Vol. 10, No. 3, 2024, pp. 38-49
DOI: https://doi.org/10.29210/020243870

Contents lists available at Journal IICET

JPPI (Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Indonesia)
ISSN: 2502-8103 (Print) ISSN: 2477-8524 (Electronic)

Journal homepage: https://jurnal.iicet.org/index.php/jppi

The role of knowledge management in enhancing innovation performance: a study on literature reviews

Ade Maria Ulfah Rakhmatika Sari*), I Gede Riana, I Gusti Ayu Manuati Dewi, I Made Artha Wibawa
Universitas Udayana Bali, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received Mar 11th, 2024
Revised May 13th, 2024
Accepted Jul 28th, 2024

Keyword:

Company performance,
Self-efficacy,
Innovation performance

ABSTRACT

Determinant performance innovation can varies depending on context organization or industry certain . Many factors decider performance involving innovation combination internal and external aspects. Companies or organizations that succeed at innovation can often combine some or all of these factors to create an environment that supports the development and implementation of new ideas. This research aims to conduct a literature review study of company innovation performance. This research uses the literature study method to determine the measurement of company innovation performance of 56 articles related to innovation performance and its determining factors. The research was carried out by comprehensively identifying and conceptualizing the determinant framework for innovation performance in terms of (1) Innovativeness and attributes; (2) The impact of Ambidextrous Leadership On innovation performance; (3) Impact of knowledge management strategy on innovation performance; (4) The impact of creative self efficacy on innovation performance; and (5) Conceptualization of determinants and their impact on innovation performance. The research results found that a company's ability to dynamically manage its resources is the main key to improving company performance. Thus, companies must have effective strategies in managing their resources and facing changes in the business environment to remain competitive.

Corresponding Author:

Ade Maria Ulfah Rakhmatika Sari
Universitas Udayana, Bali, Indonesia
Email: ade.maria1511@gmail.com

Introduction

Knowledge management has become a very important research subject in improving organizational performance, especially in the context of innovation. Innovation is a fundamental driving force for organizational development, and knowledge management plays an important role in developing and implementing effective innovation. The role of knowledge management in improving innovation performance can help organizations face changes in the dynamic business environment and increase competitiveness. Knowledge management is a process that involves the acquisition, coding, storage, transfer, application and sharing of knowledge. Knowledge sharing refers to the process of providing information or technology to help or collaborate with others in solving problems and developing new ideas from sharing knowledge on organizational innovation performance. Knowledge management plays an important role in improving organizational innovation performance. Therefore, analyzing the factors that influence improving innovation performance has become an important aspect for improving organizational innovation capabilities. Innovation

performance is an important indicator of organizational success and failure. Innovation has become a necessity for companies that want to survive in business competition.

Determinants of innovation performance refer to factors or elements that significantly influence how well an organization or system performs in terms of innovation. Innovation is crucial for long-term success and business competitiveness (Agostini et al., 2016), industry (Bandura et al., 1996), and economics (Barradas et al., 2016). According to (Buenechea-Elberdin et al., 2018) Factors contributing to determining the level of innovation performance are strong leadership with a clear vision for innovation. Leaders who prioritize and encourage a culture of innovation within the organization can have a positive impact on innovation performance (Choi & Lee, 2002). According to (Di Meglio et al., 2015). Organizational culture is a determining factor that contributes to determining the level of innovation performance by encouraging creativity (Edquist et al., 2018) and shaping innovation performance (Fan et al., 2022).

The resources owned by a company play an important role in determining competitive advantage and company performance. Therefore, companies must have an effective strategy in managing the resources they have to improve company performance. According to the Resource Base View (RBV) (ref), the main factors that produce variations in a company's achievements are differences in the resources and strategic capabilities it has (ref). Competitive advantage and company performance can be explained by the collection of resources which is the company's core competency (ref). Limitations to company growth (limit to growth) depend on the capabilities of the productive resources owned by the company (ref). The resources owned by a company can be divided into two categories, namely tangible and intangible. Tangibles are physical assets that companies use in the process of producing products or services (Ghulam Jan et al., 2021), while intangibles are resources that are difficult to touch, see and measure (including people, organizations and information) (ref).

Company has adopted a resource-focused approach, with the aim of accumulating valuable technology assets as well as rewarding highly intellectually driven workers with strong determination (Hayaeian et al., 2022). Success in the global market reflects the company's timely response, adaptable product innovation, and effective management skills in coordinating and disseminating external and internal competencies (Jia et al., 2021). Factors that differentiate a company from others will produce something that is unique and difficult to compete with (Hu et al., 2020). Innovation performance is a key indicator of organizational success or failure. By improving innovation performance, organizations can achieve competitive advantage, growth, operational efficiency, customer satisfaction, and attract and retain the best talent. However, to achieve optimal innovation performance, organizations need to overcome various challenges, including building a culture of innovation, overcoming resistance to change, managing resources effectively, and managing the risks associated with innovation.

According to (Forés & Camisón, 2016) innovation performance is an important indicator of organizational success or failure. Innovation performance can be impacted by various factors (Jiang et al., 2023). Internal factors such as employee behavior, organizational characteristics (Karwowski, 2012), while external factors such as regional culture, government policies. On the other hand, the knowledge possessed by a company has a vital role in improving the innovation performance of an organization (Akhavan & Hosseini, 2015). According to (Johannessen et al., 2001) A company's innovation performance can be measured based on product, service, process, market, logistics innovation and organizations (Zacher & Wilden, 2014). (Stolz et al., 2022) measuring innovation performance through comparison with competitors regarding product modifications made. According to (Tang & Wei, 2022) innovation has a better market response, the organization has better success in innovating, the organization uses newer technology, the organization's product is the most sophisticated product, the organization is the most important in launching products (Wilden et al., 2013).

