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Abstract

Prior research on innovative work behavior (IWB) has focused on the importance of IWB for organizational effectiveness, success, and longer-term survival (see e.g. Axtell et al., 2000; De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010; Janssen, 2000; Rahnama, Mousavian, Alaei, & Maghvan, 2011; Sartori, Favretto, & Ceschi, 2013), as well as on antecedents and consequences of IWB (see e.g. Devloo, Anseel, De Beuckelaer, & Salanova, 2015; Khorakian, Shahroodi, Jahangir, and Farkhani, 2019; Shanker, Bhanugopan, Van der Heijden, & Farrell, 2017; Woods, Mustafa, Anderson, & Sayer, 2018). Despite the exponential increase of academic literature on IWB, no prior studies have been conducted into individuals’ experiences with the process of showing IWB. While an extensive body of literature exists on what stimulates employees to show IWB and which results IWB has for both employees and organizations, to date it remained unclear how employees experience the process of showing IWB. Studying the experiences of employees showing IWB is important as this is the only way to obtain in-depth knowledge on what it means for employees in practice to show IWB. This study focuses on innovative employees, divided in three categories: extrarole innovative employees, professional innovative employees, and professional innovative managers. Data was collected by conducting semi-structured interviews with twelve respondents. The obtained data was analyzed and coded using the inductive analysis approach (Bleijenbergh, 2015). Results indicate innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB as a reiterative and rather chaotic process. Furthermore, all innovative employees reported showing IWB is part of their job and a large majority reported IWB to be expected (role) behavior. All innovative employees indicated IWB is necessary and indispensable for organizations. Experiences with IWB are very mixed: innovative employees reported to experience a sense of pride on the one hand, but on the other hand innovative employees also reported feelings of uncertainty and frustration. Reactions from coworkers and/or managers on shown IWB are also mixed: innovative employees receive compliments, but also face resistance from coworkers and/or managers. Overall, innovative employees’ experiences with the process of showing IWB are positive.
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Over the last twenty years, the number of articles published on innovation has grown exponentially (Anderson, Potočnik, & Zhou, 2014). Innovation is connected with a broad range of benefits for organizations (see e.g. Amabile, 1988; Anderson, De Dreu, & Nijstad, 2004; Janssen, Van de Vliert, & Zhou, 2004; Kanter, 1988; West, 2002; Zhou & Shalley, 2003). For example, innovation is one of the key determinants of organizational performance, success and longer-term survival (see e.g. Janssen et al., 2004; Kanter, 1988; Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Scott & Bruce, 1994; Shih & Susanto, 2011; Yuan & Woodman, 2010). Furthermore, innovation has become a critical source of distinct competitive advantage for organizations (Anderson et al., 2004; Engle, Mah, & Sadri, 1997; West, 2002; Zhou & Shalley, 2003). Organizations lacking those competitive advantages are at risk, because competitive advantages are the foundation of organizations’ distinctiveness (Teigland, Di Gangi, Flaten, Giovanacchini, & Pastorino, 2014). Anderson et al. (2014, p. 1298) developed an integrative definition of innovation, which is:

“Creativity and innovation at work are the process, outcomes, and products of attempts to develop and introduce new and improved ways of doing things. The creativity stage of this process refers to idea generation, and innovation refers to the subsequent stage of implementing ideas toward better procedures, practices, or products.”

Innovation is a widely and in-depth studied research topic and can be studied on different levels, such as on organizational level, work team level, and individual level. This study focuses on innovation on an individual (employee) level. Employees are of crucial importance in achieving organizational innovation, since employees generate new ideas and propose novel approaches at work (Scott & Bruce, 1994). Research has taught that employees’ actions are fundamental for continuous innovation (Janssen, 2000; McLoughlin & Harris, 1997;
Employees can be innovative by engaging in certain behavior (Wang, Fang, Qureshi, & Janssen, 2015). This behavior is referred to as innovative behavior, although recent literature more often refers to this behavior as innovative work behavior (IWB) (see e.g. Luksyte, Unsworth, & Avery, 2018; Shanker, Bhanugopan, Van der Heijden, & Farrell, 2017; Woods, Mustafa, Anderson, & Sayer, 2018). IWB sees on an individuals’ behavior that aims at achieving the initiation and intentional introduction of new and useful ideas, processes, products, and procedures (West & Farr, 1989). IWB thus includes various innovative efforts, as it sees on behavior resulting in for example product innovation as well as process innovation.

IWB has been characterized as a unique organizational asset (Axtell et al., 2000; Janssen, 2000; Sartori, Favretto, & Ceschi, 2013), because of (among other things) the significant effect of IWB on organizational effectiveness (Rahnama, Mousavian, Alaei, & Maghvan, 2011), and because IWB is important for enhancing business performance (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010). Taking these benefits of IWB into account, IWB is argued to be one of the most important responsibilities of employees (Khorakian, Shahroodi, Jahangir, and Farkhani, 2019). Considering the suggested importance of IWB and the benefits of IWB, it is remarkable employees are rarely demanded to perform IWB (George & Brief, 1992; Katz, 1964). Mostly, IWB is seen as extrarole behavior: behavior shown by employees, which goes beyond employees’ expected behavior based on job descriptions (Katz, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1978, Organ, 1988).

This study aims to examine how employees experience the process of showing IWB. IWB is considered to be potentially risky behavior aiming to challenge the status quo (Heilman & Haynes, 2005; Janssen et al., 2004; Karpowitz, Mendelberg, & Shaker, 2012; Proudfoot, Kay, & Koval, 2015), which could result in unintended costs for the innovative employees.
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Despite the intention to provide beneficial outcomes (Janssen et al., 2004). For example, IWB can be ignored or punished by coworkers and/or management who are reluctant to change their work habits. Considering the risky nature of IWB, it is remarkable experiences of employees with the process of showing IWB have not yet been studied.

To be able to examine how employees experience the process of showing IWB, it is necessary to recognize a four-folded distinction between employees (on which is being elaborated further at the start of the second chapter). Distinguishing employees based on their engagement in IWB results in the following types of employees: employees who never show IWB (non-innovative employees), employees who show IWB as extrarole behavior (extrarole innovative employees), employees who show IWB as role behavior (professional innovative employees) and employees who manage employees showing IWB (professional innovative managers). This study considers the three latter categories of employees to be categories of innovative employees. This study focuses on how these three categories of innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB.

The definition by West and Farr (1989) of IWB is widely accepted. However, there is not yet consensus on the dimensions and stages IWB has (see e.g. De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010; Scott & Bruce, 1994). Scott and Bruce (1994) operationalized IWB as a three-stage process, as they outlined the stages idea generation, idea promotion and idea implementation. De Jong and Den Hartog (2010) proposed IWB as a four-stage process, as they labeled the consecutive stages idea exploration, idea generation, idea championing, and idea implementation.

Even though these processes differ a little, the dissimilarity between these processes does not pose insurmountable problems. The only dissimilarity worth mentioning is the distinction De Jong and Den Hartog (2010) make of a preceding stage of idea exploration, which includes looking for ways to improve current products, processes or services or trying to think about them in alternative ways (Basadur, 2004; Farr & Ford, 1990; Kanter, 1988). De
Jong and Den Hartog (2010) and Scott and Bruce (1994) both include a stage of idea generation, which involves the search to new products, processes, or services, as well as the entry into new markets and improvements in current work processes (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010). In general terms, idea generation implies generating solutions to identified problems (Amabile, 1988; Kanter, 1988, Van de Ven, 1986). De Jong and Den Hartog (2010) and Scott and Bruce (1994) include a similar subsequent stage, respectively idea championing (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010) and idea promotion (Scott & Bruce, 1994). This stage includes acquiring the necessary power in the organization to be able to implement ideas, as well as gaining support of coworkers and building coalitions about the beneficial aspects of the innovation, being persistent, and getting the right people involved (see e.g. Howell, Shea, & Higgins, 2005; Scott & Bruce, 1994). The last stage in both processes is called idea implementation and this stage comprises of two parts: the attempt to transform proposed ideas into practical solutions, products, services or processes, which could be implemented (Kanter, 1988; Scott & Bruce, 1994), and executing the idea (Janssen, 2000). Whereas both Scott and Bruce (1994) and De Jong and Den Hartog (2010) consider IWB to be a process of consecutive stages, various other authors (see e.g. Kanter, 1988; King, 1992; Schroeder, Van de Ven, Angle, & Poole, 1989; Van de Ven, Scudder, & Polley, 1989) consider IWB to be a rather chaotic process of going back and forth.

When studying innovation and IWB, one of the most striking observations is the ‘rosy picture’ the concepts of innovation and IWB have in academic literature. Even though the number of studies on innovation and IWB increased considerably, undesirable aspects of innovation and IWB have received little attention. The lack of attention for undesirable aspects of innovation and IWB is remarkable, considering that innovation literature for example reports extremely high failure rates of implemented product innovations, ranging from 50% to 90% (Heidenreich & Spieth, 2013). Even though the study by Heidenreich and Spieth (2013) only concerns failed product innovations and IWB also includes process innovations, Heidenreich
and Spieth’s (2013) study provides a clear indication failure rates are high. Success and failure rates of IWB are unknown, presumably because it is hard to track ideas of employees over time and to eventually be able to mark an idea as failed or successful. In most cases, innovative employees either decide themselves to abandon their innovative ideas before moving on, or ideas get rejected by coworkers and/or managers.

Concerning the positive image innovation and IWB have in academic literature, Kimberly (1981) noted the presence of a proinnovation bias for as long as almost forty years ago. This proinnovation bias describes the presumption that innovation is a desirable characteristic and that positive outcomes will invariably arise from all forms of innovation. Anderson et al. (2014) more recently even concluded contemporary literature suffers from innovation maximization fallacy, which describes the thought that all innovation is good and the more innovation, the better. The proinnovation bias is an element of the innovation maximization fallacy. Although Anderson et al. (2014) addressed the innovation maximization fallacy in 2014, it remains unclear whether innovative employees experience a proinnovation bias concerning their IWB.

On the one hand, academic literature describes many advantages and beneficial effects of showing IWB. On the other hand, high failure rates of implemented innovations have been reported (Heidenreich & Spieth, 2013) and, as discussed, Kimberly (1981) reported a proinnovation bias among employees and organizations that has been readdressed by Anderson et al. (2014). In the meantime, the lack of research into the experiences of employees with the process of showing IWB still exists as shown by Appendix A. This gap is addressed by studying IWB in-depth and discovering how innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB. By addressing this gap, this study aims to contribute to academic literature with in-depth knowledge on several topics. Firstly, this study aims to obtain in-depth knowledge on how innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB. Secondly, this study aims to
obtain in-depth knowledge on what innovative employees showing IWB experience. Thirdly and finally, this study aims to obtain in-depth knowledge on whether experiences of innovative employees showing IWB differ based on particular antecedents.

To conduct this research and to achieve the formulated research aims, the following central question is being addressed: “How do innovative employees experience the process of showing innovative work behavior (IWB)?”

By answering the research question, this study makes several contributions. Since a large majority of all literature on IWB focuses on antecedents and consequences of IWB, work remains to be done to gain insight into how innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB in practice.

Studying the experiences of innovative employees has both practical and scientific value. Firstly, where academic literature contains a contradiction regarding the process of IWB (as is discussed in section 2.1), the most important for practice is how employees who actually show IWB experience the IWB process. Secondly, as innovation failure rates are extremely high (Heidenreich & Spieth, 2013), it should be insightful for organizations and their employees what showing IWB results in for innovative employees, for successful as well as for unsuccessful innovative ideas. Since innovative employees explore and generate ideas themselves, it is possible innovative employees abandon their ideas for certain reasons in an early stage. Furthermore, ideas can for example be abandoned in the idea promotion stage or innovations can fail after being implemented.

In-depth knowledge also lacks on whether the experiences of showing IWB differ among innovative employees based on particular antecedents. Furthermore, it remains unclear what innovative employees in practice experience with regard to the in academic literature noticed proinnovation bias and innovation maximization fallacy. As innovative employees are
the facilitators of innovation in organizations by showing IWB, it has value to obtain in-depth knowledge on how those innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB.

This study consists of five chapters, including this introduction. Whereas chapter two elaborates on the relevant theoretical background, which is being used to formulate propositions, chapter three describes how this research is being conducted in terms of methodology. Results of this study are shown in chapter four and discussed in chapter five. Furthermore, chapter five contains recommendations for future research and a conclusion to close this study.
2 Theoretical background

This chapter provides a theoretical framework building up to the formulation of the seven propositions (i.e., expected research outcomes) which are tested in this study. As this study aims to explore how innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB, three key concepts are distinguished and defined now: innovative employees, experiences, and IWB.

As the reader will recall from the introduction, IWB stands for an individuals’ behavior that aims at achieving the initiation and intentional introduction of new and useful ideas, processes, products and procedures (West & Farr, 1990). IWB is considered to be a type of proactivity (Wu, Parker, & De Jong, 2014), as employees assertively challenge the status quo by providing alternatives for the existing processes, products, and procedures (Parker & Collins, 2010; Wu et al., 2014). All further to this study relevant aspects of IWB are discussed more in detail in the remainder of this chapter.

