have a say in the process. The purpose of Workplace Innovation is to contribute to organizational performance (efficiency, competitiveness and capacity for innovation) and the quality of work (productive, healthy and meaningful jobs) at the same time. Workplace Innovation allows an organization to adapt new circumstances and adopt new technologies, in particular make better use of talents and human abilities.

Dhondt and Totterdill, (2014) "While for years, the only area of innovation has been technology, products and services, new areas of innovation have emerged recently (for example, social innovation, organizational innovation, field innovation, user innovation). Of these, innovation in the workplace (today WPI) has received much attention and has been recognized as one of the main drivers of economic growth.

Tushman and O'Reilly, 1996; Dess and Picken, 2000; Friedman, 2011 concluded in their studies that since organizations operate and compete in a rapidly changing, highly volatile and inconsistent environment. Therefore, "to take advantage of competitiveness in these conditions, it was

necessary that innovation is mandatory and essential for sustainability and success.

Foss et al., 2010 in their study states that Organizations must continually innovate to remain competitive. As a result, "organizational practices and processes to facilitate staff innovation become important. Effective human resource management (HRM) practices can influence the innovative nature of the organization and the sharing of knowledge,

Boselie et al, 2005; Piton and Redman, 2010 conclude their study as "it is necessary to conduct research focused on the links between human resource management and their outcomes, often overlooked in most research in human resource management.

The European Commission has made WPI a priority in the enhanced communication on EU industrial policy (Kesselring et al., 2014) and several countries have recognized the importance of the WPI in their national action program (Alasoini, 2009).

3. Objective of the study

The Broad objective of the study is to analyse the perception of the knowledge professionals regarding workplace innovation on the basis of their demographic variables.

1. To analyse the perception of the knowledge professionals regarding workplace innovation on the basis of their gender.
2. To analyse the perception of the knowledge professionals regarding workplace innovation on the basis of their age.
3. To analyse the perception of the knowledge professionals regarding workplace innovation on the basis of their position in the organization.
4. To analyse the perception of the knowledge professionals regarding workplace innovation on the basis of their experience.

4. Research Methodology

To solve a problem systematically coherent and rational research methodology is required. The research methodology used in conducting the research has been mentioned below

Research Design: Research design adopted for the study is descriptive in nature.

Nature and Source of Data: Both Primary and secondary data has been used in this study.

Data Collection instrument: Structured questionnaires of five point Likert scale are adopted from the past studies. Primary data has been collected with the help of questionnaire and secondary data used are from published sources and websites like www.nasscom.in, for additional information.

Survey Questionnaire: Multiple choice questions are used to collect the demographic profile of IT employees. Five point Likert scale are used to measure the study variable of the research.

Population of Study/ Sample Frame: ~3.97 million IT and ITeS employees (NASSCOM, 2018).

Sample unit- IT and ITeS professionals are the sample unit of this study.

Sampling Technique: Convenience sampling has been adopted to conduct the current study.

Data Collection : 600 Questionnaire were given to respondents directly to collect data, 502 filled questionnaire

were received out of which 21 were excluded because of incomplete data or unengaged responses. The remaining usable questionnaire were 481 with a rejection rate of 20%.

Data Analysis Data has been analyzed using SPSS version 20 for Windows. Percentage analysis, T-Test, ANOVA, has been used as statistical tools for data analysis

5. Data Analysis and interpretation

Table-1 Demographic Profile of the respondents

DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
GENDER	Male	270	56.1	56.1
	Female	211	43.9	43.9
	Total	481	100.0	100.0
AGE	less than 30 years	275	57.2	57.2
	30 to 35 years	141	29.3	29.3
	more than 35 years	65	13.5	13.5
	Total	481	100.0	100.0
EXPERIENCE	less than 5 years	303	63.0	63.0
	5 to 10 years	136	28.3	28.3
	more than 10 years	42	8.7	8.7
	Total	481	100.0	100.0
POSITION	Lower level Empl	301	62.6	62.6
	Middle level Empl	145	30.1	30.1
	Upper level Empl	35	7.3	7.3
	Total	481	100.0	100.0

Source: Primary data, Researcher's own findings

The above table indicate that 56 percent are the male respondents and approximately 44 percent are female indicate that male are more outspoken as compare to female knowledge professional. Further 57percent are the age of below 30 years. And 63 percent of respondent having the experience below 5 years and 28 percent of respondent having the experience in between 5 to 10 years and followed by the more than 10 years only 8.7 percent. Above respondents profile also indicates that lower the position of the knowledge professionals higher the will to participate in the study and vice versa.