Measuring innovation performance is a complex process and requires various indicators and methods to determine how well an organization or company is developing and implementing innovation. Research on measuring innovation performance has been carried out previously using various methods such as research (Prajogo & Ahmed, 2006) measure innovation performance using measurements related to process innovation and product innovation. (Auken et al., 2008) categorizes innovation performance into three dimensions, namely; innovation in products, innovation in managerial processes and system innovation. According to (Kostis et al., 2018) product innovation refers to product changes or the commercialization of new products. Process in innovation refers to changes in the process of creating innovation (Zack et al., 2009). The innovation system includes administration and management, purchasing and sales referring to changes in the organizational structure of the company (Noori et al., 2017) and the administrative procedures of company management (Turner et al., 2015).

According to (Díaz Duarte et al., 2022) measure innovation performance by adapting the scale created by (Auken et al., 2008). According to (Noori et al., 2017) measuring innovation performance using the dimensions

of innovation output and innovation input. Based on several studies that have been conducted previously, there are several methods that can be used to measure innovation performance, such as product, service, process, market, logistics innovation and organizations (Tantawy et al., 2021). Even though previous research has carried out various methods to measure innovation performance, this research did not pay attention to how the use of dimensions, indicators and items has an impact on innovation performance. Based on these problems, this research aims to conduct a literature study related to how the influence of innovation performance can have an impact on the use of dimensions, indicators and the impact on a company's innovation performance.

This research was carried out by studying literature from various journals that have published research results related to measuring company innovation performance. Research was carried out by identifying comprehensive and conceptualize the determinant framework for Innovation Performance in terms of (1) Innovation and attributes; (2) The impact of ambidextrous leadership on innovation performance; (3) Impact of knowledge management strategy on innovation performance; (4) The impact of creative self-efficacy on innovation performance; and (5) Conceptualization of determinants and their impact on innovation performance. The novelty of this research lies in a comprehensive approach that combines various determinants of innovation performance in one holistic conceptual framework. By integrating aspects of ambidextrous leadership, knowledge management strategies, and creative self-efficacy, this research offers new and deeper insights into the dynamics that influence corporate innovation performance. This not only enriches the existing literature, but also provides practical guidance for companies wishing to improve their innovation performance through a more structured and integrated approach.

Method

Research on innovation performance has continued to be carried out in the last decade. This research was conducted to find out the Innovation Performance factors through literature study. The literature research method is an approach that involves analysis and synthesis of existing literature to understand a particular issue or topic. In terms of determinants of innovation performance, the literature review can provide in-depth insights into the factors that influence innovation performance in various contexts. This research was conducted to find the right determinants of Innovation Performance. Online journal databases such as Elsevier, Emerald, JSTOR, Sage and Wiley Online Library are used as media to access articles. This research was carried out by collecting 56 published scientific papers on Innovation Performance and its determining factors. These articles were classified according to research themes and tabulated to describe the main concerns of each article that were relevant to this research. Article tabulation is carried out to see the findings or conclusions of each study related to the discussion of the determinants of innovation performance. The steps taken in the research are as follows;

Identify Themes and Research Questions
Relevant questions related to innovation performance determinants aim to investigate the determinants of innovation performance in the context of high-tech organizations. An in-depth analysis of these questions can provide valuable insight into the strategies and practices that support the achievement of innovation performance determinants.

Literature Search
A literature search regarding the determinants of innovation performance was carried out from the Elsevier, Emerald, JSTOR, Sage and Wiley Online Library databases by reading abstracts and evaluating the relevance of each literature source. The use of keyword variations and keyword combinations is carried out to help expand the search scope for innovation performance determinants articles.

Literature Selection
After conducting a literature search, the next step is to carry out literature selection to ensure that the sources selected are relevant and of high quality. Literature selection aims to determine the most relevant and valuable literature to complete the theoretical framework or support arguments in research on the determinants of innovation performance by considering the quality, relevance and validity of the information.

Classification and Grouping of Literature
After selecting the literature, the next step in this research was to classify and group the literature based on themes or determinants of innovation performance, such as identifying similarities, differences and trends that emerged from the selected literature.

Analysis and synthesis

The content analysis of this research literature aims to understand the viewpoints, findings and methodology used by previous researchers. Literature synthesis is carried out to compile information from various sources into a comprehensive picture.

Research Objectives

This research aims to measure company innovation performance and identify its relevant determinants. Therefore, this research focuses on developing an integral model of the determinants of innovation performance that can help companies improve their innovation performance. A literature review was conducted to understand how the factors that determine innovation performance influence and impact overall innovation performance. This research uses a literature study method to determine the measurement of company innovation performance from 56 articles related to innovation performance and its determining factors. The results of this research help in understanding how companies can improve their innovation performance in an effective way. This research also helps in developing an integral model of the factors that determine innovation performance that can help companies improve their innovation performance.

Search Scope

Search Scope Limitations (1) Keywords Innovation Performance, Determining Factors, Knowledge Management, Ambidextrous Leadership, Creative Self-Efficacy, Entrepreneurial Orientation, Innovation Capacity, Company Performance. (2) Database with articles originating from scientific journal articles and books published in Indonesian and English. (3) The search period was carried out to obtain the latest and relevant information, so the time period taken was 2010-2023. (4) Inclusion Criteria with articles and books that meet the following criteria (a) Contains information about innovation performance and its determining factors (b) Contains analysis and synthesis of innovation performance and its determining factors and (c) Contains research results that relevant and up to date. (5) Exclusion Criteria with articles and books that do not meet the following criteria (a) Do not contain information about innovation performance and its determining factors. (b) Does not contain analysis and synthesis of innovation performance and its determining factors (c) Does not contain relevant and current research results. This search was carried out to obtain relevant and up-to-date information about innovation performance and its determinants, as well as to understand how companies can improve their innovation performance in an effective way.