Since this study is a qualitative study aiming to obtain in-depth knowledge on IWB, causal relationships are not aimed for and cannot be found. To be able to get insight into what innovative employees think of and how they feel about showing IWB, this study focuses on how innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB. The word experience refers to something that happens to someone, that affects the way someone thinks, feels and behaves (Cambridge Dictionary, n.d.). By asking questions that invite respondents to talk about their work and their IWB, respondents were left room to construct answers themselves without being steered by the researcher.

With regard to the innovative employees, the reader will recall from the introduction this study makes a three-folded distinction between categories of innovative employees. Firstly, according to Katz and Kahn (1978) most employees show IWB solely as extrarole behavior (see section 2.2). For this majority of employees, IWB is not prescribed behavior and employees choose to show IWB in their jobs to improve processes, services and/or products. This study
labels this category as extrarole innovative employees (e.g. a lawyer trying to digitalize his cases and administration). Secondly, many organizations employ employees of whom is expected to show IWB, as their job task is to be innovative and develop new and/or improved processes, services and/or products. This category is labeled as professional innovative employees (e.g. an R&D engineer responsible for developing new machinery). Thirdly, to lead all individual IWB in the right direction, many (semi-large to large) organizations employ managers responsible for innovation within the organization. Innovation managers can, but do not necessarily, show IWB themselves, but are closely involved in IWB in the organization from managerial perspective. This study labels this category as professional innovative managers (e.g. an innovation expert in an organization managing (all) current innovation projects).

In the following sections, IWB is being discussed in detail leading to the formulation of seven propositions.

2.1 | The process of IWB

Traditionally, IWB has been measured using a single dimension (Kleysen & Street, 2001; Janssen, 2000; Reuvers, Van Engen, Vinkenburg, & Wilson-Evered, 2008; Scott & Bruce, 1994). Such an approach might not be satisfying, as IWB is also described to be a complex multi-dimensional concept (Woods et al., 2018). Several studies have underlined the necessity of examining IWB using multiple dimensions (Niu, 2014; Wisse, Barelds, & Rietzschel, 2015). A study by De Jong and Den Hartog (2010) suggests that IWB nonetheless is one-dimensional, as evidence for the multi-dimensional measurement of IWB was found weak. Future research might find evidence to support multi-dimensional measurement of IWB, but for the time being, IWB has to be methodologically treated one-dimensional in studies. Theoretically, IWB can yet be described as multi-dimensional.
In literature distinguished dimensions of IWB are often linked to stages of the innovation process (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010). While some authors (see e.g. Woods et al., 2018) claim there is consensus on the stages IWB comprises, it is safe to say there is no consensus on this topic yet.

Building up to the first of seven propositions of this study, the way IWB is conceptualized is further examined. As the reader will recall from the introduction, IWB has been portrayed as a process of consecutive stages (e.g. see De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010: idea exploration, idea generation, idea championing, and idea implementation). However, various authors argue IWB is not as consecutive as it is displayed in literature (e.g. see Schroeder, Van de Ven, Scudder, & Polley, 1989; Scott & Bruce, 1994). Amabile (1988) for example argues there is no smooth sequence of steps from initial vision to final implementation. Some authors also mark IWB as a chaotic, messy, and reiterative process (Kanter, 1988; King, 1992; Schroeder et al., 1989; Van de Ven, Angle, & Poole, 1989). Hence, there is no consensus in academic literature regarding the process of IWB. In addition, input from (innovative) employees on what the process of IWB looks like lacks. This study expects innovative employees experience the process as a reiterative and chaotic process, as many processes described in academic literature form a simplification of reality. As this study focuses on the experiences of innovative employees with showing IWB, the first proposition of this study sees on how innovative employees experience the IWB process:

Proposition 1: “Innovative employees experience the process of showing innovative work behavior (IWB) as a reiterative and chaotic process rather than a consecutive and smooth process.”
2.2 | IWB as (extra)role behavior

The effort to show IWB is considered to be one of the key responsibilities of employees (Khorakian, Shahroodi, Jahangir, & Farkhani, 2019). This consideration is remarkable since employees are rarely demanded to perform IWB (George & Brief, 1992; Katz, 1964). As the reader will recall from the introduction, IWB has been acknowledged as a crucial factor for the emergence of innovation (Bysted, 2013) and the importance of IWB for the long-term survival of organizations is beyond doubt (see e.g. Amabile, 1988; Ancona & Caldwell, 1987; Janssen, 2000; Kanter, 1988; Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Shalley, 1995; Van de Ven, 1986; West & Farr, 1989; Woodman, Sawyer & Griffin, 1993). Considering the consensus on the need for individuals to engage in IWB, it is noteworthy IWB is not a prevailing part of most job descriptions. However, while Scott and Bruce (1994) claim IWB can be expected from individuals at any time, for most employees IWB is identified as extrarole behavior (Katz & Kahn, 1978). As shortly discussed in the introduction, extrarole behavior refers to discretionary actions shown by employees, which go beyond employees expected behavior based on job descriptions (Katz, 1964; Katz & Kahn, 1978, Organ, 1988). Given the fact that IWB mostly is considered to be extrarole behavior, Janssen (2000) states employees have a choice to refrain from showing IWB, as IWB is not mandated by most employers. This study focuses on the three categories of innovative employees discussed at the beginning of this chapter. This study expects its respondents to experience IWB as role behavior and not as extrarole behavior, as extrarole innovative employees choose to show IWB and professional innovative employees and professional innovative managers are expected to show IWB. The second proposition is:

*Proposition 2: “Innovative employees experience showing innovative work behavior (IWB) as role behavior and not as extrarole behavior.”*
2.3 | Proinnovation bias and innovation maximization fallacy

An extensive body of literature exists on the antecedents of IWB, which is being discussed in section 2.5. Whereas IWB has been researched intensively over the past decades, this attention mainly focused on those antecedents of showing IWB. Anderson et al. (2014) noted there appears to be little attention for the experiences of employees with showing IWB. As this study also aims to address the in the introduction discussed proinnovation bias and innovation maximization fallacy, the third proposition sees on what experiences innovative employees have when it comes to the proinnovation bias and the overarching innovation maximization fallacy in the organization they work for.

Anderson and Gasteiger (2008) emphasize showing IWB has undesirable aspects that are less visible or managerially appealing and still potentially seriously harmful to individuals (Anderson et al., 2004). As discussed in the introduction, Kimberly (1981) noted the lack of attention to undesirable aspects of innovation as he addressed a proinnovation bias. This bias is fed by the efficiency-oriented perspective of innovation, in which the assumption is that organizations adopt innovation to maximize their efficiency gains (Abrahamson, 1991; Rogers, 1983). This assumption by itself is not problematic, but a practice in which innovation decisions are based on expected positive performance outcomes is (Yuan & Woodman, 2010).

Studies have resulted in a number of beneficial effects that IWB has on organizational performance. As reported in the introduction, the failure rate of implemented product innovations (and therewith engagements in IWB, since every innovation starts as an idea from an employee) is up to 90%, which is very high (Heidenreich & Spieth, 2013). Anderson and Gasteiger (2008) argue that the great belief organizations have in innovation is unjustifiable, unwise and potentially harmful to organizations and to the employees within them.

The third proposition focuses on the in academic literature described proinnovation bias. Results on this proposition provide insight into how innovative employees experience the
organization to think of and react on IWB, by focusing on whether innovative employees experience a proinnovation bias in the organization they work for. The third proposition of this study therefore is:

**Proposition 3:** “Innovative employees experience the organization in which they work has a proinnovation bias with regard to their innovative work behavior (IWB).”

### 2.4 Results and outcomes of IWB

The fourth proposition sees on how innovative employees experience showing IWB. Various quantitative studies have examined the outcomes of showing IWB. Examples of positive outcomes of individuals showing IWB that have been examined are a lowered job-dissatisfaction (Zhou & George, 2001), and positive job attitudes (Janssen et al., 2004). Similarly, negative outcomes of innovative employees showing IWB have been measured in quantitative studies. Examples of negative outcomes of showing IWB are less satisfactory relations with coworkers (Janssen, 2003), discontentment and a lowered performance as a consequence of a lack of fit between creativity demands, individual skills and organizational conditions (Livingstone, Nelson, & Barr, 1997), dissatisfaction with the job if ideas are not accepted and implemented by the organization (Zhou & George, 2001), and lowered performance, negative job attitudes, and stress (Janssen et al., 2004). Furthermore, when employees feel unfairly treated by the organization, they tend to reduce IWB, which ultimately could lead to a decrease of the effective functioning of organizations (Amabile, 1988; Ancona & Caldwell, 1987; Kanter, 1988; Katz & Kahn, 1978; Oldham & Cummings, 1996; Shalley, 1995; Van de Ven, 1986; West & Farr, 1989; Woodman et al., 1993).

However, while those outcomes have been studied quantitatively, a good understanding of how innovative employees experience showing IWB lacks (Yuan & Woodman, 2010).
Showing IWB has downsides for employees (see e.g. Janssen, 2003; Janssen et al., 2004), but also has advantages for employees (see e.g. Zhou & George, 2001). The fourth proposition is negatively formulated as the majority of the outcomes of IWB found is negative. The fourth proposition therefore is:

*Proposition 4: “Innovative employees have negative experiences with showing innovative work behavior (IWB).”*

### 2.5 Antecedents of IWB

As briefly mentioned in section 2.3, a variety of factors has been found to be important antecedents of IWB (Yuan & Woodman, 2010). West and Rickards (1999) have noted that IWB is instigated by a combination of personality traits and environmental factors, which has been confirmed by more recent research (see e.g. Devloo, Anseel, De Beuckelaer, & Salanova, 2015; Khorakian et al., 2019; Shanker et al., 2017; Woods et al., 2018). Furthermore, Luksyte et al. (2018) have studied the influence of gender on IWB.

The fifth, sixth, and seventh proposition of this study each focus on a particular antecedent and examine whether the experiences of innovative employees with showing IWB differ among innovative employees based on the particular antecedents of IWB.

#### 2.5.1 Environmental factors and IWB

Regarding the influence of environmental factors on IWB, West and Farr (1989) concluded it is important for employees to feel safe to share ideas at work, because employees otherwise might be reluctant to share novel insights. De Jong (2006) and Scott and Bruce (1994) have suggested that IWB is enabled by an organizational innovation climate, to which is referred as OCI by Shanker et al. (2017). Janssen and Van Yperen (2004) studied the impact of the relationship with supervisors on IWB and found a positive relationship between IWB and a mastery orientation (which entails striving to develop competence, skills, and ability).
Employees experiencing freedom and autonomy are more likely to engage in IWB, as those employees have the idea that they are in control to change the situation they are in and to solve perceived performance gaps (Krause, 2004; Shanker et al., 2017).

The presence of external work contacts of an employee has also been found to relate positive to IWB, as employees have contact with individuals or groups outside the organization who may be a source of information, inspiration or innovation resources (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010). Furthermore, various studies have emphasized the importance of the availability of sufficient resources, the amount of support received, and the resistance to change by colleagues on IWB (Hakanen, Perhoniemi, & Toppinen Tanner, 2008; Janssen, 2003; West & Farr, 1990). Khorakian et al. (2019) found that knowledge sharing behavior among employees, which includes sharing best practices and sharing mistakes (Moustaghfir, Schiuma, Mura, Lettieri, Radaelli, & Spiller, 2013), has a positive relationship with IWB. The by Khorakian et al. (2019) found influence of sharing mistakes on IWB corresponds with various other studies that found that sharing mistakes results in higher levels of IWB (Homsma, Van Dyck, De Gilder, Koopman, & Elfring, 2009; Madsen & Desai, 2010), as sharing mistakes prevents other employees from making mistakes that have already been made by other employees (Khorakian & Jahangir, 2018). Likewise, several studies (see e.g. Rezaeian & Ghazinoory, 2011) found beneficial effects of sharing best practices on the amount of shown IWB, as employees are more willing to share knowledge when they feel their sharing behavior has led to innovation by colleagues (Rezaeian & Ghazinoory, 2011).

Since authors have found many environmental factors that influence the degree of IWB an employee shows, the fifth proposition is as follows:

Proposition 5: “The experiences of showing innovative work behavior (IWB) differ among innovative employees based on environmental factors.”
2.5.2 | Personality traits and IWB

A second category of antecedents of IWB is formed by personality traits (Anderson et al., 2014). Relationships between personality traits and the extent to which an employee shows IWB are also widely examined (see e.g. Amabile, 1996; Bunce & West, 1995; Woodman et al., 1993). Various authors have suggested that employees vary in their potential to innovate based on differences in their personality traits (Amabile, 1988; George & Zhou, 2001; Hammond, Neff, Farr, Schwall, & Zhou, 2011; Niu, 2014; Raja & Johns, 2010). An individual’s intrinsic interest in his or her job tasks positively affects IWB (Amabile, 1996; Devloo, Anseel, De Beuckelaer, & Salanova, 2015; Woodman et al., 1993). Studies on the relationships between the Big Five personality factors by Goldberg (1999) and IWB have shown openness and conscientiousness are consistent predictors of IWB (Baer, 2010; Baer & Oldham, 2006; George & Zhou, 2001; Madjar, 2008). Openness, which is the degree to which someone is flexible, curious and imaginative (Costa & McCrae, 1992), relates positively to IWB (Hammond et al., 2011). Conscientiousness, which is an orderly, planful, and dependable approach to work (Costa & McCrae, 1992), relates negative to IWB (Feist, 1998; Niu, 2014; Raja & Johns, 2010; Woods et al., 2018). Similar to the in section 2.5.1 discussed environmental factors, personality traits also influence the degree an innovative employee shows IWB. The sixth proposition therefore is as follows:

*Proposition 6: “The experiences of showing innovative work behavior (IWB) differ among innovative employees based on their personality traits.”*
A relatively new topic in the IWB research domain is the influence gender has on (expected) IWB. Attention for the influence of gender on IWB arose after various authors argued IWB is viewed as a prototypically masculine activity, as IWB requires actions to be taken that are likely to be more associated with men than women. IWB requires initiative to be taken (Parker & Collins, 2010), is considered to be risky behavior (Janssen et al., 2004), and requires an embracing attitude towards change (Wu, Parker, & De Jong, 2014).