6. Differences in the perceptions of Knowledge professionals regarding Workplace Innovation on the basis of their Age.

H1: There is no significant difference between the perceptions of employees' Age on Workplace innovation.

Table 2 contains the results for ANOVA test conducted to check the differences among the knowledge professionals on the basis of their age. The age of the employees are divided in to 3 slabs and each slab was tested against the workplace innovation. To test whether there is a significant difference between the ages of the employees and the perception of workplace innovation through analysis of variance (ANOVA), it is found that there is a significant difference among the age group and perception Organizing Smarter(F=3.270,p=.039),Working Flexible (F=5.353, P=.005) and people practice (F=3.500,p=0.031).

Table 2 ANOVA Table for Age vs WPI

ANOVA						
Workplace Innovation	Age	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Organizing Smarter	Between Groups	5.472	2	2.736	3.270	.039
	Within Groups	399.911	478	.837		
	Total	405.383	480			
Working Flexible	Between Groups	9.631	2	4.815	5.353	.005
	Within Groups	429.966	478	.900		
	Total	439.597	480			

People Practice	Between Groups	4.561	2	2.281	3.500	.031
	Within Groups	311.442	478	.652		
	Total	316.003	480			
Hi-Tech Application	Between Groups	.959	2	.479	.667	.514
	Within Groups	343.532	478	.719		
	Total	344.490	480			

Source: SPSS output of primary data

7. Differences in the perceptions of Knowledge professionals regarding Workplace Innovation on the basis of their experience.

H2: There is a significant difference between Experience of employees and their perception of Workplace Innovation.

To test whether there is a significant difference between the experience of the employees and their perception of

workplace innovation through analysis of variance, it is found that that there is a significant difference between the experience and perception on Hi-Tech Application (F=6.409, p=.002), While there is no significant difference was found regarding the perception of organizing smarter, people practices and working flexible as all the p values are above the significant level. The details of the analysis has been shown in the table 3.

Table-3 ANOVA Table for Experience vs WPI

ANOVA						
Workplace Innovation	Experience	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Hi-Tech Application	Between Groups	8.997	2	4.498	6.409	.002
	Within Groups	335.493	478	.702		
	Total	344.490	480			
Organizing Smarter	Between Groups	.392	2	.196	.684	.505
	Within Groups	136.886	478	.286		
	Total	137.277	480			
Working Flexible	Between Groups	.524	2	.262	.571	.565
	Within Groups	219.230	478	.459		
	Total	219.754	480			
People Practice	Between Groups	.198	2	.099	.285	.752
	Within Groups	165.978	478	.347		
	Total	166.176	480			

Source: SPSS output of primary data

8. Differences in the perceptions of Knowledge professionals regarding Workplace Innovation on the basis of their experience.

H3: There is a significant difference between Position of employees and their perception of Workplace Innovation.

Table-4 ANOVA Table for Position vs WPI

ANOVA						
Workplace Innovation	Position	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Hi-Tech Application	Between Groups	7.025	2	3.512	4.975	.007
	Within Groups	337.465	478	.706		
	Total	344.490	480			
Working Flexible	Between Groups	6.992	2	3.496	4.628	.010
	Within Groups	361.052	478	.755		
	Total	368.044	480			
Organizing Smarter	Between Groups	.886	2	.443	.756	.470
	Within Groups	280.298	478	.586		
	Total	281.184	480			
People Practice	Between Groups	9.786	2	4.893	8.348	.000
	Within Groups	280.149	478	.586		
	Total	289.935	480			

Source: SPSS output of primary data

To test whether there is a significant difference between the position of the employees and their perception of workplace innovation through analysis of variance, it is found that there is a significant difference between the position and perception on Hi-Tech Application ($F=3.512, p=.000$), Working Flexible ($F=3.496, p=.010$) and People Practice ($F=8.348, p=.010$).

9. Differences in the perceptions of Knowledge professionals regarding Workplace Innovation on the basis of their gender.

H4: There is a significant difference between Position of employees and their perception of Workplace Innovation

Table-4 ANOVA Table for Gender vs WPI

Independent Samples Test							
workplace innovation	gender	N	Mean	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
				F	sig.	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
Hi-Tech Application	Male	270	2.86	4.631	.032	.054	.957
	Female	211	2.86			.055	.956
Organizing Smarter	Male	270	3.97	4.052	.045	.368	.713
	Female	211	3.95			.375	.708
Working Flexible	Male	270	3.52	3.138	.077	-.141	.888
	Female	211	3.53			-.144	.886
People Practices	Male	270	3.73	4.890	.027	-.346	.729
	Female	211	3.75			-.355	.722

Source: SPSS output of primary data

To check the difference in the perception of gender for the workplace innovation in the organization, the researcher has conducted the Independent Sample test. The results of the Independent Sample test shows that no value of t-test for equality of means (Significant 2-tailed) is above the significant level ($p > 0.05$). Hence, the hypothesis cannot be rejected. This infers that there is no significant differences regarding the Workplace Innovation perceived by both the gender (Male and Female) of the organizations.