Search Strategy

The search was carried out on several relevant scientific databases, including Scopus, Web of Science, Google Scholar, ScienceDirect with a combination of Keywords. The combination of keywords used to search for literature were: "Innovation Performance", "Determining Factors", "Knowledge Management", “Ambidextrous Leadership”, “Creative Self-Efficacy”, “Entrepreneurial Orientation”, “Innovation Capacity”, “Firm Performance”. This search strategy was carried out to obtain relevant and up-to-date information about innovation performance and its determinants, as well as to understand how companies can improve their innovaion performance in an effective way.

Selection Process

The selection of literature sources is carried out by applying the following criteria: (1) The relevance of the literature sources must be relevant to the research topic, namely innovation performance and its determining factors. (2) the quality of the literature source must be of good quality, such as being published by a scientific journal that is trusted and has a good reputation. (3) The year of publication of the literary source must be published within the relevant time period, namely 2010-2023. (4) The selected literature sources must meet the above criteria and have a significant contribution to the research. Literature sources that do not meet the criteria or do not have a significant contribution are not selected for inclusion in the review.

Analysis Method

This research uses qualitative and quantitative approaches to analyze literature related to innovation performance and its determining factors consisting of (1) Concept mapping was carried out to comprehensively identify and conceptualize the determinant framework of innovation performance. This concept mapping involved text analysis and synthesis of findings from 56 articles related to innovation performance and its determinants. (2) Synthesis of findings is carried out to integrate research results and theories related to innovation performance and its determining factors. This synthesis of findings helps in identifying patterns and relationships between variables related to innovation performance. (3) Certain statistical methods are used to analyze the data collected from the research. This statistical method involves linear regression analysis, correlation analysis, and variance analysis to identify relationships between variables related to innovation performance. (4) Qualitative analysis is carried out to analyze data that cannot be measured quantitatively, such as data related to product quality and business performance. This qualitative analysis involves text analysis and synthesis of findings to identify patterns and relationships between variables related to innovation performance.

Thus, this literature analysis helps in identifying the determinants of innovation performance and synthesizing findings related to innovation performance. The results of this analysis help in developing an integral model of the determinants of innovation performance that can help companies improve their innovation performance.

Result and Discussion

Innovation and its Attributes

In recent decades, innovation has been considered in the business and management science literature as one of the important strategies that organizations can follow to achieve their goals and objectives (Fagerberg et al., 2005). The concept of innovation in the business environment is associated with doing something new or different (Garcia & Calantone, 2002). In today's competitive and dynamic business environment, innovation is becoming increasingly important. Organizations that do not continually renew, rebuild and reinvent their products or services are under threat of survival (Tidd & Pavitt, 2011). (O'Sullivan & Dooley, 2009) explains innovation as a driver of change consisting of the application of practical tools and techniques that make large and small changes to products, processes and services, which translates into the introduction of something new for the organization that adds value to customers and contributes to the company's knowledge repository.

Innovation is a recognized value in the business world, therefore, it is important for innovation to be inegrated into an organization's strategic decisions, which may include starting a new business, substantially updating the current business, internationalizing the company, differentiating production or creating a market . This activity allows cataloging new items, but the results will vary depending on organizational factors such as size, sector, competitive conditions and others (Mueller et al., 2020). The positive impact of innovation activities does not only benefit certain sectors or regions, because the impact can also be felt in all types of industries and countries (Na-Nan et al., 2019). Several variations in the definition of innovation have emerged across several perspectives, such as economics, organization studies, business and management, innovation and entrepreneurship, marketing, science and technology, and knowledge management. Innovation comes in several forms and also has an impact on individual lives and has its own element of renewal (Baregheh et al., 2009).

(Zawislak et al., 2014) identified two types of innovation, one that refers to technology-driven innovation, which is divided into technological innovation and operations innovation, the other is business-driven innovation, which in turn is divided into management innovation and transactions. Technological innovation refers to the development of new designs, new materials, and new products. In addition, they include the development of new machines, equipment and new components. And operations innovation focuses on new processes, improvements to current processes, introduction of modern techniques, new layouts, etc. This allows companies to create products with quality, efficiency and flexibility at the lowest possible cost.

Based on the information above, researchers want to build innovation performance which is relevant to leadership, knowledge management and self efficacy. (Rosing et al., 2011) explains the heterogeneity of the relationship between leadership and innovation and provides a new understanding called Ambidextrous Leadership, which is considered to need attention in developing company innovation in order to be able to maintain competitive advantage. A leader must have the ability to foster both explorative and exploitative behavior in team members by managing the degree of variation in their actions, and with the ability to switch flexibly between the two. (Zacher et al., 2016) developed research on Ambidextrous Leadership which found that opening and closing behavior can increase employee innovative performance. In 2020 (Gerlach et al., 2020) re-developing research related to Amdidextrous Leadership and revealed that Ambidextrous Leadership has a significant positive effect on innovation performance.

