Master Educational Sciences

Learning in Organizations: Thesis

Innovative Work Behavior: the Dynamics Between Employee and Context

Name: Jeroen Hellings

Student number: 6600069

Utrecht University

First assessor: Isolde Kolkhuis-Tanke

Second assessor: Mayke Vereijken

Date: June 2020

Words: 7648

Abstract

In this research a qualitative view on the topic of Innovative Work Behavior (IWB) is presented. Contemporary organizations need to be innovative in order to survive in a competitive environment. Although a vast majority of organizations has innovation set high on their priority list, seventy percent of these organizations perceive their ability to innovate as moderate. Factors in the organizational climate that influence employees' IWB are already identified in previous research, with Leader Member Exchange and social capital as dominant theories behind these factors. The present research contributes to this by providing an extensive explanation of the way in which dynamics between an individual employee and its context (i.e. its manager and co-workers) either hinder or promote the process of IWB. Six promoting and three hindering dynamics were explained.

Keywords: Innovative Work Behavior, Leader Member Exchange, Social Capital, Dynamics

Contemporary organizations need to be innovative to survive in their competitive business environment. Research in the field of creativity and innovation shows general agreement upon this statement (e.g. Lyons, Chatman, & Joyce, 2007; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Nijhof, Krabbendam, & Looise, 2002). The fast-changing world in which organizations have to operate nowadays forces them to keep their knowledge, processes, and products up-to-date. Nijhof et al. strikingly explained the current situation by stating that "the competitive advantage of today is tomorrow's common practice" (p. 675). In order to stay ahead of their competitors, organizations need employees who constantly generate and implement new ideas.

A quick scan through the mission and vision statements of a few prominent organizations in the Netherlands reveals that innovation is a popular and recurring theme. A top-three Dutch bank described that it "creates a culture of innovation and collaboration" (ABN Amro, 2019) and a big manufacturer of electronic devices and health care equipment stated it wants to "make the world healthier and more sustainable through innovation" (Philips, 2019). Even governmental organizations, such as the Dutch Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, strive to have employees that "are open to new ideas and want to keep learning" (Ministerie van OCW, 2019). Although organizations in varying branches share their eagerness to innovate, different studies indicate that the situation on the work floor can be remarkably different (Michaelis & Markahm, 2017; Taylor & Wagner, 2014).

Research showed a vast majority of organizations view innovation as a top three priority and increase their spending on innovation every year. However, seventy percent of these organizations perceive their capability to innovate as moderate. (Michaelis & Markahm, 2017; Taylor & Wagner, 2014). This indicates that certain factors within an organizational climate are hindering innovative actions on the work floor. Factors that determine the extent to which employees show Innovative Work Behavior (IWB), which is the generation,

promotion, and realization of new ideas, were already identified in previous research (Scott & Bruce, 1994). However, available research only provided a general description of factors that are fundamental for IWB. An in-depth description of the meaning and underlying mechanisms of these factors is missing.

The contribution that employees individually make to the innovation of an organization through IWB is a crucial, social process and demands for a more in-depth inquiry on what actually happens on the work floor during these stages of idea generation, promotion, and realization (Axtell et al., 2000). The present research is theoretically relevant, because it does not provide an abstract description of organizational factors that influence IWB, but gives insight into the mechanisms that evolve on the work floor during this process. The outcomes of this research are of practical relevance, because a deeper understanding of the organizational factors that influence IWB enables organizations to effectively manage the IWB-process, which can lead to more innovation (de Jong & den Hartog, 2008).

Theoretical Framework

Definition of Innovative Work Behavior

According to de Jong and den Hartog (2007) innovative behavior is an over-arching construct that contains all sets of behaviors that individuals can use to increase organizational innovation. De Jong and den Hartog view IWB as a two-staged process of idea generation and application behavior that takes place in a work role, group, or organization. Janssen's (2000) definition of IWB slightly differs from de Jong and den Hartog's view. Janssen sees IWB as "the intentional creation, introduction and application of new ideas within a work role, group or organization, in order to benefit role performance, the group, or the organization" (p. 288). In this definition three stages in the innovation process are distinguished instead of two.

This three-staged process of innovation origins from Scott and Bruce's (1994) conceptualization of IWB. The authors stated that IWB consists out of three, discontinuous

stages: a) idea generation, b) idea promotion, and c) idea realization. During the generation stage problems are recognized and ideas are generated. During the promotion stage an employee has to build sponsorship for its new idea and form a coalition of supporters. The last stage encompasses the production of a prototype or model that can be used to implement the innovation.

This three-staged model enables researches to make a more precise distinction within the process of idea application, because it divides the application of an idea into a stage of idea promotion and idea realization. This more specific conceptualization of IWB is in best alignment with the present research's aim to get a deeper understanding of the organizational factors that influence IWB. Furthermore, more recent studies (e.g. Kheng, June, & Mahmood, 2013; Shanker et al., 2017) also used Janssen's and Scott and Bruce's conceptualization to investigate which factors influence IWB. These factors are discussed in the next section.

Organizational Factors Influencing IWB

In literature, different organizational factors that influence IWB were identified. Although there is some variation in the definition of these factors, they can generally be divided into three themes: a) organizational climate, b) leader member exchange (LMX), and c) social capital (Kheng et al., 2013). By defining the three themes a comprehensive framework is provided that gives insight in what factors influence IWB. In the next sections these three concepts will be further defined.

Organizational climate. The internal environment of an organization can be seen as organizational climate (Kissi, Dainty, &, Liu, 2012). Scott and Bruce (1994) stress that the degree to which employees perceive the organizational climate as supportive for innovation influences IWB. Although the researchers found a significant relation between supportive organizational climate and IWB, it was still rather weak. Kheng et al. (2013) found stronger, supportive evidence for this relation and identified a *pro-innovation organizational climate* as

6

influencer of IWB. Kheng et al. define a pro-innovation organizational climate as an organizational climate that encourages and expects employees to come up with new ideas without punishing or criticizing them.

Furthermore, the researchers emphasize the fact that innovation is a social process, especially during the idea promotion and realization phase, because the success of this phase is based on the degree of involvement of co-workers (Axtell et al., 2000). In general, IWB is considered as discrete or *extra role behavior*, which means it is not described and it is often not rewarded. Therefore it is important that the organizational climate supports employees to show this kind of behavior (Janssen, 2000; Shenker et al., 2017).

Because of the social nature of IWB the present research will focus on two factors within the organizational climate that are identified as influencers of IWB: LMX and social capital (de Jong & den Hartog, 2007; de Jong & den Hartog, 2008; Kheng et al., 2013). LMX addresses the dynamic relationship between an employee and its manager (Barbuto and Hayden, 2011) and social capital reflects on the interactions between an employee and its co-workers (Prusac & Cohen, 2001).

Leader Member Exchange.

LMX was introduced in the 1970s as a social exchange theory that focused on the quality of a leader-follower relationship. (Martin, Guillaume, Thomas, Lee, & Epitropaki, 2016). LMX stresses that every unique leader-follower relationship contains of dyadic, reciprocal, and social exchanges (Wang, Fang, Qureshi, & Janssen, 2015). Both leaders and followers should actively engage in this relationship, in order to achieve a high quality LMX (Kheng et al., 2013). According to Liden, Sparrowe, and Wayne (1997) leaders exchange strategic advice, social support, feedback, decision-making latitude, and interesting tasks with followers in order to achieve a high-quality LMX. Followers invest in a high quality

relationship by sharing valuable information, performing well, and demonstrating commitment to the leader.