Kabat-Farr and Cortina (2012) suggested that women’s IWB may be viewed and valued differently than that of their male colleagues. More recently, Luksyte et al. (2018) examined sex-based differences in IWB and found IWB is stereotypically ascribed more to men than to women. While men not engaging in IWB get penalized by lowered performance ratings, women are not expected to show IWB. Luksyte et al. (2018) found that women’s IWB is ignored, downplayed, not recognized and foremost not rewarded to the same extent as IWB displayed by men. The lack of recognition and equal rewarding of women’s IWB may be the reason why women are often reluctant to show IWB (Unsworth & Clegg, 2010). The study by Luksyte et al. (2018) sees on what employers and organizations expect of employees in terms of IWB and how IWB is rewarded compared between the sexes. As the study by Luksyte et al. (2018) found women’s IWB is judged differently than IWB displayed by men, this study assumes the experiences of innovative employees differ among innovative employees based on their gender as well. The seventh proposition is as follows:

**Proposition 7:**

“The experiences of showing innovative work behavior (IWB) differ among innovative employees based on gender.”
3  |  Methodology

The aim of this study is exploring how innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB. Based on literature on innovation and IWB, seven propositions have been formulated that describe expected research outcomes. To conduct this study, qualitative research has been chosen to examine the formulated propositions. Qualitative research has been chosen considering the explorative character of this study. Whereas IWB has been studied over the past decades mainly using quantitative research resulting in significant relationships, this study aims to obtain in-depth knowledge on the experiences innovative employees have with the process of showing IWB. Whereas quantitative research aims to obtain results from a large number of respondents to be able to ascertain effects between specific variables, qualitative research is extremely suitable for research that aims to obtain in-depth information on correlations between certain phenomena (Bleijenbergh, 2015).

In line with the qualitative research approach, a semi-structured interview framework has been developed. This semi-structured interview framework has been used to conduct the interviews held in the context of this study. The following section describes the way respondents for this study have been recruited and which characteristics the respondents (should) have to participate in this study (section 3.1). Subsequently, the way the data was collected is discussed (section 3.2). Finally, the method by which collected data has been analyzed is discussed (section 3.3).

3.1  |  Respondent selection

Data for this study was collected by interviewing twelve innovative employees. The respondents have been recruited by an online announcement (see Appendix B), which has been published on Facebook and LinkedIn.
As discussed in the introduction and in the introductory words of chapter 2, this study distinguishes three different types of innovative employees: extrarole innovative employees (EIE, type 1), professional innovative employees (PIE, type 2), and professional innovative managers (PIM, type 3). The type 1, 2, and 3 indications are used in the respondent overview in Table 2. The twelve respondents of this study are equally distributed across these three categories. Furthermore, each distinguished category innovative employees was represented by two male and two female respondents and each gender was represented by a relatively young and a relatively old respondent. The relatively young respondents have an average age of 27. The relatively old respondents have an average age of 41. As this study uses a qualitative research approach, a relatively small number of respondents is allowed, as collected material is extensive (Bleijenbergh, 2015).

Several selection criteria have been used in the announcement. Regarding the extrarole innovative employees (type 1) the announcement contains the criterion that the respondent shows IWB, while this behavior is not part of the respondent’s job description. Professional innovative employees (type 2) should meet a second criterion. Respondents representing the professional innovative employees should be professionals whose job it is to show IWB. Professional innovative managers (type 3) should meet a third criterion, as they should be innovation experts or innovation managers (and similar job descriptions).

As the aforementioned IWB is self-reported, the researcher will ask respondents to (shortly) elaborate on what their IWB entails. Furthermore, introductory questions of the interview see on the respondents’ work history and their current job and tasks.

The table below (Table 2) displays the characteristics of the interviewed respondents, by which readers can judge what other contexts (or whether their own situation) might be informed by the findings of this study (i.e., transferability). Names of respondents are not published in this study to guarantee anonymity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent (#)</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age (in years)</th>
<th>Current job title</th>
<th>Type innovative employee (1, 2, or 3)</th>
<th>Current sector</th>
<th>Respondent (abbreviation in transcripts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>All-round Employee Accountancy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accountancy</td>
<td>EIE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Manager Global Feed Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Genetics &amp; Breeding</td>
<td>EIE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Operations Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Market Research</td>
<td>EIE3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>IT Auditor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Sector Auditing</td>
<td>EIE4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Road Developer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mobility &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td>PIE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Global Product Manager</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Genetics &amp; Breeding</td>
<td>PIE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Advisor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Mobility &amp; Infrastructure</td>
<td>PIE3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Product Owner RPA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>PIE4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Innovation Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ministry of Defence</td>
<td>PIM1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Innovation Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>PIM2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Innovation Coach</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spacial Development</td>
<td>PIM3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Innovation Manager</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Professional Football</td>
<td>PIM4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: characteristics of the respondents
3.2 | Data collection

As the interviews in this study were conducted in the context of a qualitative research, these interviews are called open interviews (Boeije, 2005). Questions asked were open and respondents were fully able to formulate answers themselves.

Data was collected by conducting semi-structured interviews. A semi-structured interview is the most widely used type of interview (Kitchin & Tate, 2000; Owens, 2006). As using a semi-structured interview framework allows to explore experiences, feelings, and perceptions of respondents (Bleijenbergh, 2015), this method was suitable for conducting this study. While having a guideline of questions, the researcher also had the opportunity to deviate from the guideline in interviews to gather more relevant information and to get clarification of given answers (Bleijenbergh, 2015), as is not possible using for example a survey. Contrasting to unstructured interviews, a guideline of questions was used during the interviews. Using a guideline of questions increased the reliability of the data collection, as the guideline ensured all respondents (eventually) were asked the same questions (Bleijenbergh, 2015).

All interviews were conducted in Dutch, as all respondents as well as the researcher speak Dutch as native language. Interviews with the respondents were conducted in the months April 2020 and May 2020. Due to the COVID-19 outbreak, which was declared to be a pandemic early March 2020, the researcher was homebound and not able to conduct interviews in person. All interviews were conducted using Skype, Microsoft Teams or telephone. Using Skype, Microsoft Teams and telephone thus was not an attempt to replicate face-to-face interviewing, it was chosen as the researcher otherwise would not have been able to conduct interviews at all. Skype was chosen because of its recognition, and because the software is freely downloadable. Microsoft Teams was used to interview respondents who preferred using Microsoft Teams. Two respondents were interviewed using the telephone, as they favored telephone over a video call.
Using Skype, Microsoft Teams and the telephone had a financial advantage, as interviewing was less costly than face-to-face interviews, since the researcher did not have to travel to respondents to conduct interviews (see e.g. Deakin & Wakefield, 2014). Another advantage of using Skype, Microsoft Teams and the telephone for conducting interviews is that prior research even suggests respondents favor participating in interviews this way, as interviews can be conducted from the comfort of one’s home (Lo Iacono, Symonds, & Brown, 2016). Furthermore, the quality of responses gained through online interviews and interviews by telephone is argued to be much the same as responses produced by more traditional methods of interviewing, such as face-to-face interviews (Denscombe, 2003).

Research ethics were taken into account during conducting this study. First of all, the only personal information that was gathered during this study were the respondents’ names, ages, and the respondents’ current job titles. Once an interview was finished, a respondent’s name was converted to a unique code: EIE1 and further for type 1 innovative employees, PIE1 and further for type 2 innovative employees and PIM1 and further for type 3 innovative employees. These codes have been used in the transcripts of the interviews. Besides, no other personal information was gathered, and no GDPR special category personal data was gathered at all.

Prior to every interview, the respondents were informed about the aim of this study and the main subject of the questions which were about to be asked. The respondents also were asked for permission to record the interview. As all respondents agreed on recording the interview, every interview was recorded auditory by using the Dictaphone app on the researchers’ iPad. All interview recordings were transferred to the researchers’ laptop as soon as the interview had finished. Subsequently, the interview recordings were deleted on the iPad. The interview recordings were stored on the researchers’ laptop and were encrypted with passwords only known by the researcher.
Respondents were asked whether they would like to receive the transcripts of their interviews, providing respondents the opportunity to check (and make adjustments to) the transcripts of their interviews. One respondent liked to receive the transcript; the other eleven respondents did not want to receive the transcript. The researcher asked for and was granted permission to contact respondents after the interviews with any emerging questions related to the conducted interviews. Furthermore, the researcher informed the respondents that they would be referred to anonymously in this study and that their answers would only be used for scientific purposes. The respondents furthermore were asked for their preferred moment to be interviewed and respondents were informed the interview would last approximately 30 to 45 minutes.

The used semi-structured interview framework consists of twenty-two open-ended questions (Appendix C). This framework was developed before the interviews took place and contains questions on all topics mentioned in the formulated propositions in order to at least cover all these propositions during all interviews. The semi-structured interview framework allowed to give respondents the opportunity to elaborate further on relevant topics that deviated from the interview guideline (Bleijenbergh, 2015). Since some of the respondents covered multiple questions in one (comprehensive) answer, some questions from the interview guideline have been asked in different order than prescribed by the interview guideline.

The interviews started with an introduction of the study in which the respondents participated. Subsequently, the respondents were asked three general questions. Thereafter, the interview guideline was followed during the interview to make sure all topics were discussed. Questions were formulated in a neutral way to avoid leading respondents in a certain direction in giving answers. All interviews lasted between 30 and 45 minutes and each interview was transcribed within five days after the interview took place.
3.3 | Data analysis

The researcher started with data analysis once all interviews had been conducted and transcribed. The transcripts were analyzed using an inductive analysis approach. The inductive analysis approach allows to derive key themes from the data and categorize those themes based on detailed readings of the transcripts (Bleijenbergh, 2015). Since the researcher has to attribute codes (at his own discretion) to text fragments, the researcher’s interpretation of the transcripts plays a role in the inductive analysis approach (Bleijenbergh, 2015). Inductive analysis allows to contribute to existing academic literature by systematically recording, coding and categorizing the data (Bleijenbergh, 2015).

Data analysis started with open coding. The researcher made use of ATLAS.ti, which is freely downloadable coding-software. All transcripts were imported in ATLAS.ti and were thoroughly read from beginning to end as a starting point of the data analysis. Whilst reading the transcripts, the researcher highlighted the most relevant phrases regarding the formulated propositions. The highlighted phrases were subsequently summarized by writing a keyword or a short phrase next to the highlighted phrase, which is the essence of open coding (Bleijenbergh, 2015). Open coding resulted in a list of 493 different codes that were assigned to the highlighted phrases in the transcripts (see Appendix D for the list of open codes). To provide insight into the open coding process, all twelve coded transcripts are presented in Appendix E.

All codes resulting from the open coding process were subsequently categorized into eight categories. This categorization was made by combining codes with a common theme or topic. This process is known as axial coding (Bleijenbergh, 2015). The resulting eight categories were: ‘reiterative and project depending process’, ‘IWB as role behavior’, ‘expectations of IWB’, ‘proinnovation attitude’, ‘mixed experiences with IWB’, ‘reflections on IWB’, ‘proactive and extrovert personality traits’, and ‘informal and non-hierarchical organizations’.
Comparison of the eight identified categories led to the reduction of the eight initial categories to six categories. As a qualitative study has to be dependable, it is important to show methodological changes, such as changes in categories. Firstly, the initial categories ‘mixed experiences with IWB’ and ‘reflections on IWB’ were merged into the category ‘experiences with IWB’, since codes of both categories showed similarities. Secondly, ‘IWB as role behavior’ and ‘expectations of IWB’ were merged into the category ‘expected IWB’, since codes of both categories also showed similarities. The six categories remaining are ‘reiterative and project depending process’, ‘expected IWB’, ‘proinnovation attitude’, ‘experiences with IWB’, ‘proactive and extrovert personality traits’, and ‘informal and non-hierarchical organizations’. These six categories correspond to a large extent to the formulated propositions. As the semi-structured interview guideline did not contain questions to gather specific data on the seventh proposition (as is explained in Appendix C), this proposition is also not represented by a category in the following chapter.

The six identified categories are used to present the results of the inductive coding process in the following chapter. Results are presented in the following chapter by providing multiple exemplary quotes per category. The gathered interview data contains mixed results and all categories accommodate several interesting results. Results are presented per category, and within each category, results are presented by sorting them on perspective or on subtopic. For example, the first category (‘reiterative and project depending process’) houses two subtopics: the experienced reiterative and chaotic nature of the process of showing IWB, and the experienced project depending nature of the process of showing IWB. Both subtopics are illustrated by exemplary and for the data representative quotes.
4 | Results

The in section 3.3 discussed data analysis of the transcripts resulted in six categories of experiences of innovative employees with the process of showing IWB. All six categories are clarified and discussed by showing supporting and exemplifying quotes. As all interviews were conducted in Dutch, original quotes are in Dutch as well. To preserve the authenticity of the used quotes, both the original quote and the English translation of the quote are provided. All quotes are provided with a reference to the respondent from whom the quote originates and a page number of the interview transcript the quote can be found on. All coded transcripts are, as mentioned in section 3.3, attached in Appendix E.