(Bierly & Chakrabarti, 1996) found that companies that acquire and share knowledge by combining people-oriented systems and strategies tend to be more profitable. Companies need to be more aggressive in managing their knowledge to gain an advantage (Aliaga, 2000). According to (Gloet & Terziovski, 2004) states that the implementation of knowledge management has a significant influence on Innovation Performance. According to (Mardani et al., 2018) also strengthens the results of this research. Quantitative empirical studies provide many positive results from the implementation of knowledge management on innovation performance.

(Tierney & Farmer, 2011) found Creative Self Efficacy had a significant positive impact on Creative Performance. According to (Carmeli & Schaubroeck, 2007) stated that Self Efficacy can increase Creativity and how the role of leaders is to encourage employee creativity. (Mumtaz & Parahoo, 2019); (Akbari et al., 2020) (Islam et al., 2024) in their research using Self Efficacy as a mediating variable to determine the influence on Innovation Performance.

The Impact of Ambidextrous Leadership on Innovation Performance

Ambidextrous Leadership is the ability to foster explorative and exploitative behavior in subordinates by increasing or reducing variations in how the individual acts or behaves and flexibly switching between these behaviors. Ambidextrous Leadership influences innovation performance. The leader's opening and closing behavior influences innovation performance. Ambidextrous Leadership has an influence on achieving organizational performance as one of the resources owned by the company. Several empirical studies reveal that there is a significant positive impact between Ambidextrous Leadership on Innovation Performance, namely according to (Gerlach et al., 2020) (Cheng & Huang, 2021) (Khan et al., 2021). These empirical studies contradict (Niu, 2010) which states that Ambidextrous Leadership has no significant effect on innovation. The results of this empirical study build a hypothesis in this research which can be formulated in hypothesis 1, namely that Ambidextrous Leadership has a significant effect on innovation performance.

It is important to note that the results of empirical studies can be influenced by context, sample population, and research methods. The hypothesis can be tested further in specific organizational or industry contexts to understand more deeply the relationship between Ambidextrous Leadership and Innovation Performance. The importance of understanding and considering these factors supports the idea that further research needs to deepen contextual analysis and evaluate the impact of Ambidextrous Leadership on Innovation Performance in various situations. This research can provide deeper and more applicable insights to guide managerial practices and organizational decision making.

A deep understanding of the impact of Ambidextrous Leadership on Innovation Performance in various contexts is essential to inform managerial practice and organizational decision making and is therefore necessary; (1) Further research can help develop theories about Ambidextrous Leadership and innovation, provide new insights, and identify factors that may moderate the relationship; (2) A deeper understanding of how Ambidextrous Leadership can be implemented effectively in various contexts can guide organizations in designing personalized management strategies; (3) The business context is always changing, and ongoing research can help organizations understand how to adapt to those changes and remain effective in leading innovation; (4) In-depth research can provide insight into how leaders can better engage employees in the innovation process, encourage collaboration, and harness individual creative potential; (5) Understanding the variability of the impact of Ambidextrous Leadership on Innovation Performance can help organizations improve their performance through more focused and effective leadership strategies; (6) Research findings can guide leadership training and development programs to help leaders develop the necessary ambidextrous skills; (7) A deeper understanding will help managers and executives make better decisions regarding the implementation of Ambidextrous Leadership in an effort to improve innovative performance.

By digging deeper and asking more specific research questions, research can provide a more holistic and contextual view of the role of Ambidextrous Leadership in supporting innovation. This will support the development of best practices and enable organizations to be more responsive to innovative challenges across a wide range of business conditions.

The Impact of Knowledge Management Strategy on Innovation Performance

Company strategy to capture and identify procedures in managing knowledge base activities in the organization. Knowledge management strategy has a significant positive effect on innovation performance. Empirical studies confirm this stated by (Lai et al., 2014) (Mardani et al., 2018). This empirical study contradicts (Inkinen, 2015) (Safdar et al., 2021) which reveals that knowledge management strategy does not have a significant impact on innovation performance. The differences in findings in the research literature indicate that the relationship between Knowledge Management Strategy and Innovation Performance can depend on certain contexts or other variable factors. It is important to examine research methodology, sample populations, and contextual differences between these studies to gain a better understanding of differences in findings. In this context, good knowledge management may need to be combined with other factors, such as organizational culture, leadership, and employee engagement, to achieve a positive impact on innovation performance. Further analysis or follow-up research may be needed to understand more deeply the factors that influence the relationship between knowledge management strategies and innovation performance in specific contexts.

Differences in findings in research literature related to Knowledge Management Strategy and Innovation Performance require an understanding of the relationship involving context and other factors that can influence research results such as: (1) Organizational culture that supports innovation can strengthen or moderate the relationship between Knowledge Management Strategy and Innovation Performance so that innovation values are reflected in organizational culture may play an important role; (2) Leadership roles and styles can influence the effectiveness of knowledge management strategies in supporting innovation and leadership that supports innovation and facilitates the implementation of Knowledge Management can increase its impact; (3) The level of employee participation and involvement in Knowledge Management and innovation initiatives can be a

relevant variable and employee support and participation can influence the implementation and success of the strategy; (4) Differences in industry context or organizational size may shape the way knowledge management strategies are implemented and influence outcomes and larger organizations may face different challenges and opportunities than smaller organizations; (5) Technological readiness and organizational infrastructure can influence the implementation of knowledge management strategies and the role of information technology in supporting knowledge and collaboration needs to be considered; (6) Changes in time, such as industry trends or technological developments, can influence the impact of knowledge management strategies on innovation.

Further analysis and research involving additional variables can provide richer and more contextual insight into the relationship between Knowledge Management Strategy and Innovation Performance. A holistic approach that considers multiple aspects can help organizations design more effective knowledge management strategies to support innovation.