10. Findings of the Study

IT and ITeS employees have different perceptions of workplace innovation based on their demographic factors. More precisely based on their age, experience, position and education. Employees in the over 35 age group and those over 10 years of experience perceive more innovations in the workplace while younger and less experienced employees perceive a low level of productivity. According to the model, the age group over 35 corresponds to the career development phase; the employee tries to settle in his work and interacts with his colleagues to develop good relationships with them. A person's productivity increases during this phase, while younger employees seek an identity, try to understand each

other and understand their personality, as well as the various roles during their career. At this point, the employee is relatively unstable in his career and less productive because he continues to change jobs to find the right one. Another Important finding of the study suggest that there is no significant difference has found in the perceived workplace innovation on the basis of the gender of the employees. This gives an insight that both male and female in the organization perceived similar or has been given the equal opportunities and treatment at the workplace.

11. Conclusion

These results are very important because organizational innovation is one of the most influential factors in the organization's growth and performance. The use of cutting-edge technologies to provide immediate customer service and the use of group / collaborative software for collective work and data sharing such as files, information and information. These are essential for the success of the organization. The organizations should try to mitigate the existing differences for the workplace innovation that exists on the basis of the demographic variables.

References

1. Aagaard Nielsen, K. and L. Svensson, eds (2006) Action and Interactive Research: Beyond Practice and Theory. Maastricht: Shaker Publishing..
2. Alasoini, T. (2009). Strategies to Promote Workplace Innovation: A Comparative Analysis of Nine National and Regional Approaches. Economic and Industrial Democracy, 30(4), 614–642.
3. Alasoini, T., E. Ramstad, T. Hanhike and M. Lahtonen (2005) European Programmes on Work and Labour Innovation: A Benchmarking Approach, Coordinated Action WORK-IN-NET, supported within the Sixth Framework Programme of the European Commission. Helsinki: Finnish Workplace Development Programme (TYKES).
4. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2014). Job demands–resources theory. In P. Y. Chen & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), Work and Wellbeing: Wellbeing: A complete reference guide (Vol. III). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley & Sons.

5. Baldry, C., Bain, P. and Taylor, P. (1997), "Sick and tired? Working in the modern office", *Work Employment and Society*, Vol. 11 No. 3, pp. 519-539
6. Dhondt, S. and Totterdill, P. (2014), "EUWIN, the second year", available at: www.workplaceinnovation.Org/nl/kennis/kennisbank/euwin-the-second-year-/1244 (accessed September 1, 2016).
7. Eeckelaert, L., Dhondt, S., Oeij, P., Pot, F., Nicolescu, G.I., Trifu, A. and Webster, J. (2012), "Review of workplace innovation and its relation with occupational safety and health".
8. Howaldt, J., Oeij, P.R.A., Dhondt, S. and Fruytier, B. (2016), "Workplace innovation and social innovation: an introduction", *World Review of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 1-12.
9. Hussein Nabil Ismail, Adnan Iqbal, Lina Nasr, (2019) "Employee engagement and job performance in Lebanon: the mediating role of creativity", *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, Vol. 68 Issue: 3, pp.506-523,.
10. Janssen, O. (2004). How fairness perceptions make innovative behavior more or less stressful. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 25(2), 201-215.
11. Mariella Miraglia, Roberto Cenciotti, Guido Alessandri & Laura Borgogni (2017) Translating self-efficacy in job performance over time: The role of job crafting, *Human Performance*, 30:5, 254-271,.
12. Prus, I., Nacamulli, R. C., & Lazazzara, A. (2017). Disentangling workplace innovation: a systematic literature review. *Personnel Review*, 46(7), 1254-1279.
13. Rich, B.L., Lepine, J.A. and Crawford, E.R. (2010), "Job engagement: antecedents and effects on job performance", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 53 No. 3, pp. 617-635.
14. Parzefall, Marjo-Riitta, Seeck, Hannele and Leppänen, Anneli (2008) Employee innovativeness in organizations: a review of the antecedents. *Finnish Journal of Business Economics*, 2 (08).pp. 165-182.
15. West, M. A., & Farr, J. L. (1989). Innovation at work: psychological perspectives. *Social Behavior*, 4, 15–30.