4.1 | Category 1: Reiterative and project depending process

All twelve respondents reported to perceive the process of showing IWB to consist of various phases, such as idea generation, idea promotion, and idea implementation. However, respondents reported different experiences with the structuredness of the process of showing IWB. Whereas all extrarole innovative employees reported the process of showing IWB to be the same to a large extent, a large majority of the professional innovative employees and the professional innovative managers reported the process of showing IWB to be a chaotic and/or reiterative process, in which moving back and forth between phases is required. Two exemplary quotes of the perceived chaos and reiterativeness of the process of showing IWB are shown.

Original quote 1:

“Het is wel best wel een chaotisch proces” (…) “uiteindelijk is het ook wel een pingpong spel, want je bent toch wel constant iets aan het implementeren dat men zegt: ‘oh, maar kan dit ook of zou dit net wat anders kunnen?’ Dus je bent toch wel de hele tijd heen en weer aan het spelen.” (…) “Dus het is altijd wel een beetje chaotisch. Zo gestroomlijnd mogelijk, maar het blijft toch altijd chaotisch.” (Transcript PIE3, p. 2)
Translated quote 1:

“It is a pretty chaotic process” (...) “more or less, it is a game of table tennis, as you are constantly implementing something and people say: ‘oh, but is this also possible or could this be slightly different?’ So, you’re going back and forth the whole time.” (...) So, it is always a little chaotic. As streamlined as possible, but it always stays chaotic.” (Transcript PIE3, p. 2)

Original quote 2:

“Dat is chaotisch. Ja, dan weten we wel wat we willen bereiken, maar de context bij ons verandert heel vaak. Dus dan is het: okee, we gaan nu een duwtje naar rechts. En dan later: okee, nu een duwtje naar links. Dus die stip op de horizon weten we vaak wel” (...) “van nou, we willen daarheen, maar dat is een minder gestructureerd proces.” (Transcript PIM3, p. 4)

Translated quote 2:

“That’s chaotic. Yes, we know what we want to achieve, but context changes a lot in our business. So, then it’s like: ‘okay, let’s push to the right.’ And later: ‘okay, now let’s push to the left’. So, we mostly know the dot on the horizon” (...) “so, we want to go there, but that’s a less structured process.” (Transcript PIM3, p. 4)

Ten innovative employees indicated the process of showing IWB differs per project. Some of the organizations the respondents work for have implemented principles to follow (for example: three respondents use design thinking-principles) or frameworks to use (two respondents use frameworks similar to the stage gate-model). Even though some of the organizations have implemented particular methods to structure innovation efforts, ten innovative employees perceive the process of showing IWB to differ per project, as is shown by the two exemplary quotes below.
Original quote 3:

“Ik kan een prachtig protocol opstellen hoe je de intake moet doen van voor tot einde, maar gedurende dat proces: elk idee is anders, je hebt voortdurend andere mensen nodig, dus continu dien je in dat proces zelf innovatief te zijn. Op het moment dat het links niet lukt, moet ik innovatief zijn om te kijken of het dan rechts wel lukt. Maar je zult, ja, je kunt niet zeggen: ik schrijf een protocol van voor tot achter, ik kan alle mensen erop zetten zolang ze het protocol maar volgen, dan komt het altijd goed. Dat gaat hem niet worden.” (Transcript PIM2, p. 3)

Translated quote 3:

“I could write a beautiful protocol on how to do the intake from beginning to end, but during the process: every idea is different, you constantly need other people, so in the process you constantly need to be innovative yourself. If it doesn’t work in one way, I have to be innovative and see whether it works out in another way. You should, yes, you can’t say: ‘I write a protocol from start to finish, I can put all people on it as long as they follow the protocol and it’ll always work out.’ That’s not going to work.” (Transcript PIM2, p. 3)

Original quote 4:

“Wij hebben daar een standaard voor ontwikkeld. Het is een beetje lastig, want wij hebben een framework, wat we al proberen toe te passen, maar feit is dat het altijd maatwerk is omdat of de skills van het team anders zijn, per case ofzo, en” (...) “hoe iemand reageert op coaching en aanwijzingen is anders.” (Transcript PIM3, p. 2)
Translated quote 4:

“We have developed a standard for this. It’s a bit tricky, because we have a framework, which we are trying to apply, but it’s a fact it’s always a customized process as skills of the team differ per case, and” (…) “the way someone reacts to coaching and directions differs.” (Transcript PIM3, p. 2)

Furthermore, although all respondents agreed on the fact that innovation processes consist of various phases, interpretation of those phases differs strongly among the innovative employees. All respondents agreed on the fact that ideas are generated in an early stage of the innovation process. However, four respondents reported to work partially problem- (or incident-) driven, which means in practice a problem comes up and an idea has to be generated to solve the problem or incident. As it seems, the innovative employees working problem-driven make use of the by De Jong and Den Hartog (2010) identified ‘idea exploration’-stage. All other respondents skip the ‘idea exploration’-stage and start at the ‘idea generation’-stage (De Jong & Den Hartog, 2010; Scott & Bruce, 1994).

4.2 | Category 2: Expected IWB

As the reader will recall from the introduction, this study distinguishes three categories of innovative employees based on their (expected) IWB: extrarole innovative employees, professional innovative employees, and professional innovative managers. These three respondent categories are equally represented in this study. All twelve innovative employees reported to experience showing IWB as part of their (daily) job. This means the in this study categorized as extrarole innovative employees also experience showing IWB as part of their job. Two exemplary quotes are presented in which innovative employees have answered the question whether they experience showing IWB as part of their job.
Original quote 5:
“Ja, dat vind ik wel. Ik vind wel dat dat erbij hoort, want je moet vooruit, denk ik, en dat kan alleen maar doordat je op een gegeven moment dingen ook anders gaat doen, omdat de wereld ook verandert, dus je moet de dingen op een andere manier doen, en het is belangrijk om een voorsprong op concurrentie te houden of te creëren en daarom is innovatie belangrijk. Het is super belangrijk.” (Transcript PIE2, p. 3)

Translated quote 5:
“Yes, I think I do. I think it’s part of the job, you have to move forward in my opinion, and that’s only possible by doing things differently at a certain point in time, because the world also changes, so you have to do things differently, and it’s important to create or keep a lead on competition and that’s why innovation is important. It’s super important.” (Transcript PIE2, p. 3)

Original quote 6:
“Ja, ja. Dat zijn gewoon een paar onderdelen van mijn werk. Waarom dat bij mij ligt weet ik niet precies, dat is denk ik zo gegroeid.” (…) “Dat is op een of andere manier wel heel automatisch bij mij gekomen.” (Transcript EIE4, p. 3)

Translated quote 6:
“Yes, yes. That’s just a part of my job. I don’t know exactly why I do those things, that’s grown this way I guess.” (…) “That has one way or another automatically found its way to me.” (Transcript EIE4, p. 3)

Perceived employers’ expectations of whether the in this study interviewed respondents have to show IWB differ between innovative employees. Some respondents strongly experience IWB to be role behavior, as their employer has the expectation of them to show IWB, whereas
other respondents do not experience IWB as role behavior. Below three exemplary quotes are shown: one per distinguished category of innovative employees.

Original quote 7:

“Maar, er wordt van mij wel verwacht dat ik luister naar de markt.” (…) “En anticipeer op de verandering in de markt en dat ik wel bezig ben met, ehm, kijk het woord innovatie noemen ze niet hoor, maar wel dat je flexibel bent. Dus als de markt naar links beweegt, dat je dan daaraan denkt.” (Transcript EIE2, p. 5)

Translated quote 7:

“However, I am expected to listen to the market.” (…) “And to anticipate on change in the market and to be busy with, ehm, look, the word ‘innovation’ is not being used, but you have to be flexible. So, if the market moves to the left, you have to think about it.” (Transcript EIE2, p. 5)

Original quote 8:

“Het is echt, het wordt ook heel vaak genoemd als ik ergens bij zit, dat ik dan de frisse blik ben, moet zijn, haha. Dus dat wordt wel echt verwacht, door mijn rol, door mijn leeftijd, er zijn best wel wat oudere mensen die in dat team werken, daarom ben ik aangenomen, omdat die heel vaak de reden gebruiken: ik doe dit omdat ik dit altijd zo heb gedaan. En daar moeten we vanaf.” (…) “Maar ja, ik ben wel de persoon van wie men verwacht dat ik iets daaraan doe.” (Transcript PIE3, p. 2-3)

Translated quote 8:

“It’s really, it’s very often mentioned when I’m in a meeting, that I’m the fresh perspective, have to be, haha. So, that’s really something that’s expected from me, by my role, by my age, as there are some older people working in the team, that’s why I’ve
been hired, because they often use the reason: ‘I do this because I have always done this.’ And we have to get rid of that.” (…) “So yes, I am the person of whom is expected to turn that around.” (Transcript PIE3, p. 2-3)

Original quote 9:

“Ja, mijn werkgever vraagt dat niet van me, maar ik bespreek dat wel met mijn leidinggevende. Het is niet altijd een idee. Soms zie je iets en dan wil je daar iets mee. En dat bespreek ik altijd. Als ik iets zie wat beter kan of anders kan, dan bespreek ik dat en dan krijg ik altijd: ‘dat is hartstikke goed, ga er maar mee aan de slag’, dus dat is de ruimte die in onze organisatie zit om vernieuwing toe te passen, maar de driver, dus de prikkel, die komt niet van mijn werkgever, maar die komt altijd van de medewerkers.”

(Transcript PIM3, p. 3)

Translated quote 9:

“Yes, my employer doesn’t ask me to, but I do discuss it with my supervisor. It’s not always an idea. Sometimes you see something, and you’d like to do something with it. I always discuss those things. If I see something that can be done better or different, I discuss it and I always get to hear: ‘that’s excellent, go ahead with it’, so that’s the option our organization provides to innovate, but the driver, the impulse doesn’t come from my employer, it always comes from the employees. (Transcript PIM3, p. 3)

As can be noted from the exemplary quotes above, the results of this study do not indicate the differences in employers’ expectations are purely explained by the type of innovative employee (extrarole versus professional). Some respondents reported employers’ expectations are not merely based on their ‘role’ (category innovative employee), but also on aspects as personality traits and age.
4.3 | Category 3: Proinnovation attitude

The twelve innovative employees were unanimously in reporting what they think of innovation and IWB. Both innovation and IWB are perceived to be necessary and extremely important for an organization. All respondents are open to innovation and IWB and characterize IWB as a necessity. Two exemplary quotes of this proinnovation attitude can be found below.

Original quote 10:
“Dus ehm, ik denk dat stilstand achteruitgang is, dus je hebt mensen nodig die continu tegen dingen aan blijven schoppen van: ‘dit kan beter, of makkelijker, of sneller’.”
(Transcript PIE1, p. 3-4)

Translated quote 10:
“So ehm, I think standing still is moving backwards, so you need people who continuously push the boundaries: ‘this can be done better, or easier, or faster’.”
(Transcript PIE1, p. 3-4)

Original quote 11:
“De voetbalwereld is mega conservatief en ik ben van mening dat innovatie de enige manier is om ook te kunnen overleven. Dat klinkt misschien heel zwart-wit, maar de meeste commerciële bedrijven voelen wel de noodzaak om te innoveren omdat ze anders gewoonweg niet genoeg geld binnenkrijgen. Bij ons vloeit het geld uit een aantal andere middelen binnen, waardoor die urgentie niet zo gevoeld wordt.” (…) “Dus, de noodzaak om te innoveren is er, innovatie is volgens mij cruciaal en dat idee heeft de bond gelukkig ook.” (…) “Ik denk dat wij als klein land gewoon slim moeten zijn en innovaties moeten gebruiken om met de top mee te kunnen blijven doen, dus het is in mijn ogen een noodzaak.” (Transcript PIM4, p. 4)
Translated quote 11:

“Professional football is super conservative, and, in my opinion, innovation is the only way to survive. It may sound very black-and-white, but most commercial organizations feel the urge to keep innovating since they otherwise don’t earn enough money. Our revenues stem from a number of other sources, which causes the urge to be felt less.”

(…) “So, the necessity to innovate exists, innovation is crucial in my opinion and luckily the association shares this opinion.” (…) “I guess that we as a small country have to be smart and use innovations to keep track with the others, so in my opinion it’s a necessity.” (Transcript PIM4, p. 4)

Although all twelve respondents acknowledge the necessity of being innovative as an organization and showing IWB as an employee, two respondents explicitly ask themselves the why-question: why change a winning team, why would we change our processes? All other respondents did not report to be concerned with this dilemma. Two exemplary quotes containing the why-question can be found below.