The Impact of Creative Self-Efficacy on Innovation Performance

Creative Self Efficacy is the belief a person has the ability to produce creative results. Creative Self Efficacy influences Innovation Performance. Creative self-efficacy refers to an individual's belief in their ability to generate creative and innovative ideas. The impact of creative self-efficacy on innovation performance can be very significant. Therefore, creative self-efficacy not only influences individual innovation performance, but can also have a positive impact on overall organizational innovation performance. Organizations that encourage and develop creative self-efficacy among their team members can create a sustainable, innovative culture. Self-confidence in creative abilities can reduce an organization's innovative performance. This is confirmed through several empirical studies (Ghosh et al., 2019) (Iqbal et al., 2022). Empirical study (Shehzad et al., 2023) Contrary to the study above, 7 Self Efficacy has no effect on Innovation Performance.

By increasing individual innovation performance, as a whole, organizations can also gain benefits in the form of increasing their innovative performance. Therefore, developing Creative Self Efficacy can be an important strategy in creating an innovative culture at the individual and organizational levels. several ways in which Creative Self Efficacy can impact individual innovation performance: (1) increasing individual motivation to try new things and take risks; (2) Individuals with a high level of Creative Self Efficacy tend to be more open to new ideas and are able to find creative solutions to the problems or opportunities they face; (3) Creative Self Efficacy can increase an individual's fighting power in facing obstacles or obstacles in the innovation process and a high level of self-confidence can make individuals more persistent in achieving their innovative goals; (4) Individuals who believe in their ability to make innovative contributions are more likely to take initiative and responsibility for innovation projects; (5) Success in achieving creative ideas can increase individual job satisfaction and this achievement can provide a sense of achievement and pride, which can motivate individuals to continue to innovate; (6) Creative Self Efficacy can also influence an individual's ability to collaborate in a team; (7) Individuals who are confident in their creative abilities are more likely to share ideas and collaborate with teammates to achieve innovative goals; (8) A high level of Creative Self-Efficacy can help individuals adapt to change, face challenges, and find innovative solutions to these changes.

Conceptualization of Determinants and Their Impact on Innovation Performance

A comprehensive review of the determinants of innovation performance helps posit that innovation performance is significantly influenced by several factors, namely, ambidextrous leadership, knowledge management strategy and creative self efficacy. Frameworks conceptual framework that has been developed to synthesize the determinants of innovation performance , describing the relationship between these influences. Thus ambidextrous leadership, knowledge management strategy has been identified us influence cores to innovation performance. Besides that, creative self efficacy plays a role in determining the influence on innovation performance, where it has a direct impact on innovation performance and mediates the relationship between ambidextrous leadership and knowledge management strategy . In line with nature connections between determinant, proposition following can developed.

Innovation and its Attributes

The results of this research provide information that innovation is important for organizational success. Innovation has been recognized as an important strategy that can help organizations achieve their goals. In an increasingly competitive and dynamic business environment, the ability to innovate becomes crucial for survival. Innovation not only leads to the introduction of something new, but also adds value to customers and increases the knowledge base of the organization. Innovation is considered an important value in the business world, so its integration in organizational strategic decisions is very important. These strategic decisions may include starting a new business, renewing an existing business, internationalizing the company, differentiating production, or creating new markets. However, the results of innovation activities will vary depending on organizational factors such as size, sector, and competitive conditions.

The positive impact of innovation activities is not limited to certain sectors or regions, but can be felt by all types of industries and countries. That innovation has the potential to provide broad benefits that transcend geographic and industry boundaries. The results of this research confirm that innovation is a key element for long-term success in an ever-changing business world. Integration of innovation into organizational strategy, recognition of various forms of innovation, as well as understanding its broad impact are important for achieving competitive advantage and sustainability. Organizations that are able to innovate continuously will be better able to survive and develop amidst global market dynamics.

The Impact of Ambidextrous Leadership on Innovation Performance

Given the varying results, further research is needed to test the hypothesis that Ambidextrous Leadership has a significant effect on Innovation Performance in various organizational or industrial contexts. This research is important to understand more deeply the relationship between Ambidextrous Leadership and Innovation Performance, as well as to guide managerial practices and organizational decision making. In-depth research on Ambidextrous Leadership can provide various benefits, including: (1) can develop theories about Ambidextrous Leadership and innovation, provide new insights, and identify factors that can moderate this relationship. (2) A deeper understanding of how Ambidextrous Leadership can be implemented effectively in various contexts can guide organizations in designing tailored management strategies. (3) can understand the variability of the impact of Ambidextrous Leadership on Performance. Innovation can help organizations improve performance through more focused and effective leadership strategies and (4) a deeper understanding will help managers and executives make better decisions regarding the implementation of Ambidextrous Leadership in an effort to improve innovative performance.

The research results found can also be used to confirm that Ambidextrous Leadership is an important component in supporting innovation in organizations. To gain a more comprehensive understanding, further research needs to be conducted considering different contexts, sample populations, and research methods. This will support the development of best practices and enable organizations to be more responsive to innovation challenges in a variety of business conditions. A deep understanding of the role of Ambidextrous Leadership can provide valuable guidance for managerial practice and decision making, as well as assist organizations in designing more effective strategies to improve innovation performance.