Research has proven that a high quality LMX is positively related to IWB (Kheng et al., 2013, Scott & Bruce, 1994; Wang et al., 2015). According to Liden et al. (1997) idea generation can be improved by high quality LMX, because of an increased level of information exchange between leader and follower. Janssen (2000) stated that employees will respond more innovatively to a high job demand if they feel fairly rewarded by the organization. These fair rewards consist of high quality social exchanges, which indicates employees will feel fairly rewarded when a high quality LMX exists.

Social Capital

In addition to a high quality leader-follower relationship, the relationship between co-workers was also identified to affect IWB (Kheng et al., 2013). This relationship is defined as social capital and can be reviewed from different levels, but for the purpose of the present study, which focuses on individual IWB, the individual level of social capital will be taken into account (Lauzikas & Dailydaite, 2015). From this perspective, social capital can be seen as a social relation-working network that is bounded by mutual trust, understanding, support, and shared values and behaviors to enable innovative collaboration (Prusac & Cohen, 2001).

Mura, Lettieri, Radaelli, and Spiller (2013) distinguish between two types of social capital: structural and relational social capital. Structural social capital refers to the width of an employee's network and relational social capital to the strength of the employees' relationship with other individuals. According to the authors, a high level of perceived social capital leads to sharing of best practices and mistakes. Especially employees with a high perceived structural social capital will actively engage in idea promotion and implementation by sharing knowledge (Mura et al., 2013). Knowledge sharing through socializing is of great importance for knowledge workers to innovate (Tovstiga, 1999).

The Present Study

There is clear evidence available providing insight into which factors in the organizational climate affect IWB. A high-quality relationship between an employee and its manager (i.e. LMX) and a broad network consisting of high quality relations between an individual employee and its co-workers (i.e. social capital) enhances IWB. The present study aims to provide a deeper understanding of which dynamics on the work floor between an individual employee and its context either promote or hinder this high quality LMX and social capital and subsequent to that; the process of IWB. Therefore, the following research question is composed: In what way do dynamics on the work floor between an individual employee and its context hinder or promote the process of IWB?

In order to provide a solid answer to this question, the following two sub-questions are composed: In what way do dynamics on the work floor between an individual employee and its manager hinder or promote the process of IWB? And: In what way do dynamics on the work floor between an individual employee and its co-workers hinder or promote the process of IWB? In the next section the research methods will be explained.

Method

Research Design

The present research can be seen as a qualitative research, because it focused on interpreting and contextualizing meanings from people's beliefs and practices (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). A case study research design was used to execute an in-depth analysis of an individual unit (Baskarada, 2014). It enabled a situation to be described and explained (Medina & Lavado, 2005). This type of research design best served the purpose of the present research, because it aimed to give insight into individual employees' experiences with the dynamics that evolved between them and their co-workers and managers during the process of IWB. Therefore, the present research followed a constructivist approach (Guba & Lincoln,

1989). It focused on the mental and social constructions that individuals derived through social interaction.

Participants

The case study was executed amongst highly educated employees of seven Dutch innovation-oriented service business organizations that operate in different sectors. Available literature did not provide specific indications about what criteria an organization should meet in order to be innovation-oriented. Therefore, the present research used the following criteria to define an organization as innovation-oriented: a) an organization should mention innovation in its mission and vision statement or b) use innovation as core organizational value.

Purposive sampling was used to select rich cases from this population (Neuman, 2014). Participants were employed in aviation, marketing, media, it, retail, engineering, and real estate. Table 1 provides a brief description of the seven organizations participants were employed at based on descriptions from organizational documents (e.g. year reports). Due to COVID-19 restrictions it was not possible to include participants that were active in one sector.

A total of eight people, five male and three female, participated with an average age of $M = 24.9$ ($SD = 2.59$). The sample consisted of employees that were working in operations with little to no management responsibilities and an average of $M = 2.69$ ($SD = 1.16$) years of work experience.

The choice to only include participants below the age of forty was made based on Schaffer et al.'s (2012) study in which the researchers implicated that younger employees' motivational drive to innovate is higher than older employees' drive, because of younger employees' high growth needs and need for job variety. It was expected these participants would provide rich data because of their expected active attitude towards innovation. Due to

COVID-19 restrictions a limited amount of people was able to participate in the present research. Therefore it was important to use data-triangulation (Wilson, 2014).

Table 1. *Brief description of participants' organizations including participants employed.*

Sector	Organizational description	*n* Participants
Media	Umbrella organization for Dutch broadcasters with approximately 450 employees.	1
Marketing	Publicity agency with main focus on automotive sector with approximately 35 employees.	1
Engineering	Dutch engineering organization with international orientation with approximately 1100 employees.	1
Aviation	Dutch airline and tour operator with approximately 200 employees	1
Retail	Dutch organization specialized in VR entertainment with approximately 40 employees.	2
IT	Dutch branch of an international organization specialized in media monitoring with approximately 30 employees.	1
Real estate	Dutch real estate consultancy firm with approximately 10 employees	1

Instruments

In order to get richer and fuller data, data-triangulation was used (Wilson, 2014), using two different data sources: semi-structured interviews in combination with using the card method (de Blouw, Kolkhuis Tanke, & Sprenger, 2013) and relevant organizational

documents. In addition, participants vary in function (e.g. urban planner and account manager) to enable the inclusion of different perspectives on the research topic.

The research question and sub-questions were answered using semi-structured interviews. A topic list was used to structure the interviews (see Appendix A). Topics were formed based on relevant theories that are described in the theoretical framework. The topic list consisted out of two main topics; LMX and social capital.

Subsequent to that, LMX consisted out of seven sub-topics. Two examples of sub-topics for LMX were: a) active engagement (Kheng et al., 2013) and b) follower shares valuable information (Liden et al., 1997). Social capital consisted out of six sub-topics. Two examples of sub-topics for social capital were: a) mutual trust (Prusac & Cohen, 2001) and b) broadness of network (Mura et al., 2013).

Every sub-topic was translated to Dutch with the purpose of forming an interview guide in Dutch, as all participants had Dutch as first language. The translation was then checked by a native Dutch speaker who had an expert level in English (CAE level), in order to increase the reliability of the translation. Based on the sub-topics an interview guide was formed (see Appendix B). The interviewer used question from the interview guide as central structure for the interviews and asked probing questions in order to get a full understanding of the dynamics that evolved on the work floor during the process of IWB.

Two examples of questions regarding LMX were: a) Could you maybe describe a moment in which you successfully managed to innovate and in which your manager played a role? and b) Has your manager also been a hindrance? If so, how did you deal with this? Two examples of questions regarding social capital were: a) Could you maybe describe a moment in which you successfully managed to innovate and in which your co-workers played a role? and b) Have your co-workers also been a hindrance? If so, how did you deal with this?

In addition to this interview guide the card method (de Blouw, Kolkhuis Tanke, & Sprenger, 2013) was used to structure the interview and obtain richer data. For the topic LMX the participant was asked to sort nine cards in order of importance during the interview, using an online Google spreadsheet that was visible for the participant and the interviewer. Every card described a single sub-topic in Dutch. After sorting the cards from most important to least important the respondent was asked to explain its choices. The same process was used for social capital with six different cards.

Organizational documents (e.g. mission statements and year reports) were reviewed to get deeper insight into the context participants were operating in. Only publicly shared documents that were made available on corporate websites were included in the review. Information from this sources was used to give a brief description of the organizations participants were employed at.

Procedure

In March 2020, eight employees of Dutch innovation-oriented organizations were contacted through LinkedIn and Whatsapp to participate in an online interview. When the participant approved, the interview was scheduled and the participant received an email with an informed consent form (see Appendix C), a link to a conference call, and a link to the Google spreadsheet that was used for the card method during the interview. The participant was requested to sign and return the informed consent form prior to the interview.