Original quote 12:

“En daarnaast heb je nog, het systeem dat nu staat, dat staat en dat werkt. En we zeggen weleens: ‘never change a winning team’, natuurlijk, maar je moet ook wel weer die ballen kunnen hebben om het wel te kunnen veranderen. Dat is een beetje een weegschaal. Het is natuurlijk gemakkelijker om gewoon te doen waar je mee bezig bent.” (Transcript PIM1, p. 4)

Translated quote 12:

“And besides we have, the system we now have, it works. We sometimes say: ‘never change a winning team’, of course, but you sometimes have to show the guts to be able
to change. That’s sort of a scale. Of course, it’s easier to just keep doing what you’re doing.” (Transcript PIM1, p. 4)

Original quote 13:

“Ja, dan is mijn antwoord dat ik daar open tegenover sta, wel met de vraag stellende van: ‘waarom pas je het aan en wat brengt het dan?’ Ik heb een drijfveer op vernieuwen en ik vind het leuk om te proberen, ik kan daar soms in doorgaan omdat het dan leuk is omdat het anders is, maar dat is omdat ik dat leuk vind als persoon, dus ik moet mezelf wel de vraag stellen waarom dan en wat brengt het ons dan. Maar ik sta er dus welwillend tegenover.” (Transcript PIM3, p. 5)

Translated quote 13:

“Yes, so my answer is I’m up for it, although asking the question: ‘why would you change it and what would be the result?’ I’m motivated to innovate and I like to experiment, sometimes I can keep doing that because it’s fun as it’s different, but that’s just because I like it as a person, so I have to ask myself why and what would be the result. But I’m positive about it.” (Transcript PIM3, p. 5)

According to all respondents, their employers are very keen on innovation and do foster the IWB of their employees. Respondents reported their employers are also enthusiastic about innovation, as the organizations see innovation as a means to be competitive and IWB as a means to be innovative. Two exemplary quotes on the respondents’ employers positive attitude towards innovation and IWB can be found below.

Original quote 14:

“Ja, zeker, voor mijn baas is het ontzettend belangrijk. Vooral, ook al zijn we nieuw en moeten we het wiel opnieuw uitvinden in vergelijking met andere onderzoeksbedrijven,
onze grootste competitor is Nielsen, maar wat wij voor hebben op hen is dat zij al zo vastzitten in hun proces, dat ze daarin ook minder innovatief zijn. Dat is ook onze competitive edge, waardoor wij projecten winnen, wij zijn nog helemaal flexibel en we willen alles uitproberen.” (Transcript EIE3, p. 4)

Translated quote 14:
“Yes, certainly, to my boss it’s extremely important. Especially, even considering we are new and we have to invent the wheel all over again in comparison to other research companies, our biggest competitor is Nielsen, but our advantage on them is that they are stuck in their process and thereby they can be less innovative. That’s also our competitive edge, by which we win projects, we are completely flexible, and we want to try and test everything.” (Transcript EIE3, p. 4)

Original quote 15:
“Ja, ja, ja, {naam baas} is ook heel erg voor innovatie, die moedigt dat alleen maar aan, wat ik zeg al: ‘eigen initiatief wordt bij ons eigenlijk alleen maar gewaardeerd.’ Het is misschien een beetje een cliché, want elk bedrijf zegt dat, maar hoe dat in de praktijk is, is vaak een tweede. Bij ons is dat wel het geval.” (Transcript EIE1, p. 4)

Translated quote 15:
“Yes, yes, yes, {name employer} is also very positive about innovation, he simply encourages it, and it is what I said earlier: ‘own initiative is being valued in our organization’. Maybe it’s a cliché, as every company claims this, but how it’s like in practice often is something else. In our organization it’s really the case.” (Transcript EIE1, p. 4)
Some respondents’ employers are more enthusiastic on innovation and IWB than others, as some respondents reported the organizations they work for first and foremost focus on earning money and put innovation at second place, or put an emphasis on the measurability of the output of the innovative efforts. An exemplary quote of both is shown below.

**Original quote 16:**

“Als je inderdaad, als je aan iedereen ehm van het management vraagt van ‘wat gaat er voorop, werk voor de klant of werk om beter te worden’, dan zeggen ze allemaal ‘werken voor de klant’. En dat is op zich logisch, want daar verdienen we ons geld mee en als we dat niet doen dan gaan we failliet, maar ik denk” (...) “dat je beter mag kijken naar wat zoiets oplevert, en best eens een gokje mag nemen.” (...) “Ja, wat zo’n organisatie vooral wil is dat heel erg meetbaar is wat iets oplevert. Terwijl degenen die aan het innoveren zijn, die vinden het leuk om te doen, maar die zijn niet direct bezig met ‘oh want dan kan ik veertig uur aan 100 euro besparen per week’. Dat komt later pas.” (Transcript PIE1, p. 5)

**Translated quote 16:**

“When asking everyone in the management team what’s more important: ‘work for the client or work to get better’, all would say ‘work for the client’. And in itself it’s logic, since that’s how we earn our money and if we don’t do it, we’ll go bankrupt, but I think” (...) “there should be more attention to the possible results, and sometimes a gamble should be taken.” (...) “Yes, so what the organization really wants is that results are very measurable. However, those innovating do it because they like to do it, but they are not necessarily thinking: ‘oh, because then I can save forty hours at 100 Euros per week’. That comes later.” (Transcript PIE1, p. 5)
In this section, three subcategories of experiences with IWB are distinguished. Firstly, respondent’s own experiences with showing IWB are discussed. Secondly, reactions of managers and/or coworkers on respondents’ IWB are discussed. Thirdly, respondents’ ways of dealing with those reactions are discussed.

Respondents reported extremely mixed experiences with showing IWB, from very positive to extremely negative. Both kinds of experiences deserve extensive attention. All innovative employees reported a sense of pride when their IWB resulted in tangible results. Furthermore, respondents reported to enjoy the fact of improving a process, service or product by showing IWB. Respondents, as can be read in the following exemplary quote, are very enthusiastic on showing IWB.

**Original quote 17:**

“Ik vind het altijd gewoon heel leuk, ik zie het altijd als een grote puzzel en ik word er altijd, zeg maar hoe minder er staat, hoe enthousiaster ik daarvan word. Hoe meer vrijheid er is om echt je eigen eindproduct te bepalen, waarvan ik dan denk ‘dit is het handigst’.” (…) “Dus ik word er wel heel enthousiast van en” (…) “ik wil dan gewoon gelijk meters maken. Als ik begin met een nieuw project kan ik het ook moeilijk loslaten zeg maar, dan vind ik het ook gewoon leuk om te gaan” (…).” (Transcript PIE3, p. 2)

**Translated quote 17:**

“I always enjoy it very much, I always see it as a big puzzle and I always get, let’s say the less already is determined, the more enthusiastic I’m getting. The more freedom I have to develop my own solution, of which I think ‘this is most convenient’.” (…) “So, I always get really enthusiastic about it and” (…) “I always want to start right away.”

4.4 | Category 4: Experiences with IWB
When I start with a new project, let’s say it’s hard for me to let go, I just enjoy starting off” (…).” (Transcript PIE3, p. 2)

On the other side of the spectrum, most respondents also described negative experiences with showing IWB. Whereas one respondent indicated to have been crying multiple times last year at her desk, another respondent reported to have been scarred by showing IWB. Two exemplary quotes can be found below.

Original quote 18:
“Ik heb vorig jaar meerdere keren huilend aan mijn bureau gezeten van ‘wat doe ik niet goed?’, omdat het gewoon niet van de grond kwam.” (…) “net als vorig jaar, dat ik af en toe echt een momentje had dat ik dacht ‘{respondent maakt huilend geluid}, hoe kan dat nou?’” (Transcript PIE4, p. 6)

Translated quote 18:
“I have been sitting multiple times at my desk crying and thinking ‘what do I do wrong?’, just because it didn’t work what I did.” (…) “just like last year, that I sometimes really had a moment thinking ‘{respondent makes crying noise}, how is this even possible?’” (Transcript PIE4, p. 6)

Original quote 19:
“Ja, precies, wij zeggen nu, als we terug kijken op het afgelopen jaar: ‘we hebben allemaal wel littekens overgehouden aan de projecten die we hebben of hebben gehad, maar dat betekent niet per se dat het bij een volgend project weer beter gaat, want bij een volgend project gaan we weer helemaal all-in, moeten we alles super goed en innovatief doen zonder dat we alles helemaal hebben uitgewerkt en dan kunnen we dus weer die littekens oplopen.” (Transcript EIE3, p. 5)
Translated quote 19:

“Yes, exactly, we now say, if we reflect on the past year: ‘we’ve all been scarred by the projects we have or have had, but it doesn’t mean it’ll get better at a next project, because at a next project we’ve to get all-in again, we’ve to do everything extremely good and innovative without working out all details, and then again we can get scarred.” (Transcript EIE3, p. 5)

The explanatory factor of the occurrence of both positive and negative experiences with showing IWB is likely to have something to do with the reactions respondents received on their IWB, less with whether a project has worked out or not. Two respondents, both innovation managers, namely indicated to be happy to stop with a project once it does not work out as hoped for. An exemplary quote is presented below.

Original quote 20:

“Nee, kijk, we zeggen altijd: ‘als iets faalt, dan is het, dan kunnen we het eigenlijk gewoon vieren’.” (…) “Kijk, het is, innovatie wordt altijd gezien als: ‘het moet allemaal lukken’. Maar ja, de beste ideeën falen tien keer en bij de elfde keer lukt het. Het is helemaal niet erg als het faalt, het is wel jammer natuurlijk als iets faalt, maar dan heb je wel alles eruit gehaald om het voor elkaar te krijgen.” (Transcript PIM1, p. 5)

Translated quote 20:

“No, let’s see, we always say: ‘if something fails, it’s something to be celebrated’.” (…) Look, it’s, innovation is always seen as: ‘everything has to succeed’. However, the best ideas fail ten times and at the eleventh time, it works out. It’s no big deal if something fails, it’s a pity, of course, but you’ve done everything you can to make it happen.” (Transcript PIM1, p. 5)
Looking at the reactions of coworkers and/or managers of the innovative employees, a distinction can also be made between positive reactions and negative reactions (and the amount of resistance) to the IWB shown by the interviewed innovative employees. Two respondents reported reactions to be based on a particular division in two main groups of coworkers, as shown in the exemplary quote below.

**Original quote 21:**

“Als je kijkt naar scheidsrechters, dan zijn er op dit moment natuurlijk best wel veel innovaties met de VAR, we zijn ook bezig met doellijntechnologie enzo, daar zie je een tweedeling. Je ziet een groep die het heel interessant vindt en zichzelf erin verdiept en ook aangespoord om met innovaties te komen en geënthousiasmeerd worden door de projecten die wij zelf opperen, en er zit ook een grote groep die bang is voor hun eigen vakgebied. Zij zeggen: ‘ja, als straks alles door computers wordt overgenomen, wordt dan een scheidsrechter uiteindelijk niet overbodig?’ Ehm, dus je ziet ook een grote groep die geregeerd wordt door angst en die het heel lastig vindt om innovatie te omarmen en die zien het ook als bedreiging.” (Transcript PIM4, p. 5)

**Translated quote 21:**

“When looking at the referees, there are at this moment a number of innovations with the VAR, we’re also busy with goal line technology and so on, there you see a dichotomy. You notice a group finding it very interesting and delving into it, also being urged to innovate themselves and being made enthusiastic by the projects we put forward, and there’s also a large group that’s afraid for their own discipline. They say: ‘if everything is taken over by computers, isn’t a referee going to be unnecessary?’ Ehm, so you also notice a large group is being ruled by fear, finding it very hard to embrace innovation and seeing it as a threat.” (Transcript PIM4, p. 5)
As mentioned, respondents reported both negative and positive reactions on their shown IWB. Focusing on the positive reactions first, innovative employees received compliments on their IWB, have been encouraged to show (more) IWB and got positive energy during and after showing IWB. Two exemplary quotes on positive experiences with IWB are shown below.

**Original quote 22:**

“Ja, die zijn super enthousiast. Die vinden het heel gaaf.” (…) “En als je iets heel gaafs doet voor een groep die er echt op zit te wachten dan is dat fantastisch, dus je hebt gewoon een veel hogere beloning bij groepen die erop zitten te wachten.” (Transcript PIE3, p. 4)

**Translated quote 22:**

“Yes, they’re super enthusiastic. They think it’s very cool.” (…) And when you do something cool for a group of people who are really into it, then it’s fantastic, so the reward is much higher with groups who are into it.” (Transcript PIE3, p. 4)

**Original quote 23:**

“Ehm, nou ja, laat ik het zo zeggen, {naam baas} is gewoon echt de baas. {Naam collega}” (…) “die zijn zeg maar degenen die nog boven mij zitten en die zijn altijd wel heel positief erover, beiden. Ze vinden het ook interessant. De meeste collega’s vinden het ook interessant.” (Transcript EIE1, p. 4)

**Translated quote 23:**

“Ehm, well, let’s say, {name employer} really is the boss. {Name colleague},” (…) “they both are my supervisors and they always are very positive about it, the both of them. They also think it’s interesting. Most colleagues find it interesting as well.” (Transcript EIE1, p. 4)
All respondents not only received and reported positive reactions on their IWB. Negative reactions on shown IWB were also given very frequently. Those reactions mostly were experienced as resistance by the innovative employees. Two exemplary quotes on the negative reactions on shown IWB received can be found below.