The Impact of Knowledge Management Strategy on Innovation Performance

Apart from good knowledge management, organizational culture, leadership and employee involvement are also needed to achieve performance goals. There are four factors that influence the relationship between knowledge management strategy and innovation performance (1) An organizational culture that supports innovation can strengthen or moderate the relationship between knowledge management strategy and innovation performance. Innovation values reflected in organizational culture can play an important role; (2) Leadership that supports innovation and facilitates the application of knowledge management can increase positive impacts; (3) Employee participation and involvement in knowledge management and innovation initiatives can be a relevant variable; (5) Technological readiness and organizational infrastructure can influence the implementation of knowledge management strategies.

The role of information technology in supporting knowledge and collaboration needs to be considered. The importance of understanding the context and other variables that influence the relationship between Knowledge Management Strategy and Innovation Performance. By exploring factors such as organizational culture, leadership roles, employee engagement, industry context, technology readiness, and industry trends, organizations can design more effective and contextual knowledge management strategies. This approach will not only support the development of best practices but also enable organizations to be more responsive to innovation challenges in a variety of business conditions.

The Impact of Creative Self-Efficacy on Innovation Performance

A person's self-efficacy regarding their ability to produce creative results has a significant influence on innovation performance. The findings of significant results indicate that high self-efficacy is correlated with increased innovation performance. Individuals with high levels of Creative Self-Efficacy are more likely to engage in creative tasks, overcome obstacles, and persist in innovative endeavors. Developing Creative Self-Efficacy is very important for individuals and organizations who want to improve innovation performance. Organizational strategies must consider developing and utilizing Creative Self-Efficacy to maintain competitive advantage through continuous innovation.

Conceptualization of Determinants and Their Impact on Innovation Performance

Several studies have found that innovation performance is influenced by several significant factors. One of the factors found was ambidextrous leadership, which describes a leader's ability to manage an organization in a flexible and adaptive way, as well as enabling effective innovation and change. Ambidextrous leadership has significantly influenced innovation performance, due to the leader's ability to integrate different strategies and

enable more effective innovation. Another factor that influences innovation performance is knowledge management strategy. This strategy involves effective management of intellectual and knowledge resources to improve innovation performance. Research has found that knowledge management strategies have a significant effect on innovation performance, because an organization's ability to effectively manage knowledge and intellectual resources enables better innovation.

Another factor that influences innovation performance is creative self-efficacy. Creative self-efficacy refers to an individual's ability to think creatively and innovate. Research has found that creative self-efficacy plays a role in determining the influence on innovation performance, because an individual's ability to think creatively and innovate enables more effective innovation. Creative self-efficacy also mediates the relationship between ambidextrous leadership and knowledge management strategies, because the leader's ability to manage the organization and effective knowledge strategies allows individuals to think creatively and innovate.

Conclusion

The concept of innovation performance is very important for building a superior and competitive business. A company's ability to manage its resources dynamically has an important role in improving company performance. Performance innovation has been discussed from a variety of different perspectives and contexts. Performance innovation is one of the determinants of a company's success and desire to run its business amidst existing competition. This literature review focuses on evaluating the determinants of innovation performance to develop an integral model of the determinants of innovation performance. Efforts were made to identify the main determinants of innovation performance and the nature of the impact of each determinant on innovation performance, namely direct and indirect. Thus, it is synthesized that ambidextrous leadership, knowledge management strategy, and creative self-efficacy are determining factors of innovation performance. This review focuses on reflecting on how each determinant impacts innovation performance.

Human resource practitioners must manage the factors that determine innovation performance to promote superior and competitive performance. One determining factor will not work effectively, but all of these determining factors need to be considered strategically and with a holistic approach. This synthesis of the literature on the factors that determine innovation performance forms a strong basis for future research. The development of an integral model for building and developing innovation as an empirical study, and is considered by the author as an extension of this study. It can also be noted that although the determinants of innovation performance discussed in this paper are identified as the main determinants of innovation performance, several researchers have identified several other variables that have an impact on innovation performance, and these can be further studied in this paper. next literature review research.

References

Agostini, L., Nosella, A., & Filippini, R. (2016). Users and radical innovation performance: The moderating role of the organisational context. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, *28*(7), 798–810. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2016.1156667

Akbari, M., Bagheri, A., Imani, S., & Asadnezhad, M. (2020). Does entrepreneurial leadership encourage innovation work behavior? The mediating role of creative self-efficacy and support for innovation. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, *24*(1), 1–22. https://doi.org/10.1108/EJIM-10-2019-0283

Akhavan, P., & Hosseini, M. (2015). Social capital, knowledge sharing, and innovation capability: An empirical study of R&D teams in Iran. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management*, *28*, 1–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2015.1072622

Aliaga, O. A. (2000). Knowledge Management and Strategic Planning. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, *2*(1), 91–104. https://doi.org/10.1177/152342230000200108

Auken, H., Madrid-Guijarro, A., & Garcia-Perez-de-Lema, D. (2008). Innovation and SME Performance in Spanish Manufacturing Firms. *International Journal of Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management - Int J Enterpren Innovat Manag*, *8*. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEIM.2008.018611

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Multifaceted Impact of Self-Efficacy Beliefs on Academic Functioning. *Child Development*, *67*(3), 1206. https://doi.org/10.2307/1131888

Baregheh, A., Rowley, J., & Sambrook, S. (2009). Towards a multidisciplinary definition of innovation. *Management Decision*, *47*(8), 1323–1339. https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740910984578

Barradas, L. C. S., Rodrigues, E. M., & Pinto Ferreira, J. J. (2016). Deriving an ontology for knowledge management in collaborative innovation networks. *International Journal of Innovation and Learning*, *19*(3), 335. https://doi.org/10.1504/IJIL.2016.075658