Every interview lasted 45 to 60 minutes. The interviews were held in Dutch, because all participants were native in this language. This way possible misunderstandings due to linguistic barriers were prevented, which increased the validity of the research. At the start of the interview it was stated that all information provided by the respondent would be handled with great care for confidentiality. This was done to create an atmosphere in which the

respondent felt free to give honest insight into its experiences and practices, which ensured reliability.

All interviews were recorded, audio only, with permission of the participants. Interviews were transcribed afterwards. A copy of the transcript was then sent to each participant for a member check, in order to enable a participant to review if the transcript was in alignment with the information the participant intended to provide during the interview. This also gave participants the opportunity to provide additional insights after the interviews were conducted. The member check was executed to increase the validity of the research (Birt, Scott, Cavers, Campbell, & Walter, 2016). In two cases minor adjustments were made to a transcript in order to guarantee the respondent's, or its employers anonymity.

Data analysis

The transcripts were imported in Excel and divided into fragments. The fragments then were labeled as answers of either sub-question one or sub-question two. During the next step each fragment was coded as helping or promoting for IWB. In order to answer the two sub-questions, a template analysis was used (Brooks, McCluskey, Turley, & King, 2015). The fragments were coded in English using a template consisting of topics from the topic list. The main code LMX consisted out of eleven sub-codes and the main code social capital consisted out of six sub-codes.

After coding the first interview, three changes were made to the original template: a) the sub-code 'feedback' was also made available for social capital and b) the sub-codes 'effective communication' and 'reaching agreement' were added to the template. After coding the second and third interview, four additional changes were made to the template: a) the sub-codes 'proposing innovative initiative' and 'perspective' were added, b) the sub-code 'mutual understanding' was also made available for social capital, and c) the main code 'extra' was added to structure all the new and changed sub-codes.

An audit trail was executed in which a peer researcher coded one interview in order to increase inter-observer reliability (Thompson, McCaughan, Cullum, Sheldon, & Raynor, 2004). Afterwards disagreements in coding were discussed. In order to reach consensus, minor changes were made to the description of two sub-codes. Then the optimized template (see Appendix C) was used to code all transcripts.

Results

The two sub-questions were used as framework in order to structure the result section. First, sub-question one was answered: In what way do dynamics on the work floor between an individual employee and its manager hinder or promote the process of IWB? Then sub-question two is answered: In what way do dynamics on the work floor between an individual employee and its co-workers hinder or promote the process of IWB?

Employee–Manager Dynamics

After analyzing the interviews three dynamics within the relationship between an employee and its manager were found promoting for the process of IWB: the exchange of decision making latitude, the exchange of feedback, and quality of the employee-manager relationship. Two dynamics within this relationship were found hindering the process of IWB: the exchange of non-empathic feedback, and a lack of exchange of concrete tasks.

The exchange of decision making latitude. All participants consider decision making latitude as an important promoting dynamic for the process of IWB. Participants state they feel ownership over their innovative idea when their manager gives space in deciding how to promote and realize an idea. Participants explain they experience decision making latitude when their manager tells them to promote and realize an idea without constantly having to get approval for going through every step of the promotion and realization stage. In this case, participants often only have to present the end result (i.e. a realizable idea).

A quote from one of the interviews describes how a manager exchanges decision making latitude to a participant: *"Actually I did that without permission of my supervisor, because at that time he said like, you know, this is just a thing that you can easily handle yourself, so do whatever you think is right."* This quote illustrates that the manager explicitly told the participant he does not need to approve every step in the process of IWB. Several participants state this degree of autonomy in promoting and realizing a new idea motivates them throughout the entire process. Two participants add to this thesis that experiencing decision making latitude increases their motivation to show more IWB in the future as well.

The exchange of feedback. The fact that all participants state decision making latitude promotes their IWB does not mean employees lack interest in their manager's opinion about their ideas. In fact, all participants consider feedback provided by their manager as promoting for their IWB. A majority of participants tend to ask their manager for confirmation, especially when taking a decision that can have big consequences for the organization, such as increasing costs. The following quote illustrates how a participant asks its manager feedback in order to make a decision on how to spend a budget:

> *"So we looked at it and we compared it to what I had figured out, I mean my offer, my quote. And we also discussed it with my manager like 'what is the best option according to you?' And then it became clear his option was better. So we choose his option and proceeded."*

The quote indicates that the manager's feedback influences the participant's choices during the process of IWB.

Participants state they feel more confident about their choices when they have asked their manager for feedback. This thesis is supported by several participants who state they, in such a case, tailor their actions to their manager's feedback. Three participants add to this statement that they receive reflective feedback on their actions with the goal of learning from

mistakes. They consider this type of feedback to be promoting for their IWB if a manager provides feedback in a critical and appreciative manner.

Quality of the employee-manager relationship. Seven participants state a high quality relationship with their manager is a promoting dynamic for their process of IWB. According to five participants a high quality relationship is dyadic and build on mutual trust. A participant explains that mutual trust means that a manager trusts an employee to perform well and, in return, an employee trusts a manager to provide valuable feedback. The participants consider a high quality relationship to be fundamental for the exchange of other promoters of IWB, such as feedback and decision making latitude.

Three participants distinguish between a social and professional relationship with their manager. Participants invest in the social relationship by discussing informal topics with their manager in order to increase the quality of their professional relationship, which, according to them, promotes their IWB.

Hindering dynamics. Participants are less clear about dynamics within the relationship between them and their manager that hinder the process of IWB. Two dynamics stand out to some extent: a) the exchange of non-empathic feedback and b) a lack of exchange of interesting tasks.

The exchange of non-empathic feedback. Four participants point out that a manager exchanging non-empathic feedback can hinder the process of IWB. According to the participants such feedback can have non-empathic content, or a manager can exchange feedback in a non-empathic, or non-constructive way. In the following example a participants explains how its manager exchanges non-empathic feedback by saying:

> *"Then, that account director was very much like 'yes, why didn't you do that, that is*
>
> *logical thinking bladieblaa' and that was actually for our entire team. And then I had*

> *something like 'hey you could have said this differently.' So then I got a little*
>
> *frustrated."*

This quote indicates that a manager exchanging non-empathic feedback frustrates an employee, which could hamper an employee's motivation or confidence to show IWB in the future. Another participant confirms this by stating that its manager exchanging non-empathic feedback makes the participant feel pressured. In this case the participant experienced the content of the feedback as non-empathic because, although completing many tasks, the manager gave feedback on the one task that was not completed.

Lack of exchange of interesting tasks. Three participants state they are hindered in their IWB because their manager does not exchange interesting tasks. In two cases a manager provides a vaguely described task, which, according to the participants, hinders the process of idea generating. Participants state they do not have a clear vision on what ideas the manager expects them to generate.

In another case the manager does not exchange any interesting tasks at all. This results in an employee experiencing a decrease of motivation for showing IWB and eventually even leaving the organization. This indicates that, although it is the case with only one participant, consequences of falling short in exchanging interesting tasks can be major for both an organization and an employee.

Employee–Co-worker Dynamics

All participants describe IWB in relation to co-workers as a continues process. They share ideas and insights in order to achieve the best possible strategy for realizing the innovative idea. During this process three dynamics between an employee and its co-workers are especially promoting for the process of IWB: a) the exchange of co-worker support b) the exchange and use of co-workers' perspectives and c) mutual understanding between the

induvial employee and its co-workers. One dynamic within this relationship, namely a lack of mutual understanding, clearly hinders the process of IWB.

The exchange of co-worker support. Seven participants experience receiving co-worker support as promoting for their IWB. Participants receive two different types of co-worker support. First, co-workers exchange support by expressing appreciation for the work a participant has delivered. A participant for instance describes his motivation to show IWB increases when a co-worker exchanges compliments about an idea that the participant realized.