Original quote 24:

“Maar vaak is dat niet per se positief. Ehm, maar dat komt dus omdat change wordt ervaren als iets slechts. Dus zelfs als je iets beter probeert te maken, dan denken ze: ‘oh oh, dan moet ik helemaal aanpassen wat ik doe. En dat vinden ze lastig. Ehm, dus het hangt ervan af wat ik voorstel natuurlijk. Als ik voorstel van: ‘normaal doe je 100 dingen op een dag en vanaf nu ga je er 70 doen, maar dan wel 5 nieuwe’, dan zijn ze wel van: ‘oh, okee, nou fijn dat ik minder moet doen, maar die nieuwe dingen vind ik wel echt heel moeilijk’. Als ik echt alleen maar een compleet nieuwe werkwijze voorstel dan is dat vaak helemaal niet goed, dan zijn ze helemaal bang, dan denken ze: ‘oh, wat zal me nu weer te wachten staan?’” (Transcript EIE3, p. 5)

Translated quote 24:

“That’s often not necessarily positive. Ehm, but that’s because change is being seen as something bad. So even if you’re trying to improve something, they think: ‘oh oh, I completely have to change what I do.’ And that’s hard for them. Ehm, so it depends on what I’m proposing of course. When I propose: ‘normally you do 100 things a day, from now on you’ll do 70, but with 5 new ones’, they’re like: ‘oh, okay, it’s nice I have to do less, but those new things are very difficult’. When I propose a completely new working method that’s often not good at all, they’re very afraid and they think: ‘oh, what awaits me now?’” (Transcript EIE3, p. 5)
When being asked how the respondents experienced the reactions of their coworkers and/or managers, the answers also were widespread, from very positive to very negative. Very positive is the energy an innovative employee reported to get from projects which were successful and in which she experienced little resistance, as shown by the following exemplary quote.

Original quote 26:

“Dus als ik kijk naar mijn projecten, dan word ik aan de ene kant heel erg blij, want ik merk wel dat het nodig is en er is een club mensen binnen de organisatie, ik moet wel zeggen dat dat altijd dezelfde mensen zijn, maar die kom ik altijd tegen en daar krijg ik super veel energie van.” (…) “iedere keer als het wel lukt en je bent met gelijkgestemden, denk je echt van: oh, we zijn echt toffe dingen met elkaar aan het doen, ja, dan word ik daar gewoon super blij en enthousiast van.” (Transcript PIE4, p. 6)
Translated quote 26:

“So, when I look at my projects, on the one hand side I get very happy, because I notice it’s really necessary and there is a group of people in the organization, I have to say it’s always the same people, but I’m always joined by them and I get a lot of energy from them.” (…) “every time when it does work out and you’re with like-minded people, you think: ‘oh, we’re really doing cool stuff with each other, so yes, then I’m getting very happy and enthusiastic.” (Transcript PIE4, p. 6)

Exemplary quotes of negative experiences with reactions from coworkers and/or managers are shown below: innovative employees taking those reactions home affecting their peace of mind (exemplary quote 1), an innovative employee getting frustrated by those reactions (exemplary quote 2), and even an innovative employee thinking of quitting her job as she felt her efforts did not lead to a positive project outcome (exemplary quote 3).

Original quote 27:

“Ik ben er in mijn werk natuurlijk heel veel mee bezig, dus als ik gewoon thuiskom, dan maalt het nog steeds door je kop. Als je in je bed ligt ’s avonds en je denkt eraan, het heeft natuurlijk persoonlijk wel invloed op je. Het is niet zo dat ik denk dat ik het zo makkelijk kan relativeren dat ik de deur dichttrek en er verder niet meer aan denk, van 9-5 job, what the hell, er zijn andere belangrijkere dingen in het leven. Ja, zo moet je natuurlijk ook weleens denken, maar ja, het kan wel degelijk persoonlijk ook invloed hebben.” (Transcript PIE2, p. 6)

Translated quote 27:

“At work I’m very busy with it of course, so when I come home, it keeps grinding in my head. When you’re in bed at night and you think about it, it does personally affect you. It’s not that I can put things in perspective so easily that I can say: ‘I close the door and
I don’t think of it any longer, 9-5 job style, what the hell, there are more important things in life’. Of course, sometimes you have to think like that, but of course, it can have a personal impact on you.” (Transcript PIE2, p. 6)

Original quote 28:
“Ehm, ik zou zeggen persoonlijk, ik vind het lastig, omdat ik ook wel gefrustreerd raak, want ik denk: ‘jongens, kom op, zet je beste beentje voor’.” (…) “En ik vind het sowieso niet echt leuk van als je een bericht brengt en iedereen begint te zuchten.” (…) “Heel zwaar. Ja, ik vind dat verschrikkelijk. Het liefst heb ik dat iedereen gewoon zegt: okee, we doen het! Maar ja, dat gebeurt natuurlijk niet, dus ik moet me er ook misschien maar bij neerleggen dat niet iedereen blij is met me. En dat is dan maar zo.” (Transcript EIE3, p. 6)

Translated quote 28:
“Ehm, I would say personally, I think it’s hard, also because I get frustrated, as I think: guys, come on, I need you to have your A-game on’.” (…) “And anyway, I don’t like it when you deliver a message, and everyone starts to sigh.” (…) “Very hard. Yes, I think it’s horrible. I would prefer to have everyone saying: ‘okay, let’s do it!’ However, that doesn’t happen of course, so I might have to accept that not everyone is happy with me. That’s just the way it is.” (Transcript EIE3, p. 6)

Original quote 29:
“Ehm, nou ja, soms bekruipt me, dat is met name bij de negatieve reacties, ik heb vorig jaar echt wel een paar keer gehad dat ik dacht: ik gooi het bijltje erbij neer, ik stop ermee, want als niemand erop zit te wachten en als ik de enige ben die het belangrijk vindt, waarom doe ik het dan?” (Transcript PIE4, p. 7)
Even though the professional innovative employees and managers also encountered negative reactions, most professional innovative employees and managers reported to have found a way to put those reactions off and even convert negative reactions into a stimulus to work harder. An exemplary quote is provided below.

**Original quote 30:**

“Tuurlijk is het soms lastig, maar het zet bij mij ook wel weer een knop aan waarvan ik denk: ik wil juist laten zien dat het tegendeel waar is en ik ga daar misschien juist wel harder door lopen.” (Transcript PIM4, p. 5)

**Translated quote 30:**

“Of course, it’s hard sometimes, but it also leads to a new way of thinking with me: ‘let’s prove them wrong’, and maybe I only start to work harder by this attitude.”

(Transcript PIM4, p. 5)

### 4.5 Category 5: Informal and non-hierarchical organizations

Even though the organizations the respondents work for vary extremely in terms of size (5 employees versus over 60,000 employees), answers provided by the respondents have a number of characteristics in common forasmuch the teams and divisions in which the respondents work. All employees described the culture of the team and/or division they work in as informal and non-hierarchical. Furthermore, respondents reported to experience the team
offers them autonomy and freedom at work. An exemplary quote of the culture of the organization the respondents work in, can be found below.

Original quote 31:
“Ik krijg heel veel vrijheid en ik spreek gewoon op voorhand doelstellingen af en daarbinnen heb ik eigenlijk alle ruimte om te opereren hoe ik wil, dus een moderne vorm van leiderschap. En ook veel op een Agile manier van werken en dat doen wij eigenlijk in de hele organisatie, dus veel testen, piloten, experimenteren, kijken of iets werkt en als iets niet werkt, iets nieuws beetpakken.” (Transcript PIM4, p. 6)

Translated quote 31:
“I get a lot of freedom and beforehand I discuss the goals and given the goals, I have all opportunities to operate how I’d like, so a modern leadership style. And a lot on an Agile way of work and we do so in the whole organization, so much testing, much piloting, much experimenting, checking of something works and if something doesn’t work, start with something new.” (Transcript PIM4, p. 6)

Most respondents also reported the organization they work for tries to share knowledge on best practices and best mistakes. Although for some organizations the process of knowledge sharing can still be improved, some innovative employees already have very positive experiences with knowledge sharing. Two exemplary quotes can be found below.

Original quote 32:
“Ja, we houden wel een bepaald archief bij en we zijn steeds meer bezig met bijvoorbeeld het opnemen van een filmpje als we klaar zijn met een project, zodat je makkelijk toegankelijk en begrijpelijk een overzicht kunt geven aan je teamleden, ook vooral van wat zijn de lessons learned, want ja, wat jij hebt meegemaakt is interessant
voor het hele team, want iedereen kan er mee in aanraking komen, dus zo proberen we zoveel mogelijk onze ervaringen te delen.” (Transcript PIM1, p. 6)

Translated quote 32:
“Yes, so we do keep a sort of an archive and we record a short movie when a project is finished, in order to create an easy accessible and understandable overview which can be offered to team members, also to provide what are the lessons learned, as everything you’ve experienced and been through is interesting for the whole team, as everyone can encounter the same, so in this way we try as much as we can to share our experiences.” (Transcript PIM1, p. 6)

Original quote 33:
“Wat bij ons super goed werkt is het delen van verhalen. We ontplooien verschillende initiatieven en een daarvan is het innovatie café en dat doen we maandelijks en we creëren gewoon een podium en we nodigen mensen uit, we zetten daar een beamer neer, lekkere hapjes en drankjes erbij en we laten daar drie pitches voorbijkomen van collega’s die met innovaties bezig zijn en we laten hen vertellen over waarom ze dat gedaan hebben, hoe ze dat gedaan hebben en wat daarvan het resultaat is. En op die manier proberen we kennis te verbinden en ook ervoor te zorgen dat de kennis vaker wordt toegepast dan in die ene context en dat werkt heel erg sterk. Een ontmoeting organiseren werkt heel sterk op het vlak van kennisdeling.” (Transcript PIM3, p. 7-8)

Translated quote 33:
“For us sharing stories works very good. We develop several initiatives and one of them is the innovation café and we do that on a monthly basis and we just create a podium and invite people, we set up a beamer, provide snacks and drinks and we let three colleagues pitch their innovations, we let them tell about why they’ve done it, how
they’ve done it and what the result is. And in this way, we try to connect knowledge and we try to make sure knowledge is more often applied than solely in the first context and that works very well. Organizing a meeting works very good for knowledge sharing.”

(Transcript PIM3, p. 7-8)

4.6 | Category 6: Proactive and extrovert personality traits

All respondents named several personality traits. The personality traits were self-reported, which led to every respondent reporting different personality traits. Although respondents described their personality traits using various words, it became clear most respondents describe themselves as proactive, extrovert, and open. An exemplary quote on the personality traits of the innovative employees is provided below.

Original quote 34:
“Beetje eigenwijs, risico’s durven nemen, toch ook wel randjes op durven zoeken, ik denk dat mijn humor mij ook best wel veel brengt” (…) “Doorzettingsvermogen heb je ook nodig. Mensen zeggen weleens tegen mij: ‘je bent een pitbull, je bijt je ergens in vast en je laat pas los als je het geregeld hebt, dus ik denk dat dat ook wel een goede omschrijving is. En open, ik denk dat een open karakter cruciaal is om mensen je ook te laten vertrouwen en mee te nemen en een stukje draagvlak te creëren.”

(Transcript PIM4, p. 6)

Translated quote 34:
“A little stubborn, daring to take risks, also daring to explore the limits, I think my humor brings me quite far” (…) “You need perseverance. Sometimes people say to me: ‘you’re a pit bull, you bite into something and you only let go when you’re done’, so I
guess that’s also a good description of me. And open, I guess an open character is crucial to let people trust you and to create support.” (Transcript PIM4, p. 6)

Furthermore, as all respondents reported resistance to their IWB, it’s also important to be strong, to believe in yourself, and to show perseverance, according to the respondents. An exemplary quote is shown below.

**Original quote 35:**

“Ja, en dat is ook wel een van de dingen die je als innovatief iemand binnen een organisatie moet hebben: het geloof in je eigen dromen of in de projecten waar je mee bezig bent moet echt supersterk zijn, want je gaat zoveel weerstand tegenkomen.” (…)

“Dus je hebt daar lef voor nodig, je hebt daar doorzettingsvermogen voor nodig. Wat ik zeg, ik heb vorig jaar echt wel een aantal keer zitten huilen, maar ik ben ondertussen wel doorgegaan, dus je moet wel realiteitszin hebben en denken: ‘en weer door’.” (Transcript PIE4, p. 7-8)

**Translated quote 35:**

“Yes, that’s something you have to have as an innovative person within an organization: the belief in your own dreams or in the projects you’re working on should be super strong, because you’ll encounter so much resistance.” (…) So, you need courage, you need perseverance. It’s what I said earlier, last year I’ve been crying a number of times, but in the meantime, I continued, so you need to have a sense of reality and think: ‘just keep going’.” (Transcript PIE4, p. 7-8)

A majority of the respondents reported to be proactive and to like coming up with new ideas and initiatives. A number of respondents also reported impatience, as they like to think and act quick. An exemplary quote on proactiveness and impatience is shown below.
Original quote 36:

“Negatief is geduld, dus ook voor innovatie heb je gewoon af en toe geduld nodig. Ik ben best wel snel, omdat ik zo snel schakel, als ik vanochtend iets hoor, wil ik vanmiddag zaken kunnen doen, dat gaat niet altijd, soms moet je ook geduld laten zien, dat vind ik heel erg lastig.” (Transcript PIM2, p. 6)

Translated quote 36:

“Negative is patience, for innovation you sometimes just need patience. I’m rather fast, and because I switch fast, when I hear something this morning, I like to do business this afternoon, but that isn’t always possible, sometimes you have to show patience, that’s something I find very hard.” (Transcript PIM2, p. 6)

Lastly, most respondents from the professional innovative employees and professional innovative managers reported to like to connect people, ideas, and projects to each other. As most of those respondents stated, networking is an important aspect of showing IWB. An exemplary quote of the importance of networking is shown below.