Bierly, P., & Chakrabarti, A. (1996). Generic knowledge strategies in the U.S. pharmaceutical industry. *Strategic Management Journal*, *17*(S2), 123–135. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250171111

Buenechea-Elberdin, M., Kianto, A., & Sáenz, J. (2018). Intellectual capital drivers of product and managerial innovation in high-tech and low-tech firms. *R&D Management*, *48*(3), 290–307. https://doi.org/10.1111/radm.12271

Carmeli, A., & Schaubroeck, J. (2007). The influence of leaders' and other referents' normative expectations on individual involvement in creative work. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*(1), 35–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.11.001

Cheng, H.-L., & Huang, M.-C. (2021). Does dual Embeddedness matter? Mechanisms and patterns of subsidiary ambidexterity that links a Subsidiary's dual Embeddedness with its learning strategy. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *38*(4), 1431–1465. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-020-09711-3

Choi, B., & Lee, H. (2002). Knowledge management strategy and its link to knowledge creation process. *Expert Systems with Applications*, *23*(3), 173–187. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0957-4174(02)00038-6

Di Meglio, G., Stare, M., Maroto, A., & Rubalcaba, L. (2015). Public Services Performance: An Extended Framework and Empirical Assessment across the Enlarged EU. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, *33*(2), 321–341. https://doi.org/10.1068/c12264r

Díaz Duarte, A. A., Marín Aguilar, J. T., & Rivera Martínez, M. E. (2022). Dimensions of Innovation Performance for Business Competitiveness. *Advances in Management and Applied Economics*, 35–44. https://doi.org/10.47260/amae/1253

Edquist, C., Zabala-Iturriagagoitia, J. M., Barbero, J., & Zofío, J. L. (2018). On the meaning of innovation performance: Is the synthetic indicator of the Innovation Union Scoreboard flawed? *Research Evaluation*, *27*(3), 196–211. https://doi.org/10.1093/reseval/rvy011

Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D. C., & Nelson, R. R. (2005). *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*. Oxford University Press.

Fan, H., Han, B., Gao, W., & Li, W. (2022). How AI chatbots have reshaped the frontline interface in China: Examining the role of sales–service ambidexterity and the personalization–privacy paradox. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, *17*(4), 967–986. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOEM-04-2021-0532

Forés, B., & Camisón, C. (2016). Does incremental and radical innovation performance depend on different types of knowledge accumulation capabilities and organizational size? *Journal of Business Research*, *69*(2), 831–848. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.07.006

Garcia, R., & Calantone, R. (2002). A critical look at technological innovation typology and innovativeness terminology: A literature review. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *19*(2), 110–132. https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-5885.1920110

Gerlach, F., Hundeling, M., & Rosing, K. (2020). Ambidextrous leadership and innovation performance: A longitudinal study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *41*(3), 383–398. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-07-2019-0321

Ghosh, V., Bharadwaja, M., Yadav, S., & Kabra, G. (2019). Team-member exchange and innovative work behaviour: The role of psychological empowerment and creative self-efficacy. *International Journal of Innovation Science*, *11*(3), 344–361. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIS-12-2018-0132

Gloet, M., & Terziovski, M. (2004). Exploring the relationship between knowledge management practices and innovation performance. *Journal of Manufacturing Technology Management*, *15*(5), 402–409. https://doi.org/10.1108/17410380410540390

Hayaeian, S., Hesarzadeh, R., & Abbaszadeh, M. R. (2022). The impact of knowledge management strategies on the relationship between intellectual capital and innovation: Evidence from SMEs. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, *23*(4), 765–798. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-07-2020-0240

Hu, W., Luo, J., Chen, Z., & Zhong, J. (2020). Ambidextrous leaders helping newcomers get on board: Achieving adjustment and proaction through distinct pathways. *Journal of Business Research*, *118*, 406–414. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.06.064

Inkinen, H. (2015). Review of empirical research on intellectual capital and firm performance. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, *16*(3), 518–565. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIC-01-2015-0002

Iqbal, Z., Ghazanfar, F., Hameed, F., Mujtaba, G., & Swati, M. A. (2022). Ambidextrous leadership and change-oriented organizational citizenship behavior: Mediating role of psychological safety. *Journal of Public Affairs*, *22*(1), e2279. https://doi.org/10.1002/pa.2279

Islam, T., Zahra, I., Rehman, S. U., & Jamil, S. (2024). How knowledge sharing encourages innovative work behavior through occupational self-efficacy? The moderating role of entrepreneurial leadership. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, *73*(1/2), 67–83. https://doi.org/10.1108/GKMC-02-2022-0041

Jia, J., Ma, G., Jiang, S., Wu, M., & Wu, Z. (2021). Influence of social media use at work on construction managers' work performance: The knowledge seeker's perspective. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, *28*(10), 3216–3235. https://doi.org/10.1108/ECAM-09-2020-0705

Jiang, Y., Asante, D., Zhang, J., & Ampaw, E. M. (2023). The influence of ambidextrous leadership on the employee innovative behavior: An empirical study based on Chinese manufacturing enterprises. *Current Psychology*, *42*(11), 9452–9465. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02233-1

Johannessen, J., Olsen, B., & Lumpkin, G. T. (2001). Innovation as newness: What is new, how new, and new to whom? *European Journal of Innovation Management*, *4*(1), 20–31. https://doi.org/10.1108/14601060110365547

Karwowski, M. (2012). Did Curiosity Kill the Cat? Relationship Between Trait Curiosity, Creative Self-Efficacy and Creative Personal Identity. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, *8*(4), 547–558. https://doi.org/10.5964/ejop.v8i4.513

