

## **Strategic Convergence: How Knowledge Sharing, Cross-Functional Collaboration, and Adaptive Leadership Drive Innovation Success**

**Tobari<sup>1</sup>, Maftuhah Dewi<sup>2</sup>, Sidrotun Naim<sup>3</sup>, Siti Nur Azizah<sup>4</sup>**

Universitas Muhammadiyah Palembang<sup>1</sup>, Universitas Islam Bunga Bangsa Cirebon<sup>2</sup>, Institut IPMI Jakarta<sup>3</sup>, Universitas Putera Bangsa<sup>4</sup>

drtoharimsi@gmail.com<sup>1</sup>, maftuhahdewi@bungabangsacirebon.ac.id<sup>2</sup>, sidrotun.naim@ipmi.ac.id<sup>3</sup>,

sitinuraziz@yahoo.com<sup>4</sup>

### **ABSTRACT**

This study investigates the relationships among knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, adaptive leadership, and innovation success in organizational settings. Employing Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM), the research analyzes data collected from employees across various industries. The findings reveal that knowledge sharing significantly influences innovation success both directly and indirectly through cross-functional collaboration, which also serves as a critical mediator between adaptive leadership and innovation outcomes. Furthermore, adaptive leadership is shown to enhance cross-functional collaboration, emphasizing the importance of leadership style in fostering a collaborative culture conducive to innovation. These results underscore the necessity for organizations to cultivate knowledge-sharing practices, promote cross-functional teamwork, and develop adaptive leadership capabilities to drive innovation success. The study contributes to the literature by elucidating the dynamic interplay among these constructs and providing practical implications for managers seeking to enhance their organization's innovative capacities.

### **Keywords:**

Knowledge Sharing;  
Cross-Functional  
Collaboration;  
Adaptive  
Leadership;  
Innovation Success;  
Leadership

### **INTRODUCTION**

In today's rapidly evolving business landscape, organizations face the challenge of remaining competitive while navigating complexities driven by technological advances, globalization, and market disruptions. Innovation has emerged as a critical factor for businesses striving to stay relevant and maintain a competitive edge. However, the success of innovation within an organization is not merely the result of creativity but rather a combination of strategic efforts involving knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, and adaptive leadership. These elements are instrumental in ensuring that innovative ideas are effectively generated, developed, and implemented to drive organizational growth and sustainability (Nonaka et al., 2000). Understanding the strategic convergence of these factors can provide businesses with a clearer roadmap to achieving innovation success.

Knowledge sharing, in particular, has garnered attention as a key driver of innovation. When organizations actively promote the dissemination of knowledge across various departments and individuals, it fosters an environment where creativity thrives and innovative solutions are born (Von Krogh et al., 2000). Knowledge sharing enables employees to build upon existing ideas, integrating new insights to form novel concepts. The collective intelligence that results from open knowledge exchange ensures that innovative ideas are more robust, scalable, and aligned with organizational goals. However, challenges such as silos, lack of trust, and poor communication can hinder effective knowledge sharing, thus stifling innovation potential.

Another essential component in driving innovation is cross-functional collaboration, which refers to the cooperative effort among different departments within

an organization. Cross-functional teams bring diverse perspectives, expertise, and experiences, creating a fertile ground for creative problem-solving and innovation (Griffin & Hauser, 1996). Collaboration between functions such as marketing, research and development (R&D), and finance allows for the integration of market demands with technical feasibility and financial viability, increasing the chances of innovation success. The interaction of diverse functional areas also helps in identifying and mitigating risks earlier in the innovation process, thus enhancing efficiency and effectiveness.

Finally, adaptive leadership plays a pivotal role in shaping an organization's innovation trajectory. Adaptive leaders are those who can recognize shifts in the external environment and guide their teams to respond with agility and resilience (Heifetz et al., 2009). These leaders foster a culture of experimentation, encourage calculated risk-taking, and support continuous learning, all of which are critical for innovation. In environments characterized by uncertainty and rapid change, the ability of leaders to adapt and steer their teams toward innovative solutions becomes an indispensable asset. The convergence of adaptive leadership with knowledge sharing and cross-functional collaboration creates an ecosystem where innovation can thrive.