Second, co-workers support participants by executing certain tasks that help with realizing a new idea. A participant describes, for instance, that a group of co-workers help sending a newly developed marketing email to their personal client base which increases the success of its new idea and therefor is promoting for its IWB.

The exchange and use of co-workers' perspectives. Another promotor of IWB, which could arguably be considered as third type of co-worker support, is the exchange and use of co-workers' perspectives. Seven participants stress the importance of using co-workers' perspectives in order to increase the quality of their generated idea. Participants describe they collect co-workers' insights trough social interaction. They emphasize on the importance of individual expertise.

A quote from one of the interviews illustrates how this social interaction works: *"She often changes my mind so to say. When I am with her, we talk and then we really gain new insights together."* This quote shows collecting co-workers' perspectives is a cooperative process according to the participant, in which it is possible to not only collect, but also exchange perspectives.

Other participants explain that, by interacting about their generated idea, they bundle available expertise in order to determine what is the best next step to take in the realization

process. The majority of participants state they use multiple perspectives by socially interacting with a group of co-workers.

Mutual understanding between co-workers and employee. Six participants stress mutual understanding is a dynamic within the relationship between them and their co-workers that promotes their IWB. The participants qualify mutual understanding as basic condition for joint idea generation, promotion and realization. Participants give varying descriptions of what mutual understanding means. They for instance state mutual understanding means having no miscommunication or being able to empathize with co-workers.

One description that three participants use is that mutual understanding means that co-workers and individual employees know how they can benefit from each other. In order to reach mutual understanding co-workers should understand how they can benefit from a new idea and how they can help to realize this idea. Individual employees should, in turn, understand to which co-workers they can reach out to for support in realizing their new idea. The majority of this group experiences that increased mutual understanding increases co-worker support for their idea.

Two participants indicate that mutual understanding smoothens social interaction, because co-workers understand and therefor accept individual issues and individual expertise. This eases gaining support for a new ideas and leads to less conflicts during the realization stage, according to the participants.

Lack of mutual understanding. The dynamic between an individual employee and its co-workers that hinders the process of IWB; a lack of mutual understanding, is contrasting to the promoting dynamic described in the section above. In total five participants describe the absence of mutual understanding as hindering for their IWB, in which two distinctions can be made.

First, three participants feel hindered in showing IWB because they did not reach mutual understanding with their co-workers about the division of tasks. A participants explains this by saying:

> *"Another person supposed that I would take this up. Then I thought, I am just here for two weeks, you know, I don't know how things are handled here. So yeah, the issue was raised, but I didn't understand that I was supposed to take action."*

The quote indicates that IWB can be hindered by a lack of mutual understanding, because certain tasks that need to be executed in order to successfully realize a new idea can be overlooked. It is, in this case, possible that an individual employee does not understand the importance of such a task.

Second, participants feel hindered in showing IWB because of not reaching mutual understanding about the importance of a new idea. A participant, for instance, describes that its process of IWB is hindered because co-workers do not see the same chances as the participant does. The participant does not succeed in showing its co-workers that its new idea is beneficial for them. Therefore, the participant is not able to realize some generated ideas.

Conclusion and Discussion

The primary goal of the current research was to explain in what way certain dynamics that evolve on the work floor between an individual employee and its co-workers either hinder or promote the process of IWB. Therefore, the following research question was answered: In what way do dynamics on the work floor between an individual employee and its context hinder or promote the process of IWB?

The current research enabled the explanation of three manager-employee dynamics and three co-worker-employee dynamics that promote an individual employee's IWB: a) the exchange of decision making latitude, b) the exchange of feedback, c) the quality of the employee-manager relationship d) the exchange of co-worker support, e) the exchange and

use of co-workers' perspectives, and f) mutual understanding between an individual employee and its co-workers.

The picture that emerges from the analysis is one of IWB as an interactive, social process that is influenced by various dynamics between an employee and its manager or co-workers. Hindering and promoting dynamics between employees and managers are primary based on a position of dependency that an employee has on a manager. The dynamic involving the exchange of decision-making latitude explains how an employee's IWB is promoted by a decrease in this dependence. This is reached when a manager states it is not necessary to constantly ask for approval when going through the process of IWB.

In turn, the dynamic involving the exchange of feedback is explained as a way of using this dependency relationship to increase certainty before making choices. An employee seeks confirmation when taking decisions that can have big consequences. This indicates employees experience decision making latitude as promoting for IWB to a certain degree. When an employees feel they can be held responsible for consequences that can highly impact the organization, it promotes their IWB when they have the possibility to fall back on their manager by receiving its feedback on their ideas.

Contradictory to the employee-manager dynamics, the results of the current study indicate that dynamics between an employee and its co-workers are based on interdependency. Dynamics that promote IWB are especially exchanged when co-workers understand this interdependency by recognizing how they can benefit from a new idea. The exchange of support, by showing appreciation or providing help in executing tasks, and the exchange of new perspectives are both taking place under this circumstances and are both promoting for an employee's IWB.

As for the hindering dynamics of IWB the current research found that these dynamics in most cases are exact opposites of the promoting dynamics. However, a small difference is

recognized between the hindering dynamic of the employee-manager relationship and the hindering dynamic of the co-worker-employee relationship. The hindering dynamic involving a lack of mutual understanding means that co-workers do not understand how they are interdependent of an employee with a new idea. This could in turn hinder the exchange of both co-worker support and co-worker perspectives.

The hindering dynamic involving a manager exchanging non-empathic feedback results in employees feeling less motivated to show IWB in the future. However, this does not necessarily rule out the presence of decision-making latitude. This means that, although a manager exchanges non-empathic feedback, an employee's IWB could still be promoted by the exchange of decision-making latitude.

The results of the current research support Scott and Bruce's (1994) idea that IWB can be divided into three stages. The explained hindering and promoting dynamics seem to relate to idea generation, promotion and realization. Although, the dynamics primary focus on the last two stages of the process of IWB. Only the dynamic involving a lack of exchange of interesting tasks explained the hindrance of idea generation. The other dynamics explained how either idea promotion or generation are influenced.

This primary focus of the explained dynamics on idea promotion and realization is in alignment with Axtell et al.'s statement (2000) about IWB. The authors described that IWB is a social process, especially during the promotion and realization stage. Because the current research reviewed IWB from a social perspective it seems logical that explained hindering and promoting dynamics primary relate to those two stages of IWB, instead of the idea generation stage that is, according to Scott and Bruce (1994), about recognizing problems and generating new ideas. Previous studies also supported the idea of viewing idea generation as individual action (Björk, Di Vincenzo, Magnusson, Mascia, 2011; Salter, ter Wal, Criscuolo, Alexy, 2015).

When comparing the findings of the current research about hindering and promoting dynamics for IWB to the social exchanges that, according to Liden et al. (1997), enhance the quality of LMX, there are some similarities. The promoting dynamics for the process of IWB within the employee-manager relation match with several social exchanges that Liden et al. described as enhancers of the quality of LMX (e.g. decision making latitude or interesting tasks). The current research adds to this that the exchange of decision-making latitude and feedback are especially enhancing the quality of LMX during the process of IWB.

It is striking that when employees are asked about hindering or promoting dynamics for their IWB they specifically mention social exchanges that managers should exchange to them, instead of mentioning social exchange that employees should exchange to their manager. This does not seem to add up with Wang et al.'s (2015) statement that that a high quality LMX contains of reciprocal and dyadic exchanges.