Khan, I., Safdar, U., & Durrani, Z. (2021). The Light Triad Traits, Psychological Empowerment, Creative Self-Efficacy, Self-Resilience and Innovative Performance in ICT of Pakistan. *Gomal University Journal of Research*, *37*, 297–310. https://doi.org/10.51380/gujr-37-03-05

Kostis, P. C., Kafka, K. I., & Petrakis, P. E. (2018). Cultural change and innovation performance. *Journal of Business Research*, *88*, 306–313. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2017.12.010

Lai, Y.-L., Hsu, M.-S., Lin, F.-J., Chen, Y.-M., & Lin, Y.-H. (2014). The effects of industry cluster knowledge management on innovation performance. *Journal of Business Research*, *67*(5), 734–739. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2013.11.036

Mardani, A., Nikoosokhan, S., Moradi, M., & Doustar, M. (2018). The Relationship Between Knowledge Management and Innovation Performance. *The Journal of High Technology Management Research*, *29*(1), 12–26. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hitech.2018.04.002

Mueller, J., Renzl, B., & Will, M. G. (2020). Ambidextrous leadership: A meta-review applying static and dynamic multi-level perspectives. *Review of Managerial Science*, *14*(1), 37–59. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-018-0297-9

Mumtaz, S., & Parahoo, S. K. (2019). Promoting employee innovation performance: Examining the role of self-efficacy and growth need strength. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, *69*(4), 704–722. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-12-2017-0330

Na-Nan, K., Saribut, S., & Sanamthong, E. (2019). Mediating effects of perceived environment support and knowledge sharing between self-efficacy and job performance of SME employees. *Industrial and Commercial Training*, *51*(6), 342–359. https://doi.org/10.1108/ICT-01-2019-0009

Niu, H.-J. (2010). Investigating the effects of self-efficacy on foodservice industry employees' career commitment. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, *29*(4), 743–750. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2010.03.006

Noori, J., Bagheri Nasrabadi, M., Yazdi, N., & Babakhan, A. R. (2017). Innovative performance of Iranian knowledge-based firms: Large firms or SMEs? *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, *122*, 179–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.04.025

O'Sullivan, D., & Dooley, L. (2009). *Applying Innovation* (p. 391). https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452274898

Prajogo, D. I., & Ahmed, P. K. (2006). Relationships between innovation stimulus, innovation capacity, and innovation performance. *R&D Management*, *36*(5), 499–515. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9310.2006.00450.x

Rosing, K., Frese, M., & Bausch, A. (2011). Explaining the heterogeneity of the leadership-innovation relationship: Ambidextrous leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*(5), 956–974. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.07.014

Safdar, M., Batool, S. H., & Mahmood, K. (2021). Relationship between self-efficacy and knowledge sharing: Systematic review. *Global Knowledge, Memory and Communication*, *70*(3), 254–271. https://doi.org/10.1108/GKMC-11-2019-0139

Shehzad, M. U., Zhang, J., Latif, K. F., Jamil, K., & Waseel, A. H. (2023). Do green entrepreneurial orientation and green knowledge management matter in the pursuit of ambidextrous green innovation: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *388*, 135971. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.135971

Stolz, R. C., Blackmon, A. T., Engerman, K., Tonge, L., & McKayle, C. A. (2022). Poised for creativity: Benefits of exposing undergraduate students to creative problem-solving to moderate change in creative self-efficacy and academic achievement. *Journal of Creativity*, *32*(2), 100024. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.yjoc.2022.100024

Tang, X., & Wei, S. (2022). How do ambidextrous leadership and self-efficacy influence employees' enterprise system use: An empirical study of customer relationship management system context. *Information Technology & People*, *35*(4), 1443–1465. https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-07-2020-0479

Tantawy, M., Herbert, K., McNally, J. J., Mengel, T., Piperopoulos, P., & Foord, D. (2021). Bringing creativity back to entrepreneurship education: Creative self-efficacy, creative process engagement, and entrepreneurial intentions. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, *15*, e00239. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbvi.2021.e00239

Tidd, J., & Pavitt, K. (2011). *Managing Innovation: Integrating Technological, Market And Organizational Change*.

Tierney, P., & Farmer, S. M. (2011). Creative self-efficacy development and creative performance over time. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *96*(2), 277–293. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020952

Turner, N., Maylor, H., & Swart, J. (2015). Ambidexterity in projects: An intellectual capital perspective. *International Journal of Project Management*, *33*(1), 177–188. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2014.05.002

Wilden, R., Gudergan, S. P., Nielsen, B. B., & Lings, I. (2013). Dynamic Capabilities and Performance: Strategy, Structure and Environment. *Long Range Planning*, *46*(1–2), 72–96. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2012.12.001

Zacher, H., Robinson, A. J., & Rosing, K. (2016). Ambidextrous Leadership and Employees' Self-Reported Innovative Performance: The Role of Exploration and Exploitation Behaviors. *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, *50*(1), 24–46. https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.66

Zacher, H., & Wilden, R. G. (2014). A daily diary study on ambidextrous leadership and self-reported employee innovation. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *87*(4), 813–820. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12070

Zack, M., McKeen, J., & Singh, S. (2009). Knowledge management and organizational performance: An exploratory analysis. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *13*(6), 392–409. https://doi.org/10.1108/13673270910997088

Zawislak, P., Tello-Gamarra, J., Alves, A., Barbieux, D., & Reichert, F. (2014). The different innovation capabilities of the firm: Further remarks upon the Brazilian experience. *Journal of Innovation Economics*, *13*, 129. https://doi.org/10.3917/jie.013.0129