While the importance of knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, and adaptive leadership in fostering innovation has been acknowledged in academic and business literature, the interactions among these factors and their collective impact on innovation success remain underexplored. Most studies tend to examine these factors in isolation, without addressing how they converge strategically to create a sustainable innovation process. There is also a lack of empirical research that identifies the specific mechanisms through which these elements influence one another to drive innovation success. This gap in the literature creates a need for comprehensive research that investigates the interrelationships between knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, and adaptive leadership in driving innovation outcomes.

The objective of this research is to examine how the strategic convergence of knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, and adaptive leadership drives innovation success within organizations. Specifically, this study seeks to explore the synergistic effects of these factors and to identify the key mechanisms through which they contribute to successful innovation. By addressing these objectives, the research aims to provide a deeper understanding of how organizations can leverage these elements to enhance their innovation capabilities and achieve long-term competitive advantage.

## **Literature Review and Hypothesis Development**

### **1. Knowledge Sharing and Innovation Success**

Knowledge sharing has long been identified as a critical enabler of organizational innovation. It refers to the process through which individuals within an organization exchange information, ideas, and expertise, facilitating the creation of new knowledge that can spur innovation (Nonaka et al., 2000). The dynamic capability theory suggests that organizations capable of continuously renewing their knowledge base are more likely to achieve sustained innovation success (Teece et al., 1997). Research shows that knowledge sharing fosters creativity and problem-solving as employees build on existing ideas, making the innovation process more efficient and effective (Cummings, 2004).

The role of knowledge sharing in innovation is particularly important in environments characterized by complexity and rapid change. Organizations that

encourage open communication and the dissemination of information across functional boundaries are better equipped to respond to shifts in the external environment, resulting in more agile and adaptive innovation strategies (Von Krogh et al., 2000). However, despite its clear benefits, knowledge sharing is often hindered by organizational silos, lack of trust among employees, and inadequate communication systems (Lin, 2007). Addressing these barriers is essential for fostering a knowledge-sharing culture that supports innovation. Thus, based on the literature, we propose the following hypothesis: Knowledge sharing positively influences innovation success.

## **2. Cross-Functional Collaboration and Innovation Success**

Cross-functional collaboration refers to the cooperation between different departments within an organization to achieve common goals. The integration of diverse perspectives and expertise from various functions, such as marketing, research and development (R&D), and finance, can enhance innovation by ensuring that products and processes meet market demands while remaining technically and financially feasible (Griffin & Hauser, 1996). Cross-functional collaboration enables organizations to leverage the unique knowledge and skills of different departments, fostering creativity and enhancing the quality of innovative solutions.

The resource-based view (RBV) of the firm suggests that organizations achieve a competitive advantage when they effectively combine and deploy their internal resources (Barney, 1991). Cross-functional collaboration is one such resource that allows organizations to integrate their functional capabilities to create innovative products and services that are difficult for competitors to imitate. However, successful cross-functional collaboration requires overcoming challenges such as communication barriers, conflicts of interest, and differing departmental priorities. When these challenges are addressed, cross-functional collaboration can significantly contribute to innovation success by aligning organizational resources and capabilities. Therefore, we hypothesize the following: Cross-functional collaboration positively influences innovation success.

## **3. Adaptive Leadership and Innovation Success**

Adaptive leadership is a leadership style characterized by the ability to respond effectively to changing circumstances and guide an organization through complex challenges (Heifetz et al., 2009). Adaptive leaders encourage experimentation, promote learning from failures, and support their teams in navigating uncertainty, all of which are critical for fostering innovation (Yukl & Mahsud, 2010). Unlike traditional leadership approaches, which rely on hierarchical authority and clear-cut solutions, adaptive leadership focuses on enabling employees to develop their own solutions to emerging problems, fostering a culture of innovation and continuous improvement (Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009).

The contingency theory of leadership suggests that the effectiveness of leadership styles depends on the specific context and challenges faced by an organization (Fiedler, 1967). In environments characterized by volatility and uncertainty, adaptive leadership is particularly well-suited to drive innovation by empowering teams to experiment and adapt to changing conditions. Research has shown that organizations with adaptive leaders are more likely to succeed in implementing innovative solutions, as these leaders create an environment that supports risk-taking and learning from failures (DeRue, 2011). Therefore, we propose the following hypothesis: Adaptive leadership positively influences innovation success.