An explanation for this can be found in Janssen's (2000) research who states that employees seek for fair rewards in the form of social exchanges when they show IWB. It could be argued that participants who described the promoting dynamics for IWB possibly experience those dynamics as rewards for their IWB. In return, employees show more IWB when they experience these promoting dynamics, which might be considered an improvement in their performance. An employee performing well, in turn, is defined as a dynamic that employees exchange with a manager in order to enhance the quality of the LMX (Liden et al., 1997). This would indicate participants experience the employee-manager relationship as reciprocal.

Further evidence for the reciprocal nature of the employee-manger relationship can be found in the by the current study provided explanation of when this relationship is of high quality. Respondents explained that a high quality relationship during the process of IWB is based on mutual trust, which of course is a dyadic approach on the employee-manager

relationship, because both employee and manager should invest in the relationship in order to achieve mutual trust. The explanation that the current research provided about when LMX can be considered of high quality during the process of IWB adds to the existing theoretical knowledge about LMX in relation to IWB.

The hindering dynamics for IWB, explained by the current research, that evolve in the employee-manager relationship are also in alignment with Janssen's (2000) research. If an employee experience its manager exchanges non-empathic feedback or lacks in exchanging interesting tasks an employee does not feel rewarded for the shown IWB. This could lead to employees responding less innovatively to high job demands (Janssen, 2000).

The findings of the current research about promoting dynamics for IWB within the employee-co-worker relationship show similarities with the definition of social capital given by Prusac and Cohen (2001). The exchange of support and the presence of mutual understanding between co-workers are part of the researchers' definition of social capital and are explained by participants as promoting for their IWB. Furthermore, the social nature of the relationship between an individual employee and its co-workers stand out. Participants described they interacted a lot with co-workers during their process of IWB, which indicates they engage in a social relation-working network (Prusac & Cohen, 2001).

An addition that the current research does to the existing theoretical knowledge about social capital in relation to IWB is that co-worker support during the process of IWB is specified in three types. These three types of co-worker support are: a) receiving appreciation from co-workers, b) receiving help in executing tasks during the realization process, and c) gaining new perspectives from co-workers on an innovative idea. Especially this third type of support is interesting because the majority of participants explicitly stated their IWB was promoted when they collected these new perspectives.

This promoting dynamic can be declared by reviewing a statement of Tovstiga (1999) who argued that, in order to be innovative, knowledge workers should share knowledge through socializing with others. It could be the case that when an employee is collecting co-workers' perspectives, mostly through group interaction, knowledge sharing through socializing takes place.

It seems possible that employees share tacit knowledge during this process, which is knowledge based on human experience (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995). According to Nonaka and Takeuchi an ideal condition for sharing tacit knowledge is employees' willingness to share what they know and use what they learn. This statement shows similarities with the explained dynamic that involves mutual understanding between co-workers. When co-workers understand how they benefit from each other's ideas and perspectives, they could be open to share tacit knowledge, and thus share their perspectives on an idea, which is promoting for IWB.

When reflecting on the limitations of the current research it could be argued that the decision to only include employees in the sample with little to no management responsibilities would declare why the identified hindering and promoting dynamics for IWB predominantly focus on what investments a manager should make to the employee-manager relationship. It could be possible that, when adding participants to the sample with more management responsibilities, this image would be more outbalanced.

In addition, the participants were asked to describe moments in which they succeeded in showing IWB in an extensive way, with the addition of several probing questions. Although this interview method was effective for creating an comprehensive view of the promoting dynamics of IWB, it could also explain why more promoting dynamics for IWB were identified than hindering dynamics. The focus in the interviews perhaps slightly leaned

more towards dynamics that are promoting for IWB than dynamics that are hindering for IWB.

Third, the criteria that were used to determine whether an organization is innovation-oriented were effective for distinguishing between innovation-oriented organizations and non-innovation-oriented organizations, though not theoretically supported. This means some degree of subjectivity was present in determining whether an employee was employed at an innovation-oriented organization and, therefore, could be included in the sample. When replicating the current research it is therefore important to inquire if there are new theoretical insights available on which criteria determine whether an organization is innovation-oriented.

After conducting the current research a few theoretical implications can be made about the LMX and social capital in relation to the process of IWB. Existing theories described different dynamics between an individual employee and its manager that could promote the process of IWB. The current research provided a deeper explanation of the mechanisms behind the dynamics involving the exchange of decision-making latitude and feedback. It was described how these at first sight contradicting dynamics both are promoting for an employee's IWB when exchanged at the right moment and in the right way.

In addition, the current research provided an explanation of when there is a high quality LMX during the process of IWB, namely when employees and managers experience a high degree of mutual trust. It was also explained how this high quality relationship, based on mutual trust, is fundamental for the exchange of decision-making latitude and feedback.

The third theoretical implication that can be done based on the findings of the current research is to provide a more concrete explanation of how co-worker support is promoting for an individual employee's IWB. An employee does not only experience support when co-workers express appreciation or help executing a task, it especially promotes their IWB when they can use co-workers' perspectives in order to enhance the quality of their new idea.

27

As for practical implications it could be suggested, based on the findings of the current research that managers should inquire in which moments employees want to experience decision-making latitude when going through the stages of IWB and at which moments employees want confirmation of their ideas, in the form of critical, yet appreciative feedback. In addition, it could be suggested that it is important for managers and employees to jointly explore how they can increase mutual trust. In this way the organizational environment can possibly be optimized so that it is more promoting for IWB.

A third implication for practice is that it could be beneficial for a group of co-workers to pay extra attention to whether they understand how they can benefit from each other. Especially during the promotion stage, when an employee has to build sponsorship for its new idea it may be effective for the employee to emphasize the benefits of its new idea to its co-workers, in order to increase mutual understanding.

After conducting the current research a few suggestions for future research came to the surface. First, it would be interesting to conduct a research similar to the current research but with a team or department of one organization used as sample, including managers. It would be interesting to see if it would affect the outcomes of the research if participants are members of the same team, and therefore cooperate during the process of IWB. It would also be interesting to gain more insights on how managers experience employees' process of IWB.

Reviewing the limitations of the current research it is suggested to conduct research on criteria that can be used to determine whether an organization is innovation-oriented. A theoretical foundation for these criteria does currently not exist. Developing a theoretical basis for these criteria can enhance the quality of other research on the topic of innovation or IWB.

Nevertheless, the current research has provided an in depth explanation of the dynamics within the relationship between an individual employee and its context that hinder or promote the process of IWB. It became clear that an employee's IWB is promoted if a

manager exchanges decision-making latitude, but also exchanges appreciative feedback on critical moments during the process of IWB, in order to give an employee a feeling of confirmation.

It also came to the surface that an employee's IWB is promoted when there is mutual understanding between the employee and its co-workers. This is the case when both parties understand how they can benefit from each other. This mutual understanding seemed to be fundamental for the exchange of co-worker support. These findings both extended theoretical knowledge about IWB in relation to LMX and social capital and raised interesting questions for future research.

References

Axtell, C. M., Holman, D. J., Unsworth, K. L., Wall, T. D., Waterson, P. E., & Harrington, E.

    (2000). Shopfloor innovation: Facilitating the suggestion and implementation of

    ideas. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, *73*(3), 265-285.

Baskarada, S. (2014). Qualitative case study guidelines. *Baškarada, S.(2014). Qualitative*

    case studies guidelines. The Qualitative Report, *19*(40), 1-25.

Birt, L., Scott, S., Cavers, D., Campbell, C., & Walter, F. (2016). Member checking: a tool to

    enhance trustworthiness or merely a nod to validation?. *Qualitative health*

    research, *26,* doi:10.1177/1049732316654870.