Original quote 37:

“Ik denk wat ook positief is, ervaar ik, dat ik snel kans schakelen en mensen bij elkaar kan brengen. Ik heb best wel een groot netwerk en ik vind het ook leuk om te netwerken, dus ik weet dan vaak mensen, projecten en ideeën door het hele land bij elkaar te brengen.” (Transcript PIM2, p. 6)

Translated quote 37:

“I think it’s also positive, I notice, that I can switch fast and I can bring people together. I have quite a large network and I like to network, so I often manage to bring people, projects, and ideas throughout the whole country together.” (Transcript PIM2, p. 6)
5 | Discussion

The final chapter of this study starts with the conclusions and implications of the study. Subsequently, limitations of this study are discussed. Furthermore, future research suggestions are identified and discussed.

5.1 | Conclusions and implications

As the reader will recall from the introduction, the research aim of this study is threefold. Firstly, this study aimed to obtain in-depth knowledge on how innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB. Secondly, this study aimed to obtain in-depth knowledge on what innovative employees showing IWB experience. Thirdly and finally, this study aimed to obtain in-depth knowledge on whether experiences of innovative employees showing IWB differ based on particular antecedents.

Chapter two contains seven propositions that have been formulated based on a theoretical framework. The developed propositions describe expected research outcomes. Based on the theoretical background, a qualitative study has been carried out as described in chapter three. Resulting from the inductive data analysis this study contains, six categories of experiences of innovative employees with showing IWB have been identified and extensively presented in chapter four. The seven formulated propositions are evaluated in this section based on the in chapter four presented results.

Proposition 1: “Innovative employees experience the process of showing innovative work behavior (IWB) as a reiterative and chaotic process rather than a consecutive and smooth process.”

The first proposition is partially supported by the results. The first proposition has been discussed in chapter four by category 1: ‘reiterative and project depending process’. As the name of the category implies, most respondents reported to perceive the process of showing
IWB as a reiterative and project depending process. A majority of the interviewed innovative employees described the process of showing IWB as one of going back and forth, taking sidesteps when necessary and switching phases during the process of showing IWB. Furthermore, the process of showing IWB is experienced to be highly project dependent, as a number of respondents pointed out every idea asks for a different approach and one prewritten or standardized process does not work in all cases.

While a majority of eight of the respondents described the process of showing IWB to be reiterative and chaotic, four respondents reported to experience the process of showing IWB as a more or less standardized process consisting of consecutive phases. As not all innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB as a reiterative and chaotic process, the formulated proposition is partially supported. Apart from this conclusion, it is noteworthy that all four respondents who reported to experience the process of showing IWB as a standardized process of consecutive stages are extrarole innovative employees, which means all professional innovative employees and professional innovative managers reported to experience the process of showing IWB as a project depending and reiterative process.

**Proposition 2:** “Innovative employees experience showing innovative work behavior (IWB) as role behavior and not as extrarole behavior.”

The second proposition is supported by the results. The second proposition has been discussed in chapter four by category 2: ‘expected IWB’. All respondents reported to experience showing IWB as part of their (daily) jobs. Furthermore, all respondents described showing IWB as role behavior, although three respondents did note showing IWB eventually was not prescribed in their initial job descriptions. The three respondents who indicated that showing IWB was no prescribed behavior at first did indicate their shown IWB originated and increased over time. Even though the formulated proposition sees on whether innovative employees experience showing IWB as role or extrarole behavior, results also see on whether the
respondents’ employers expect their employees to show IWB. All respondents indicated their employers expect them to show IWB. All three respondents who reported showing IWB was no prescribed behavior when they started to work for their employer indicated their employers at first did not expect them to show IWB but started to do so gradually over time.

Proposition 3: “Innovative employees experience the organization in which they work has a proinnovation bias with regard to their innovative work behavior (IWB).”

The third proposition is partially supported by the results. The third proposition has been discussed in chapter four by category 3: ‘proinnovation attitude’. By asking what innovative employees think of innovation and IWB has data firstly been collected on the attitude of all respondents towards innovation and IWB. Results indicate a large majority of the respondents consider innovation to be both extremely important and necessary to create and secure a lead on competitors. All innovative employees reported to be (very) positive about innovation and IWB, which can be seen as a proinnovation attitude. At the same time, two respondents reported to be very deliberate in their IWB, as they stated to ask themselves the ‘why’-question at innovative efforts.

Subsequently, respondents were asked questions on the attitude their employers (and/or the organizations they work for) have towards innovation and IWB of employees. All respondents indicated their employers are in favor of innovation. Most employers also aim for their organizations and employees to be innovative and to show IWB, one more active than another. The attitude of employers towards innovation and IWB seems to be correlated with the budget being available for innovation and innovative efforts, as some employers clearly are first and foremost aimed at making money, placing innovation at a second (or lower) place. The proposition is partially supported as most organizations highly value innovation and employees’ IWB, but some organizations focus first and foremost on measurability and finance.
Proposition 4: “Innovative employees have negative experiences with showing innovative work behavior (IWB).”

The fourth proposition is supported by the results. The fourth proposition has been discussed in chapter four by category 4: ‘experiences with IWB’. Noteworthy is the fact the proposition is supported by the results, but the results do not only contain negative experiences with showing IWB, but also positive experiences with showing IWB, meaning an opposite proposition (‘innovative employees have positive experiences with showing IWB’) would also have been supported by the results. As discussed extensively in chapter four, data on proposition four has been divided in three subcategories: experiences of innovative employees with showing IWB, reactions of managers and/or coworkers on shown IWB, and respondents’ ways of dealing with those reactions.

As elaborated on in chapter four, experiences of respondents with showing IWB are mixed. Most respondents reported to have both negative and positive experiences with showing IWB. On the one hand, examples of negative experiences are an innovative employee reporting to have been crying multiple times at work because her projects just would not work out the way she had in mind. Another respondent reported to be scarred by the projects she showed IWB in, as the projects demanded a lot from her, both physically and mentally. On the other hand, positive experiences of respondents with showing IWB were the emergence of a sense of pride when IWB resulted in tangible results. Respondents reported to be proud of their accomplishments, especially when those tangible results are the result of their own IWB. Respondents also reported to enjoy improving a process, service, or product by showing IWB.

As argued in chapter four, whether the respondent had positive or negative experiences with showing IWB correlated with the received reactions from coworkers and/or managers and correlated not per se with the result of the shown IWB. Reviewing the reported reactions of coworkers and/or managers, also both positive and negative reactions can be distinguished.
Negative reactions in most cases originated from a reluctance to change work habits, or a fear of losing jobs among coworkers and/or managers. Coworkers and/or managers often got frustrated when ideas were introduced, resisted innovative ideas from innovative employees, or even tried to emotionally blackmail innovative employees to stop putting any more efforts into their innovation projects. Innovative employees also received positive reactions on their IWB, as respondents reported to receive compliments during the process of showing IWB and afterwards, on the (tangible) results of the innovative employee’s IWB. Furthermore, (results of) IWB of respondents were used as example throughout the entire organization by managers. By receiving compliments and being used as example to colleagues, respondents were encouraged to show more IWB by coworkers and/or managers.

In accordance with the both positive and negative reactions respondents received on their shown IWB, the way respondents experienced those reactions was also very widespread, from very positive to very negative. In the case a respondent received little resistance and a project was finished successfully, experiences with reactions were found most positive. Negative experiences with reactions from coworkers and/or managers included innovative employees getting frustrated by those reactions, innovative employees taking those reactions home affecting their peace of mind, and even an innovative employee thinking of throwing the towel as she felt her efforts did not lead to a positive project outcome.

Overall, experiences of innovative employees with showing IWB were mixed. Respondents reported both extreme ups and downs in their experiences with showing IWB. On the one hand, showing IWB can be very rewarding, while on the other hand, showing IWB can be very demanding.
Proposition 5: "The experiences of showing innovative work behavior (IWB) differ among innovative employees based on environmental factors."

The fifth proposition was not supported by the results. The fifth proposition has been discussed in chapter four by category 5: ‘informal and non-hierarchical organizations’. This study focused on organizational culture to obtain insight into whether the experiences of showing IWB differ among innovative employees based on environmental factors. As the name of the category used in chapter four suggests, all respondents described the organizations, at least the team or department of which the respondents are part of, as both informal and non-hierarchical. Furthermore, most respondents reported to experience autonomy and freedom.

On the subject organizational culture, no noteworthy differences were found between which environmental factors respondents described and no correlations were found between environmental factors and how the respondents experienced showing IWB. All twelve respondents indicated to have mixed experiences with the process of showing IWB, which makes it challenging to find correlations between specific environmental factors on the one hand and the way an innovative employee experiences showing IWB on the other hand.

Furthermore, all respondents indicated knowledge on mistakes and best practices is being shared among colleagues in the organization (or team/department) they work for. Even though most respondents argued the intensity and/or focus of the knowledge sharing process could be optimized within the organization they work for, a large majority of the innovative employees indicated to have positive experiences with knowledge sharing regarding IWB.

Proposition 6: "The experiences of showing innovative work behavior (IWB) differ among innovative employees based on their personality traits."

The sixth proposition of this study is not supported by the results. The sixth proposition has been discussed in chapter four by category 6: ‘proactive and extrovert personality traits’. Similar to proposition 5, no noteworthy differences were found between the reported
personality traits of the respondents, and neither correlations were found between personality traits and how the innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB. Even though respondents used varying words to describe their personality traits, it became clear most respondents consider themselves to be extrovert, open, and proactive. Furthermore, respondents reported to find satisfaction in connecting people, ideas, and projects with each other. Most personality traits were very alike between the innovative employees. With the found similarities between the personality traits of the innovative employees could be affiliated with previous studies on IWB antecedents focusing on personality traits, as discussed in section 2.5.2.

Even though the results illustrate a combination of personality traits present in a large majority of the interviewed innovative employees, the results of this study do not support the formulated proposition.

*Proposition 7:* "The experiences of showing innovative work behavior (IWB) differ among innovative employees based on gender."

The seventh proposition of this study is not supported by the results. The seventh proposition has not been discussed separately in chapter four, as gender was not specifically discussed in the interviews. Systematically was administrated which respondents were male and which respondents were female. Subsequently, respondents were asked about their experiences with the process of showing IWB. By comparing the answers given and including the respondents’ gender, it was possible to note differences, if present, in the reported experiences with showing IWB and correlating those experiences with gender.

Respondents reported very mixed experiences with showing IWB, varying from very positive to very negative, for differing reasons. Only one female respondent self-reported gender to have influence on her ability to deal with reactions on her IWB by coworkers and/or managers, and it remains questionable whether this statement was made jokingly. Except for this one self-reported correlation between experiences with showing IWB and gender, no
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Noteworthy is the fact that female respondents have reported to experience more extreme emotional states by showing IWB. Whereas only one male respondent reported reactions on his shown IWB influenced his peace of mind, two female respondents respectively reported to have been scarred by showing IWB, and to have cried at work by showing IWB, not forgetting the fact this respondent also reported to have thought of quitting her job by showing IWB. Overall, results of this study are not enough to argue a correlation exists between gender and experiences with showing IWB. Hence, proposition 7 is not supported by the results.

As mentioned often in this study, previous studies on IWB mainly focused on either antecedents of IWB or consequences of IWB. Both were studied mainly quantitatively. This study provides in-depth insights into how innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB, which is important for organizations to understand considering the importance of IWB for the success, competitive advantages and longer-term survival of organizations. No prior in-depth studies have been conducted into the question how innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB themselves. The present study contributes to the academic literature in several ways.

First, this study contributes to the academic literature by providing insight into how innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB: mostly reiterative and project depending, instead of smooth and standardized. Respondents indicated structuring the process can help (e.g. by implementing frameworks or models), but respondents still continued to experience the process of showing IWB as reiterative and project depending.
Second, results of this study indicate all innovative employees, extrarole or professional, experience their IWB as part of their job and (thus) as role behavior. Furthermore, all respondents reported their employers currently expect them to show IWB. Academic literature already contained literature on whether IWB of employees is expected by employers. However, no research was conducted into whether innovative employees experience IWB as role behavior. Besides, respondents in this study all experience their employer to expect them to show IWB, which contrasts with previous findings as Katz and Kahn (1978) found IWB was mostly not expected or role behavior.

Third, this study contributes to the existing academic literature on proinnovation bias, as results entail all respondents to have a positive attitude towards innovation. The organizations the respondents work for also all see innovation as a means to be successful and to survive on the longer-term. Only two respondents reported to consider innovation deliberately, as they critically ask themselves why the organization would be better off with an innovative idea. All other respondents did not report to consider innovation deliberately, which suggests the presence of a proinnovation bias as innovation is seen as solution to all challenges the organization faces and the reigning thought is: the more innovation, the better.