#### **4. .The Interaction of Knowledge Sharing, Cross-Functional Collaboration, and Adaptive Leadership**

While each of these factors independently contributes to innovation success, their combined impact is likely to be even more significant. The strategic convergence of these elements can create a synergistic effect that enhances innovation outcomes beyond what can be achieved by any one factor alone. Knowledge sharing and cross-functional collaboration are interdependent processes; for example, effective cross-functional teams rely on open knowledge exchange to integrate diverse perspectives and create innovative solutions (Edmondson & Nembhard, 2009). Similarly, adaptive leadership is essential for fostering both knowledge sharing and cross-functional collaboration, as leaders who promote openness and experimentation are more likely to create an environment conducive to innovation.

The concept of ambidextrous organizations highlights the importance of balancing exploitation and exploration in achieving innovation success (O Reilly & Tushman, 2004). Knowledge sharing and cross-functional collaboration contribute to the exploration of new ideas, while adaptive leadership ensures that these ideas are aligned with the organization's strategic goals. Together, these factors create a dynamic capability that enables organizations to continuously innovate in response to changing market conditions. Based on the literature, we propose the following hypothesis: The combined effect of knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, and adaptive leadership has a stronger positive influence on innovation success than each factor individually.

##### **Mediating Role of Cross-Functional Collaboration**

Cross-functional collaboration may also serve as a mediating factor in the relationship between knowledge sharing and innovation success. While knowledge sharing provides the foundation for innovation by enabling the dissemination of information and ideas, cross-functional collaboration ensures that this knowledge is effectively integrated and applied to generate innovative solutions (Gibson & Birkinshaw, 2004). In this sense, cross-functional collaboration acts as a bridge between knowledge sharing and innovation, ensuring that shared knowledge is transformed into tangible outcomes. Therefore, we hypothesize the following: Cross-functional collaboration mediates the relationship between knowledge sharing and innovation success.

##### **5. Mediating Role of Adaptive Leadership**

Similarly, adaptive leadership may mediate the relationship between knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, and innovation success. Adaptive leaders play a critical role in creating an organizational culture that supports both knowledge sharing and cross-functional collaboration, thus facilitating innovation (Yukl & Mahsud, 2010). By empowering employees to share ideas and collaborate across departments, adaptive leaders ensure that the conditions necessary for innovation are in place. Therefore, we propose the following hypothesis: Adaptive leadership mediates the relationship between knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, and innovation success.

## METHOD

### 1. Research Design

The study adopts a quantitative research design to investigate the proposed hypotheses. A survey was used to collect data from respondents working in organizations across various industries. The survey included questions related to knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, adaptive leadership, and innovation success, which were measured using validated instruments from previous studies. PLS-SEM was chosen as the primary data analysis technique to assess the relationships between the variables and test the overall model fit.

### 2. Population and Sample

The population of this study consists of employees from medium to large-sized organizations that emphasize innovation and collaboration. These organizations were selected from various industries such as technology, manufacturing, and financial services, where knowledge sharing and collaboration play a critical role in driving innovation. A purposive sampling technique was employed to ensure that the respondents had relevant experience in knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, and adaptive leadership within their respective organizations. Respondents were mid-level and senior-level employees, including managers, team leaders, and R&D staff, as they are directly involved in decision-making and innovation processes. A total of 400 surveys were distributed, with 350 responses received, yielding a response rate of 87.5%. After data cleaning and the removal of incomplete responses, the final sample size was 320, which is considered adequate for PLS-SEM analysis (Hair Jr et al., 2017). The sample size exceeds the minimum requirements for PLS-SEM, which typically requires at least 10 times the number of indicators in the most complex construct in the model (Chin, 1998).

### 3. Measurement Instruments

The study's constructs were measured using a Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). All items for each construct were adapted from previous validated scales to ensure reliability and validity. All measurement items were pilot-tested with a small group of respondents (n = 30) to ensure clarity and understanding. Minor adjustments were made based on feedback from the pilot study.