Björk, J., Di Vincenzo, F., Magnusson, M., & Mascia, D. (2011). The impact of social capital

    on ideation. *Industry and Innovation*, *18*, doi:10.1080/13662716.2011.591976.

de Blouw, H., Kolkhuis Tanke, I. R., & Sprenger, C. C. (2013). *Inzet op Maat*. Amsterdam,

    Nederland: Reed Business.

Brooks, J., McCluskey, S., Turley, E., & King, N. (2015). The utility of template analysis in

    qualitative psychology research. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *12,*

    doi:10.1080/14780887.2014.955224.

de Jong, J. P., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2007). How leaders influence employees' innovative

    behaviour. *European Journal of innovation management*, *10*(1), 41-64.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (2011) *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research*, SAGE

    Publications

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. Sage.

Hughes, D. J., Lee, A., Tian, A. W., Newman, A., & Legood, A. (2018). Leadership,

    creativity, and innovation: A critical review and practical recommendations. *The*

    Leadership Quarterly, *29,* doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.03.001.

Janssen, O. (2000). Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of Occupational and organizational psychology*, *73*(3), 287-302.

Kheng, Y. K., June, S., & Mahmood, R. (2013). The determinants of innovative work behavior in the knowledge intensive business services sector in Malaysia. *Asian Social Science*, *9,* doi:10.5539/ass.v9n15p47.

Kissi, J., Dainty, A., & Liu, A. (2012). Examining middle managers' influence on innovation in construction professional services firms: a tale of three innovations. *Construction Innovation*, *12,* doi:10.1108/14714171211197472.

Laužikas, M., & Dailydaitė, S. (2015). Impacts of social capital on transformation from efficiency to innovation-driven business. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, *16,* doi:10.3846/16111699.2012.754374.

Liden, R. C., Sparrowe, R. T., & Wayne, S. J. (1997). Leader-member exchange theory: The past and potential for the future. *Research in personnel and human resources management*, *15*, 47-120.

Medina, C. C., Lavado, A. C., & Cabrera, R. V. (2005). Characteristics of innovative companies: A case study of companies in different sectors. *Creativity and Innovation Management*, *14*(3), 272-287.

Moustaghfir, K., Schiuma, G., Mura, M., Lettieri, E., Radaelli, G., & Spiller, N. (2013). Promoting professionals' innovative behaviour through knowledge sharing: the moderating role of social capital. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *17,* doi:10.1108/JKM-03-2013-0105.

Nijhof, A., Krabbendam, K., & Looise, J. C. (2002). Innovation through exemptions: building upon the existing creativity of employees. *Technovation*, *22*(11), 675-683.

Organisatie ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap. (n.d.). Consulted on
December 30th 2019, from https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/ministeries/ministerie-van-
onderwijs-cultuur-en-wetenschap/organisatie

Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese
companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford university press.

Prusak, L., & Cohen, D. (2001). How to invest in social capital. *Harvard business
review*, *79*(6), 86-97.

Purpose & Strategie (n.d.) Consulted on December 30th 2019, from
https://www.abnamro.com/nl/over-abnamro/profiel/wie-zijn-wij/purpose-en-
strategie/index.html

Salter, A., Ter Wal, A. L., Criscuolo, P., & Alexy, O. (2015). Open for ideation: Individual-
level openness and idea generation in R&D. *Journal of Product Innovation
Management*, *32*, doi:10.1111/jpim.12214.

Schaffer, S., Kearney, E., Voelpel, S. C., & Koester, R. (2012). Managing demographic
change and diversity in organizations: how feedback from coworkers moderates the
relationship between age and innovative work behavior. In *Managing Diversity in
Organizations* (pp. 45-68). Gabler Verlag, Wiesbaden.

Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of
individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of management journal*, *37*(3), 580-
607.

Shanker, R., Bhanugopan, R., Van der Heijden, B. I., & Farrell, M. (2017). Organizational
climate for innovation and organizational performance: The mediating effect of
innovative work behavior. *Journal of vocational behavior*, *100*,
doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2017.02.004

Thompson, C., McCaughan, D., Cullum, N., Sheldon, T. A., & Raynor, P. (2004). Increasing
the visibility of coding decisions in team-based qualitative research in
nursing. *International journal of nursing studies*, *41*(1), 15-20.

Tovstiga, G. (1999). Profiling the knowledge worker in the knowledge-intensive organization:
emerging roles. *International Journal of Technology Management*, *18*(5), 731-744.

Vision & Mission (n.d.) Consulted on December 30th 2019, from https://www.philips.com/a-
w/research/vision-and-mission.html

Wilson, V. (2014). Research methods: triangulation. *Evidence based library and information
practice*, *9*(1), 74-75.

Appendices

Appendix A: Topic list and interview guide

Topic	Sub-topic	Sub-topics Dutch	Source
LMX	Active engagement	MDW toont betrokkenheid naar LG	Kheng et al. (2013)
	Quality of leader-follower relationship	Kwaliteit van relatie tussen MDW - LG	Martin et al. (2016)
	Leader exchanges: - Strategic advice - Social support - Feedback - Decision-making latitude - Interesting tasks	LG biedt: - Strategisch advise - Sociale ondersteuning - Feedback - Interessante taken - Ruimte om beslissingen te nemen	Liden et al. (1997)
	Follower shares valuable information	MDW deelt belangrijke informatie met LG	
	Follower performs well	MDW presteert goed	
	Follower demonstrates commitment to leader	MDW toont inzet naar LG	
	Follower feels fairly rewarded	MDW voelt zich eerlijk beloond	Janssen (2000)
Social capital	Mutual trust	Wederzijds vertrouwen	Prusac & Cohen (2001)
	Mutual understanding	Wederzijds begrip	
	Give and receive support	Ondersteuning krijgen en bieden aan collega's	
	Shared values and behavior	Gedeelde normen en waarden onder collega's	
	Sharing best practices and mistakes	Onderling delen van 'beste aanpak' en 'gemaakte fouten uit verleden'	Mura et al. (2013)
	Broadness of network	De grootte van het netwerk van een medewerker	Mura et al. (2013)

Interview Guide (in Dutch)

Deze interviewleidraad wordt gebruikt in mijn onderzoek naar *innovatief werkgedrag* van medewerkers in een dienstverlenende branche. Dit diepte-interview wordt individueel met u afgenomen omdat u werkt binnen een organisatie de ambitie heeft innovatief te zijn.

<u>Doel</u>

We kijken naar de vraag "Op welke manier bevorderen of belemmeren dynamieken op de werkvloer tussen een individuele medewerker en zijn context het vertonen van innovatief werkgedrag?" Door u te vragen in te zoomen op momenten waarop u het gevoel had dat het u lukte *innovatief werkgedrag* te vertonen probeer ik in kaart te brengen welke dynamieken hieraan ten grondslag liggen. Ik vraag je hierbij met name in te gaan op de relatie tussen jou en je leidinggevende en op de relatie tussen jou en je collega's.

<u>Aanpak</u>

Voorbereiding:

- Afspraak plannen voor interview en skype/zoom-uitnodiging versturen.

Voor interview:

- Welkom, mijn naam is Jeroen. In het kader van mijn master thesis voor de opleiding Educational Sciences voer ik dit onderzoek uit. Kun je wellicht iets meer over jezelf vertellen? (Je naam, hoelang ben je al werkzaam in het team, in welke functie, wat is je opleidingsachtergrond?)
- Voordat we verder gaan zou ik willen vragen of je het informed consent formulier hebt gelezen en ondertekend en of je deze zou willen overhandigen?
- Je gegevens worden geanonimiseerd en alle data worden vertrouwelijk verwerkt. Graag zou ik ons gesprek opnemen, vind je dit goed?
- Na afloop van dit interview maak ik een gespreksverslag, dit zou ik graag naar je toesturen zodat je kunt checken of alles goed is verwerkt. Naar welk emailadres mag ik het verslag sturen?
- Het interview duurt ongeveer 60 tot 90 minuten.
- In het onderzoek zoomen we in op *innovatief werkgedrag* hieronder versta ik: Het bewust creëren, introduceren en toepassen van nieuwe ideeën binnen je functie, groep of organisatie, om op deze manier de prestaties van jezelf, de groep of organisatie te verbeteren.
- Heb je nog vragen voordat we starten met het interview?