**Table 1. Measurement of Variables**

Variable	Measurement
Knowledge Sharing	Measured using a 5-item scale adapted from (Lin, 2007). Sample items include: "Employees in my organization actively share their knowledge with each other" and "There are systems in place to facilitate knowledge exchange."
Cross-Functional Collaboration	Measured using a 6-item scale adapted from (Griffin & Hauser, 1996). Sample items include: "Teams in my organization frequently collaborate across departments" and "Cross-functional collaboration is encouraged by management."
Adaptive Leadership	Adaptive leadership was measured using a 7-item scale adapted from (Yukl & Mahsud, 2010). Sample items include: "Leaders in my organization adjust their strategies to changing circumstances" and "Leaders promote innovation by encouraging experimentation."
Innovation Success	Innovation success was measured using a 5-item scale adapted from (Gibson & Birkinshaw, 2004). Sample items include: "Our organization frequently introduces successful new products or services" and "Our organization is recognized for its innovative solutions."

Source: Primary Data Analysis, 2024

#### **4. Data Collection Procedures**

Data collection was carried out over two months using online and paper-based surveys. Respondents were assured of confidentiality and anonymity to reduce social desirability bias and encourage honest responses. The online survey was distributed via email, while paper surveys were hand-delivered to organizations that preferred physical copies. Data collection was monitored regularly to ensure an adequate response rate. Follow-up emails and reminders were sent to encourage participation.

#### **5. Data Analysis Strategy**

Data analysis followed a two-step process, which involved measurement model assessment and structural model evaluation using PLS-SEM in SmartPLS 3.0 (Ringle et al., 2012). The measurement model was evaluated to ensure reliability and validity through a series of tests. Internal consistency reliability was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability (CR), with both metrics needing to exceed the threshold value of 0.7 for acceptability (Hair Jr et al., 2019). Convergent validity was examined by calculating the average variance extracted (AVE) for each construct, where an AVE value above 0.5 indicates that the construct explains more than half of the variance in its indicators (Fornell & Larcker, 1981). To establish discriminant validity, the Fornell-Larcker criterion and cross-loadings were applied. According to the Fornell-Larcker criterion, each construct's square root of its AVE should be greater than its correlations with any other construct, while the indicator loadings must be higher on their associated construct than on any other construct, ensuring proper distinction between constructs (Fornell & Larcker, 1981).

After establishing adequate reliability and validity of the measurement model, the structural model was evaluated to test the hypothesized relationships among the constructs. The evaluation considered several criteria, starting with path coefficients, which were assessed for significance using bootstrapping with 5,000 subsamples; a hypothesis was deemed supported if the path coefficient achieved significance at the 0.05 level (Chin, 1998). Additionally, R-squared ( $R^2$ ) values for the endogenous constructs, specifically cross-functional collaboration and innovation success, were examined to evaluate the model's explanatory power, with higher  $R^2$  values indicating greater predictive accuracy. Effect sizes ( $f^2$ ) were also calculated to determine the impact of each exogenous construct on the endogenous constructs, with values of 0.02, 0.15, and 0.35 representing small, medium, and large effects, respectively (Cohen, 2016). Finally, the Stone-Geisser  $Q^2$  value was calculated using the blindfolding procedure to assess the model's predictive relevance for the endogenous constructs, where a  $Q^2$  value greater than zero signifies that the model possesses predictive relevance (Sarstedt et al., 2022).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Measurement Model Assessment

Table 2 shows the reliability, validity, and outer loadings of the constructs.

**Table 2. Measurement Model Assessment Results**

Construct	Number of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Composite Reliability	AVE	Outer Loadings
Knowledge Sharing	5	0,885	0.912	0,666	0,750
					0,812
					0,804
					0,789
					0,726
Cross-Functional Collaboration	6	0,850	0,892	0,580	0,670
					0,701
					0,715
					0,735
					0,747
Adaptive Leadership	7	0,876	0,900	0,622	0,685
					0,765
					0,790
					0,780
					0,774
Innovation Success	5	0.901	0,933	0,700	0,719
					0,740
					0,754
					0,830
					0,845
					0,828
					0,816
					0,852

Source: Data Processed by Author, 2024

The results in Table 2 indicate that all constructs achieved acceptable levels of internal consistency reliability, with Cronbach's alpha and composite reliability values exceeding 0.7. The average variance extracted (AVE) for all constructs also surpassed the 0.5 threshold, indicating satisfactory convergent validity. The outer loadings for each item are shown in three decimal places, demonstrating that all items are significant indicators of their respective constructs, with loadings well above the recommended threshold of 0.6.

### 2. Structural Model Evaluation

Table 3 summarizes the path coefficients, their significance, and direct and indirect effects.

**Table 3. Structural Model Results**

Path	Direct Effect	Indirect Effect	Total Effect	t-value	p-value	Hypothesis Status
Knowledge Sharing → Cross-Functional Collaboration	0,320	0,000	0,320	5,270	0,000	Supported
Knowledge Sharing → Innovation Success	0,240	0,114	0,354	3,870	0,000	Supported
Cross-Functional Collaboration → Innovation Success	0,380	0,000	0,380	6,010	0,000	Supported
Adaptive Leadership → Cross-Functional Collaboration	0,300	0,000	0,300	4,950	0,000	Supported

Adaptive Leadership → Innovation Success	0,290	0,100	0,390	4,680	0,000	Supported
--	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-----------

Source: Data Processed by Author, 2024

Table 3 displays the results of the path analysis, including direct and indirect effects. All hypothesized paths were significant at the 0.05 level, supporting the proposed relationships among knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, adaptive leadership, and innovation success. The total effects account for both direct and indirect relationships, demonstrating the total impact of each construct on the dependent variables.

### 3. R-Squared Values

Table 4 presents the R<sup>2</sup> values for the endogenous constructs.

**Table 4. R-Squared Values for Endogenous Constructs**

Endogenous Construct	R <sup>2</sup> Value
Cross-Functional Collaborati	0,410
Innovation Success	0,520

Source: Data Processed by Author, 2024

As shown in Table 4, the R<sup>2</sup> value for cross-functional collaboration is 0.410, indicating that 41% of the variance in cross-functional collaboration is explained by knowledge sharing and adaptive leadership. The R<sup>2</sup> value for innovation success is 0.520, signifying that 52% of the variance in innovation success can be attributed to the predictors in the model.

### 4. Effect Size

Table 5 summarizes the effect sizes (f<sup>2</sup>) for each path in the model.

**Table 5. Effect Sizes (f<sup>2</sup>) for Path Relationships**

Path	f <sup>2</sup> Value	Effect Size
Knowledge Sharing → Cross-Functional Collaboration	0,163	Medium
Knowledge Sharing → Innovation Success	0,117	Small
Cross-Functional Collaboration → Innovation Success	0,224	Medium
Adaptive Leadership → Cross-Functional Collaboration	0,138	Medium
Adaptive Leadership → Innovation Success	0,126	Medium

Source: Data Processed by Author, 2024

Table 5 provides the effect sizes for each path relationship. The results show medium effect sizes for most relationships, indicating that knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, and adaptive leadership significantly impact innovation success.

### 5. Predictive Relevance

Table 6 shows the predictive relevance (Q<sup>2</sup>) for the endogenous constructs.

**Table 6. Predictive Relevance (Q<sup>2</sup>) Results**

Endogenous Construct	Q <sup>2</sup> Value
Cross-Functional Collaborati	0,298
Innovation Success	0,412

Source: Data Processed by Author, 2024

The predictive relevance values in Table 6 suggest that both constructs have strong predictive relevance, with Q<sup>2</sup> values greater than zero, confirming the model's ability to predict outcomes effectively.

## Discussion

### 1. Knowledge Sharing and Innovation Success

The study confirms that knowledge sharing has a direct and significant impact on innovation success ( $\beta = 0.240, p < 0.05$ ). This result aligns with previous research



suggesting that the exchange of knowledge among employees facilitates creativity and the development of innovative solutions (Bock et al., 2005). Knowledge sharing fosters an environment where individuals can leverage each other's expertise, leading to more comprehensive problem-solving capabilities. Moreover, the indirect effect of knowledge sharing on innovation success, mediated by cross-functional collaboration ( $\beta = 0.114$ ), emphasizes the importance of collaborative practices in amplifying the effects of knowledge sharing. This supports the notion that knowledge sharing alone is insufficient for innovation; rather, it must be coupled with collaboration across different functional areas to fully realize its potential (Yuan & Woodman, 2010).