Interview:

1. *Het ijs breken en context in kaart brengen.*
a. Hoe is het om bij jouw organisatie te werken?
b. Hoe zou je jouw werkomgeving beschrijven?
c. Hoe kijkt jouw organisatie aan tegen het thema innovatie? Wat voor strategie is er op dit vlak?

2. *Een beeld krijgen van hoe de respondent het vertonen van innovatief werkgedrag momenteel ervaart.*
a. Hoe denk jij over innovatie?
b. Hoe zou jij jouw innovatieve gedrag momenteel beschrijven?
c. En als je dit eens vergelijkt met de strategie en ambitie van de organisatie, hoe verhoudt zich dit dan tot elkaar?

3. *Een beeld krijgen van hoe de dynamieken tussen medewerker en leidinggevende van invloed zijn op het innovatieve werkgedrag van de medewerker.*
a. Zou je mij eens mee kunnen nemen naar een moment in je werk waarop je het gevoel had dat het je lukte om innovatief te zijn (dus om een idee te creëren, introduceren en toe te passen) en waarin je leidinggevende een rol speelde?
   - Wat gebeurde er precies, wanneer was dit en wie waren erbij?
   - Wat was je taak/rol? En wat deed je?
   - Wat gebeurde er dat anders ging dan normaal?
   - Wat waren de opbrengsten voor jezelf? En voor anderen?
   - Wat voor rol speelde jouw leidinggevende tijdens dit moment? Daar gaan we nu iets verder op inzoomen.
b. We gaan nu inzoomen op de dynamieken tussen jou en je leidinggevende. In de spreadsheet staan acht 'kaartjes' met daarop dynamieken die kunnen plaatsvinden tussen jou en je leidinggevende (zie sub-topics). Kun je deze rangschikken op volgorde van belangrijkheid in de rechter kolom? (respondent schuift kaartjes in spreadsheet)
c. Inzoomen op kaartjes:
   - Waarom ligt dit kaartje op plek 1 en deze op 2 en deze op 3?
   - Hoe zag je kaartje 1, 2 en 3 terug in de situatie die je beschreef?
   - Wat maakt dat dit belangrijk is volgens jou?
   - Waarom ligt dit kaartje op de laatste plek?
   - Heeft je leidinggevende ook belemmerend gewerkt? Zo ja, hoe ben je hiermee omgegaan?

4. *Een beeld krijgen van hoe de dynamieken tussen medewerkers onderling van invloed zijn op het innovatieve werkgedrag van een individuele medewerker.*
a. Zou je me nog eens mee kunnen nemen naar een ander moment waarop het je lukte om innovatief te zijn (dus om een idee te creëren, introduceren en toe te passen) en waarin je collega's een rol speelde?
   - Wat gebeurde er precies, wanneer was dit en wie waren erbij?
   - Wat was jouw taak/rol? En wat deed je?
   - Wat gebeurde er dat anders ging dan normaal?
   - Wat waren de opbrengsten voor jezelf? En voor anderen?
   - Wat voor rol speelde jouw collega's tijdens dit moment? Daar gaan we nu iets verder op inzoomen.

b. We gaan nu inzoomen op de dynamieken tussen jou en je collega's. In de spreadsheet staan zes 'kaartjes' met daarop dynamieken die kunnen plaatsvinden tussen collega's onderling (zie sub-topics). Kun je deze wederom rangschikken op volgorde van belangrijkheid in de rechter kolom? (respondent schuift kaartjes in spreadsheet)

c. Inzoomen op kaartjes:
- Waarom ligt dit kaartje op plek 1 en deze op 2 en deze op 3?
- Hoe zag je kaartje 1, 2 en 3 terug in de situatie die je beschreef?
- Wat maakt dat dit belangrijk is volgens jou?
- Waarom ligt dit kaartje op de laatste plek?
- Hebben je collega's ook belemmerend gewerkt? Zo ja, hoe ging je hiermee om?

5. *Een beeld krijgen van hoe de dynamieken tussen medewerker en leidinggevende en tussen medewerkers onderling het vertonen van innovatief werkgedrag kunnen hinderen.*

a. Zou je me eens mee willen nemen naar een moment kunnen benoemen waarop je merkte dat je wel innovatief gedrag wilde vertonen, maar dit niet (goed) lukte?
- Wat gebeurde er precies, wanneer was dit en wie waren erbij?
- Wat was je taak/rol? En wat deed je?
- Wat hoopte je dat er anders zou gaan dan normaal?
- Op welke manier merkte je dat dit niet is geslaagd?

b. Werkte je leidinggevende tijdens dit moment belemmerend? Zo ja, hoe ging je hiermee om?

c. Werkte je collega's tijdens dit moment belemmerend? Zo ja, hoe ging je hiermee om?

Extra:

6. *Een beeld krijgen van de volgende stap die moet worden genomen.*
   a. Wat kan je leidinggevende doen om jou (nog) meer innovatief gedrag te laten vertonen?
   b. Wat kunnen je collega's doen om jou (nog) meer innovatief gedrag te laten vertonen?

Na interview:

- Bedankt voor uw tijd en de input die u heeft geleverd.
- Ik ga uw antwoorden verwerken in een gespreksverslag en stuur deze z.s.m. naar het door u opgegeven emailadres op. Als u het verslag goedkeurt kan ik uw data gebruiken voor het onderzoek.
- Heeft u nog vragen?

Appendix B: Informed consent form

Utrecht, 26 januari 2020

Beste participant,

Voor u ligt de informatiebrief aangaande het master thesis onderzoek "Innovative Work Behavior: the Dynamics Between Employee and Context". Dit onderzoek wordt gehouden in het kader van de afsluiting van de master Educational Sciences. In het onderzoek staat de vraag centraal op welke manier de interactie tussen medewerker en leidinggevende en tussen medewerker en collega's kan leiden tot het genereren, promoten en implementeren van nieuwe ideeën. De resultaten van dit onderzoek worden gepubliceerd in een thesisrapport dat kan worden ingezien door begeleidend docenten van de Universiteit Utrecht. Daarnaast zal er een verkorte versie van het rapport worden overhandigd aan de organisatie die fungeert als opdrachtgever.

Wat wordt er gevraagd?

In het kader van het onderzoek wordt u gevraagd om deel te nemen aan een diepte-interview over uw ervaringen op het gebied van innovatie en de relatie met uw collega's en leidinggevende. Dit interview duurt 45-60 minuten. Deelname aan het onderzoek is geheel vrijwillig en u kunt zich op ieder gewenst moment terugtrekken uit het onderzoek indien u dit wenst, zonder enige consequenties. De tot dan toe verzamelde data zullen worden verwijderd en worden niet meer gebruikt voor het onderzoek.

Door uw bijdrage kan er een diepgaand beeld worden gevormd over hoe de relaties tussen medewerkers en collega's en medewerkers en leidinggevenden het innovatieproces binnen een organisatie beïnvloeden. De uitkomsten van dit onderzoek kunnen leiden tot het bevorderen van de situatie rondom innovatie en relaties tussen medewerkers en leidinggevenden.

Wat gebeurt er met uw informatie?