## **2. Cross-Functional Collaboration as a Mediator**

The significant direct effect of cross-functional collaboration on innovation success ( $\beta = 0.380$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) underscores its vital role in enhancing organizational innovation capabilities. Cross-functional collaboration facilitates the integration of diverse perspectives and expertise, leading to richer idea generation and innovative outputs (Pérez-Nordtvedt et al., 2008). The finding that 41% of the variance in cross-functional collaboration is explained by knowledge sharing and adaptive leadership ( $R^2 = 0.410$ ) suggests that organizations must prioritize these areas to cultivate effective collaborative environments. Additionally, the effect size of cross-functional collaboration ( $f^2 = 0.224$ ) indicates that it is a significant driver of innovation success. This aligns with studies emphasizing the critical role of cross-functional teams in enhancing performance and innovation through collective problem-solving and resource pooling (Kahn, 1996).

## **3. Role of Adaptive Leadership**

The positive relationship between adaptive leadership and both cross-functional collaboration ( $\beta = 0.300$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) and innovation success ( $\beta = 0.290$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ) reinforces the importance of leadership style in fostering innovation. Adaptive leaders are characterized by their ability to navigate complex environments, encourage experimentation, and empower teams to collaborate effectively (Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009). The findings suggest that organizations should invest in leadership development programs that focus on adaptive leadership competencies, which can enhance both collaboration and innovation outcomes. Furthermore, the indirect effect of adaptive leadership on innovation success through cross-functional collaboration ( $\beta = 0.100$ ) highlights the critical role of leaders in facilitating collaboration among teams. This emphasizes that leaders not only shape the organizational culture but also create the conditions necessary for successful knowledge sharing and collaboration.

## **4. Theoretical Contributions**

This study contributes to the literature on innovation management by providing empirical evidence of the interconnectedness between knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, adaptive leadership, and innovation success. It extends the understanding of how these constructs interact to create a conducive environment for innovation. The findings challenge the traditional view of innovation as a linear process, highlighting instead the dynamic and interdependent nature of knowledge sharing and collaboration across organizational boundaries (Fagerberg, 2005). Additionally, this research underscores the necessity for organizations to adopt a holistic approach to innovation, integrating leadership, knowledge management, and collaborative practices. The results suggest that future research should explore other contextual factors, such as organizational culture and technology, that may influence these relationships.

## 5. Practical Implications

The findings have several practical implications for managers seeking to enhance innovation within their organizations. First, fostering a culture of knowledge sharing should be a strategic priority. Organizations can implement formal mechanisms such as knowledge management systems, training programs, and incentives to encourage employees to share their insights and expertise (Nonaka et al., 2000). Second, promoting cross-functional collaboration can lead to significant improvements in innovation outcomes. Managers should create opportunities for employees from different departments to work together on projects, fostering a culture of teamwork and collaboration. This can be achieved through the establishment of cross-functional teams or task forces that focus on specific innovation initiatives (Ancona & Caldwell, 1992). Lastly, organizations should invest in leadership development programs that cultivate adaptive leadership skills among their managers. Leaders play a pivotal role in shaping organizational culture and facilitating collaboration, making their development crucial for driving innovation (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Training programs that focus on fostering adaptive leadership competencies can empower leaders to effectively manage change, encourage experimentation, and support collaborative practices.

## 6. Limitations and Future Research Directions

Despite the valuable insights provided by this study, several limitations warrant consideration. First, the cross-sectional design of the research restricts the ability to draw causal inferences from the findings. Longitudinal studies could provide deeper insights into the causal relationships among the constructs over time. Second, the study relied on self-reported measures, which may introduce response bias. Future research could incorporate objective measures of innovation outcomes and collaboration to triangulate the findings. Third, the study focused on a specific context, and the generalizability of the results may be limited. Future research should explore these relationships in different industries and cultural settings to enhance the external validity of the findings. Lastly, further investigations could examine the role of additional variables, such as organizational culture, technological advancements, and external partnerships, in influencing the dynamics of knowledge sharing, collaboration, and innovation.

## CONCLUSION

This study highlights the essential roles of knowledge sharing, cross-functional collaboration, and adaptive leadership in driving innovation success. The findings underscore the importance of strategic convergence in fostering a collaborative and innovative organizational culture. By prioritizing these constructs, organizations can enhance their innovation capabilities and better navigate the complexities of today's dynamic business environment. The study contributes to the existing literature by providing empirical evidence of the interrelationships among these constructs and offering practical insights for managers aiming to foster innovation within their organizations.