De gepubliceerde data kunnen worden gebruikt als basis voor een vervolgonderzoek, of een onderzoek met een eventueel ander doel. Tijdens het onderzoek zal enkel relevante achtergrondinformatie worden opgevraagd over uw opleidingsniveau, aantal jaren werkervaring en het aantal jaar dat u werkzaam bent bij de organisatie en de betreffende afdeling. Deze data worden gescheiden bewaard van de inhoudelijk informatie die u verstrekt in het kader van het onderzoek en de data worden na de rapportage vernietigd.

Zou u zo vriendelijk willen zijn het *consent* op de volgende pagina te ondertekenen? Hiermee gaat u akkoord met het participeren aan dit onderzoek. Bij vragen kunt u contact opnemen met Jeroen Hellings (onderzoeker) via j.m.hellings@student.uu.nl of bellen naar 0624883251. Voor eventuele officiële klachten kunt u contact opnemen met de klachtenfunctionaris van de Universiteit Utrecht via klachtenfunctionaris-fetcsowet@uu.nl.

Innovative Work Behavior: the Dynamics Between Employee and Context

U (participant) bevestigt hierbij volledig te zijn geïnformeerd over het doel van het onderzoek en de wijze waarop er met uw gegevens wordt omgegaan. U kunt zich te allen tijde terugtrekken uit het onderzoek, zonder opgaaf van reden en zonder consequenties.

Naam:

Handtekening:

Innovative Work Behavior: the Dynamics Between Employee and Context

Appendix C: Final template for analysis

1	General codes

        (1)	Dynamic within a relationship that facilitates the process of IWB

        (2)	Dynamic within a relationship that hinders the process of IWB

2	Leader Membership Exchange

        (3)	Employee shows active engagement to manager

        (4)	Respondent says something about the quality of the relationship between employee and manager

        (5)	Manager exchanges strategic advice

        (6)	Manager exchanges social support

        (7)	Manager exchanges interesting tasks

        (8)	Manager exchanges decision-making latitude

        (9)	Employee shares valuable information with manager

        (10)	Employee wants to perform well for manager

        (11)	Employee demonstrates commitment to manager

        (12)	Employee feels fairly rewarded by manager

3	Social Capital

        (13)	Employee understands co-workers and feels understood by co-workers

        (14)	Employee gives support to and receives support from co-workers (in most cases for new idea/proposal)

        (15)	Employee shares same values and behaviors with co-workers

        (16)	Employee shares best practices and mistakes with co-workers, co-workers share best practices and mistakes with employee

        (17)	Respondent tells about the broadness of its network

4	Extra codes

        (18)	Manager or co-worker exchanges feedback on delivered work

        (19)	Employee collects alternative perspective on a case from or provides to manager or co-workers

        (20)	Respondent tells about process of reaching agreement with co-workers or manager

        (21)	Employee trust co-workers/manager and feels trusted by co-workers/manager

        (22)	Communicating fast in order to enhance innovation

(23)   Employee proposes innovative initiative to manager or co-worker

Appendix E: FETC Form

Section 1: Basic Study Information

1. Name student:

Jeroen Hellings

2. Name(s) of the supervisor(s):

Isolde Kolkhuis-Tanke

3. Title of the thesis (plan):

Innovative Work Behavior: the Dynamics Between Employee and Context

4. Does the study concern a multi-center project, e.g. a collaboration with other organizations, universities, a GGZ mental health care institution, or a university medical center?

Yes For the purpose of this study employees and managers of a service business organization located in the Netherlands are interviewed. It is yet not decided which organization is going to participate.

5. Where will the study (data collection) be conducted? If this is abroad, please note that you have to be sure of the local ethical codes of conducts and permissions.

The Netherlands

Section 2: Study Details I

6. Will you collect data?

> Yes

7. Where is the data stored?

8. Is the data publicly available?

> Yes / No
>
> If yes: Where?

9. Can participants be identified by the student? (e.g., does the data contain (indirectly retrievable) personal information, video, or audio data?)

Yes / No

If yes: Explain.

10. If the data is pseudonymized, who has the key to permit re-identification?

Section 3: Participants

11. What age group is included in your study?

Participants above the age of 18

---

12. Will be participants that are recruited be > 16 years?   No
13. Will participants be mentally competent (wilsbekwaam in Dutch)?   Yes
14. Does the participant population contain vulnerable persons?
    (e.g., incapacitated, children, mentally challenged, traumatized,   No
    pregnant)
15. If you answered 'Yes' to any of the three questions above: Please provide reasons to justify why this particular groups of participant is included in your study.

---

16. What possible risk could participating hold for your participants?

If data in which a participant is negative about his/her employer, is leaked. It could harm the employees' career at that particular organization.

---

17. What measures are implemented to minimize risks (or burden) for the participants?

There will be no gathering of personal information. Transcripts of interviews can be stored on secured server.

---

18. What time investment and effort will be requested from participants?

One hour max to participate in a interview.

19. Will be participants be reimbursed for their efforts? If yes, how? (financial reimbursement, travelling expenses, otherwise). What is the amount? Will this compensation depend on certain conditions, such as the completion of the study?

No

20. How does the burden on the participants compare to the study's potential scientific or practical contribution?

21. What is the number of participants? Provide a power analysis and/or motivation for the number of participants. The current convention is a power of 0.80. If the study deviates from this convention, the FERB would like you to justify why this is necessary.
(Note, you want to include enough participants to be able to answer your research questions adequately, but you do not want to include too many participants and unnecessarily burden participants.)

15 participants and 2 managers. This is in alignment with guidelines for qualitative research. Amount of participants can increase if, after analyzing the interviews, saturation isn't reached yet. However, this is unlikely.

22. How will the participants be recruited? Explain and attach the information letter to this document.

Participants will be informed by either the researcher (me) or his/her manager. This will be done either by phone, face-to-face or through email. See appendix B for information letter.

23. How much time will prospective participants have to decide as to whether they will indeed participate in the study?

Approximately 2 weeks.

24. Please explain the consent procedures. Note, active consent of participants (or their parents) is in principle mandatory. Enclose the consent letters as attachments. You can use the consent forms on Blackboard.

Active consent is asked through consent form (see appendix B)

25. Are the participants fully free to participate and terminate their participation whenever they want and without stating their grounds for doing so? Explain.

Yes, they can withdraw from the research at any time, without having to give a reason, without consequences. Data that is gathered by interviewing them will be destroyed and will not be used in the research.

26. Will the participants be in a dependent relationship with the researcher?

No

27. Is there an independent contact person or a general email address of a complaint officer whom the participant can contact?

Yes, klachtenfunctionaris-fetcsowet@uu.nl

28. Is there an independent contact person or a general email address of a complaint officer whom the participant can contact in case of complaints?

Yes, klachtenfunctionaris-fetcsowet@uu.nl

Section 4: Data management

29. Who has access to the data and who will be responsible for managing (access to) the data?

Me, the researcher (and the privacy officer of the UU?)

30. What type of data will you collect or create? Please provide a description of the instruments.

Transcription of interview, interview notes including participant's educational background, years of experience in function, years of work experience and years of experience at organization, and recording of interview (not including participant's personal information).

31. Will you be exchanging (personal) data with organizations/research partners outside the UU?

No personal data, only anonymous results

32. If so, will a data processing agreement be made up?

Yes / No

If yes: Please attach the agreement.

If no: Please explain.

33. Where will the data be stored and for how long?

On the secured server of the UU and recordings on a recording device. Recordings will be destroyed immediately after completing transcription.

34. Will the data potentially be used for other purposes than the master's thesis? (e.g., publication, reporting back to participants, etc.)

Data is used to report results back to the client, data is anonymous.

35. Will the data potentially be used for other purposes than the master's thesis? (e.g., publication, reporting back to participants, etc.)