## Reference

Ancona, D. G., & Caldwell, D. F. (1992). Bridging the boundary: External activity and performance in organizational teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 634–665.

- Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), 99–120.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. sage.
- Bock, G.-W., Zmud, R. W., Kim, Y.-G., & Lee, J.-N. (2005). Behavioral intention formation in knowledge sharing: Examining the roles of extrinsic motivators, social-psychological forces, and organizational climate. *MIS Quarterly*, 87–111.
- Chin, W. W. (1998). The partial least squares approach to structural equation modeling. *Modern Methods for Business Research*, 295(2), 295–336.
- Cohen, J. (2016). *A power primer*.
- Cummings, J. N. (2004). Work groups, structural diversity, and knowledge sharing in a global organization. *Management Science*, 50(3), 352–364.
- DeRue, D. S. (2011). Adaptive leadership theory: Leading and following as a complex adaptive process. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 31, 125–150.
- Edmondson, A. C., & Nembhard, I. M. (2009). Product development and learning in project teams: The challenges are the benefits. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 26(2), 123–138.
- Fiedler, F. E. (1967). *A THEORY OF LEADERSHIP EFFECTIVENESS*. MCGRAW-HILL SERIES IN MANAGEMENT.
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). *Structural equation models with unobservable variables and measurement error: Algebra and statistics*. Sage Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA.
- Gibson, C. B., & Birkinshaw, J. (2004). The antecedents, consequences, and mediating role of organizational ambidexterity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(2), 209–226.
- Griffin, A., & Hauser, J. R. (1996). Integrating R&D and marketing: A review and analysis of the literature. *Journal of Product Innovation Management: An International Publication of the Product Development & Management Association*, 13(3), 191–215.
- Hair Jr, J. F., LDS Gabriel, M., Silva, D. da, & Braga, S. (2019). Development and validation of attitudes measurement scales: fundamental and practical aspects. *RAUSP Management Journal*, 54(4), 490–507.
- Hair Jr, J. F., Matthews, L. M., Matthews, R. L., & Sarstedt, M. (2017). PLS-SEM or CB-SEM: updated guidelines on which method to use. *International Journal of Multivariate Data Analysis*, 1(2), 107–123.
- Heifetz, R. A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Harvard business press.
- Kahn, K. B. (1996). Interdepartmental integration: a definition with implications for product development performance. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 13(2), 137–151.
- Lin, H. (2007). Knowledge sharing and firm innovation capability: an empirical study. *International Journal of Manpower*, 28(3/4), 315–332.
- Nonaka, I., Toyama, R., & Konno, N. (2000). SECI, Ba and leadership: a unified model of dynamic knowledge creation. *Long Range Planning*, 33(1), 5–34.
- O Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2004). The ambidextrous organization. *Harvard Business Review*, 82(4), 74–83.
- Pérez-Nordtvedt, L., Payne, G. T., Short, J. C., & Kedia, B. L. (2008). An entrainment-

- based model of temporal organizational fit, misfit, and performance. *Organization Science*, 19(5), 785–801.
- Ringle, C. M., Sarstedt, M., & Straub, D. W. (2012). Editor's comments: a critical look at the use of PLS-SEM in "MIS Quarterly". *MIS Quarterly*, iii–xiv.
- Sarstedt, M., Hair, J. F., Pick, M., Liengard, B. D., Radomir, L., & Ringle, C. M. (2022). Progress in partial least squares structural equation modeling use in marketing research in the last decade. *Psychology and Marketing*, 39(5), 1035–1064. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.21640>
- Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509–533.
- Uhl-Bien, M., & Marion, R. (2009). Complexity leadership in bureaucratic forms of organizing: A meso model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20(4), 631–650.
- Von Krogh, G., Ichijo, K., & Nonaka, I. (2000). *Enabling knowledge creation: How to unlock the mystery of tacit knowledge and release the power of innovation*. Oxford university press.
- Yuan, F., & Woodman, R. W. (2010). Innovative behavior in the workplace: The role of performance and image outcome expectations. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53(2), 323–342.
- Yukl, G., & Mahsud, R. (2010). Why flexible and adaptive leadership is essential. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(2), 81.