Fourth, this study contributes to academic literature on what experiences innovative employees have with showing IWB by providing in-depth insights into the experiences of the respondents. Until now, studies pointed out consequences of showing IWB, lacking insight into the specific experiences IWB showing employees have in practice. Experiences with showing IWB appear to be very mixed, ranging from very negative to very positive. Furthermore, experiences with showing IWB seem to correlate with the reactions of coworkers and/or managers on the shown IWB, and not specifically with the (non) successful result of an employees’ IWB. Moreover, reactions to IWB shown by innovative employees appear to sometimes be very intense, more negatively than positively. On the one hand, innovative
employees face a large amount of resistance, while on the other hand innovative employees receive many compliments on shown IWB. Reactions on IWB appear to affect the innovative employees both positively and negatively, as results indicated innovative employees are proud of their achievements. The sense of pride is being strengthened by receiving compliments or being used as example. Reactions also affect the innovative employees negatively, as resistance by coworkers and/or managers results in feelings of frustration, uncertainty and impatience and it appeared to as well result in the thought of quitting the job.

As results of this study partially support the predetermined propositions, the research question “how do innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB?” has be answered cautiously. Summarizing all discussed results, innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB as reiterative and project depending, as part of their job and as role behavior, and as necessary for organizational success and longer-term survival. Furthermore, experiences with showing IWB are very mixed, most probable correlating with the reactions of coworkers and/or managers, as reactions affect innovative employees both positively and negatively.

The results of this study are useful for coworkers and/or managers of innovative employees, as well for innovative employees themselves. Innovative employees are provided insights into how other innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB, enabling innovative employees to learn from each other. For example, some innovative employees have already developed good initiatives to share knowledge on best practices and mistakes, whereas knowledge sharing at other innovative employees is still in its infancy. Furthermore, coworkers and/or managers of innovative employees is provided insight into how their reactions on IWB shown by innovative employees could affect the innovative employees. Whereas resistance among coworkers and/or managers impacts the peace of mind on innovative employees, compliments and an encouraging attitude appear to positively affect innovative employees.
5.2 | Limitations

As every other study, the present study also has some limitations. This section acknowledges three limitations. First, respondents of this study have self-reported their status as innovative employee. By providing the criteria the three types of respondents (innovative employees) should have met, respondents have placed themselves in a formulated category. The categorization the respondents made was tested by asking questions on what the daily work of respondents entails. Furthermore, respondents self-reported environmental factors and personality traits and those reported environmental factors and personality traits were not verified or tested.

Second, this study’s focus on innovative employees can be considered to be a limitation. Whereas this study uses a categorization of three types of innovative employees, a fourth category of employees was also mentioned briefly in chapter two: non-innovative employees, i.e., employees who never show IWB. As this study focused on how the process of IWB is experienced by employees, non-innovative employees have been left out of the present study, as non-innovative employees should not be able to answer (most) questions asked in this study, as most questions imply the respondent actually shows IWB. Although, by including the non-innovative employees, it would have been possible to compare experiences with IWB of innovative employees and non-innovative employees to each other, which could have resulted in insights into experiences of non-innovative employees with IWB (which would be of their innovative coworkers). Considering the fact that time to conduct this study was limited, the choice was made to (solely) focus on experiences with showing IWB, leaving the group of non-innovative employees out of the study.

A third limitation to this study is the smaller difference in age between the younger and older respondents per category than was aimed for. Prior to conducting interviews, the goal was set to conduct twelve interviews, which has been accomplished. Those twelve interviews should
be equally distributed among the three formulated categories, which has been managed. Furthermore, male and female respondents should be equally distributed (in total as per category), which has also been managed. The aim to conduct interviews with both a relatively old and a relatively young male and female respondent per category has led to less satisfaction, as the difference between the average age of the relatively young respondents and the relatively old respondents was only 14 years (27 compared with 41). Considering the previously mentioned limited time to conduct this study in, there has been settled for this relatively small difference.

5.3 Future research suggestions

The present study poses some interesting findings, resulting in three concrete suggestions for future research. Firstly, as shortly mentioned in the limitations section, a qualitative study focusing on the experiences of both non-innovative employees and innovative employees with IWB could be of added value to the present study, as such study would result in a more complete overview of the experiences of all employees involved and a comparison could be made between what experiences both categories of employees have with IWB.

Secondly, as briefly discussed in the concluding words of proposition seven, women reported more than men to have experienced extreme emotions by showing IWB. The nature of this difference in emotional reactions to showing IWB has stayed unclear and could be due to several reasons. A possible explanation for the difference is that women react more emotionally on both positive and negative feedback, but the difference could also be explained by under-reported emotions by men. By studying the emotional reactions showing IWB brings about, further insights can be obtained in what employees experience by showing IWB and what role coworkers and/or managers have in this regard.
Thirdly, a qualitative study could also be conducted with more attention to mental health of (innovative) employees. During the present study, it became very clear IWB leads to mixed experiences for both innovative employees as well as for non-innovative employees. While innovative employees experience among other things resistance and aversion from non-innovative coworkers and/or managers, non-innovative employees seem to experience among other things uncertainty about (the future of) their job. By studying emotions of both groups in-depth, insights can be obtained in how IWB affects mental health.
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Discovering how innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB


After reading an extensive body of literature on IWB, it became clear experiences of employees showing IWB in practice have not been studied in-depth before. Although much has been written on IWB and the read literature focused on antecedents and consequences of IWB, experiences of employees showing IWB in practice remained underexplored. To make sure studies on this topic were not overlooked, research has been conducted in two of the most used databases for academic literature, Google Scholar and Web of Science.

To filter results effectively, keywords of this study, that should be in a similar study, were entered as query between quotation marks (e.g. “experiences”). By using quotation marks, both Google Scholar and Web of Science only show results containing all entered search terms. Firstly, the most obvious and relevant query was entered in the mentioned databases (“innovative work behavior” and “innovative employees”). Results were effectively filtered, as Google Scholar showed 119 results, and Web of Science showed only 2 results. To make sure studies similar to the present study would show up, this process was repeated three times in both databases by reiteratively changing the queries. The second query was done using “innovative work behavior” and “employees”, the third query was done using “innovative work behavior” and “experiences” and the fourth query was done using “innovative employees” and “experiences”. Screenshots of all queries are shown below and have recently been updated (June 6, 2020)

To identify potential similar studies to the present study, the from the queries resulting studies have been analyzed by studying their abstracts. From queries resulting in five or less studies, all resulting studies’ abstracts have been analyzed. Queries resulting in more than five studies have been sorted on relevance by both Google Scholar and Web of Science. Results sorted on relevance means studies are sorted based on the density of both search terms.
Reasoning a similar study should also contain the present study’s key terms, similar studies should be displayed as top results if being sorted on relevance. In the case of queries resulting in more than five studies, the five most relevant studies’ abstracts have been analyzed. The results of this analysis are presented in the table below (Table 1). The first column indicates which database was consulted. The second column shows the used search terms (queries). In the third column, the analyzed studies are shown, accompanied by a short summary of the essence of the studies’ abstracts. The fourth column shows how many times the particular studies have been cited.

As can be read in Table 1, no similar studies have been found at all. All studies contain the used search terms. Nonetheless, all those studies focus on other parts of the research topic of IWB. Furthermore, during studying the extensive body of literature resulting in the theoretical framework, also no similar studies were found.

The analysis, combined with the extensive study of literature resulting in the theoretical background of the present study, leads to the conclusion experiences of innovative employees with the process of showing IWB are underexplored and this study is first to provide insight into the experiences of innovative employees with the process of showing IWB.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Search terms (queries)</th>
<th>Results (#)</th>
<th>Essence of article (in one/two sentences from abstract)</th>
<th>Cited (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Google Scholar | “innovative work behavior” “innovative employees” | 241, top 5: | Prieto & Pérez-Santana (2014): examines the relationship between HRM and IWB of employees, mediated by supportive work environment conditions.  
Stock (2015): focuses on whether a lack of resources affects IWB and distinguishes three forms of boureout (a negative psychological state of low work-related arousal).  
De Spiegelaere, Van Gyes, & Van Hootegem (2012): distinguishes blue- and white-collar employees and uses recent insights on the distinction between job challenges and job hindrances, as job design has been identified as a crucial variable in promoting IWB.  
Shih & Susanto (2011): investigates the negative impacts of IWB on conflict with coworkers and turnover intention, while testing the moderating effect of perceived distributive fairness on these relationships.  
Afsar, Badir, & Khan (2015): examining the effects of two person-environment fit perspectives (person-job and person-organization) on IWB through innovation trust. | 195 |
| Google Scholar | “innovative work behavior” “employees”         | 5,020, top 5:| Yidong & Xinxin (2013): explores how ethical leadership influences employees’ IWB through the mediation of intrinsic motivation at both group and individual level.  
Prieto & Pérez-Santana (2014): examines the relationship between HRM and IWB of employees, mediated by supportive work environment conditions.  
Stock (2015): focuses on whether a lack of resources affects IWB and distinguishes three forms of boureout (a negative psychological state of low work-related arousal).  
Afsar, Badir, & Saeed (2014): | 347 |
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| “innovative work behavior” | 2.360, top 5: | Alfes, Truss, Soane, Rees, Gatenby (2013): examines the role played by line managers in the link between HRM practices and individual performance outcomes. | 327 |
| “experiences” | | Afsar & Badir (2017): builds and tests a theoretical model linking workplace spirituality, perceived organizational support and IWB via person-organization fit, by examining the mediating effect of person-organization fit on the relationship of workplace spirituality and perceived organizational support with IWB. Madrid, Patterson, Birdi, Leiva, & Kausel (2014): proposes and tests a model of individual innovation in which weekly moods represent a core construct between context, personality, and IWB. Hertel & Stamov-Rossnagel (2013): introduces reconstruction methods as an approach to measure momentary thoughts and feelings at work. Stock (2015): focuses on whether a lack of resources affects IWB and distinguishes three forms of burnout (a negative psychological state of low work-related arousal). |
| “innovative employees” | 1.500, top 5: | Janssen (2004): examines how perceptions of distributive and procedural fairness |
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**De Spiegelaere, Van Gyes, & Van Hootegem (2012):** distinguishes blue- and white-collar employees and uses recent insights on the distinction between job challenges and job hindrances, as job design has been identified as a crucial variable in promoting IWB.

**“innovative work behavior” “experiences”**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Web of Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Discovering how innovative employees experience the process of showing IWB** | moderate the relationship between IWB and stress.  
**Kaplan (2017):** describes how a culture of innovation plays a role in the shaping of assumptions about what behavior is desirable or undesirable.  
**De Jong & Den Hartog (2007):** provides an inventory of leader behaviors likely to enhance employees’ IWB, including idea generation and application behavior.  
**Jafri (2010):** addresses the relationship between organizational commitment and innovative behavior (in retail).  
**Kim & Koo (2017):** examines how the quality of leader-member exchange helps hotels to achieve innovative behavior and job performance.  

**Web of Science**  
“innovative work behavior” “innovative employees” | 4  
**Awang et al. (2014):** examines the effects of organizational learning and work environment on the formation of employees’ IWB in SMEs in Malaysia.  
**De Spiegelaere, Van Gyes, & Van Hootegem (2012):** distinguishes blue- and white-collar employees and uses recent insights on the distinction between job challenges and job hindrances, as job design has been identified as a crucial variable in promoting IWB.  
**Riaz, Xu, & Hussain (2020):** examines the role of thriving at work and its effects on employees’ IWB.  
**Ampofo, Coetzer, & Poisat (2018):** examines the job embeddedness-life satisfaction relationship, having gender and community embeddedness as moderators and IWB as mediating role. | 3  

1116 195 44 17 0 1 |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“innovative work behavior” “employees”</th>
<th>129, top 5:</th>
<th><strong>Hui, Zhu, &amp; Chen (2015):</strong> explores how developmental experience and organizational commitment affect young employees’ IWB (SMEs in Zhuhai, China).</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Arif, Zubair, &amp; Manzoor (2012):</strong> explores the relationship between employees’ IWB and communication climate within advertisement agencies of electronic and print media.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Awang et al. (2014):</strong> examines the effects of organizational learning and work environment on the formation of employees’ IWB in SMEs in Malaysia.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ho Thanh Tri, Vo Thi Nga, &amp; Juraj (2019):</strong> focuses on the impact of empowering leadership and challenges work environment on both sale employees’ creativity and IWB in the Vietnamese banking industry.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Yunus, Bustaman, Rashdi (2013):</strong> reports on a study that investigated IWB orientation among employees of a local government.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“innovative work behavior” “experiences”</td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Lee &amp; Kartika (2014):</strong> provides more understanding about the antecedents and consequences of expatriate adjustment, which is very important for the expatriate as well as the organization.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Hussain, Iren, &amp; Rice (2020):</strong> examines the determinants of IWB of self-initiated expatriates (SIEs) in a country.</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“innovative employees” “experiences”</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n / a</td>
<td>n / a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: queries in academic literature databases*
Below, screenshots of Google Scholar and Web of Science are presented, showing the queries as described above.

Screenshot 1: Search on Google Scholar with search terms: “innovative work behavior” and “innovative employees” on June 6, 2020.

Screenshot 2: Search on Google Scholar with search terms: “innovative work behavior” and “employees” on June 6, 2020.
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Screenshot 3: Search on Google Scholar with search terms: “innovative work behavior” and “experiences” on June 6, 2020.

Screenshot 4: Search on Google Scholar with search terms: “innovative employees” and “experiences” on June 6, 2020.
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Screenshot 5: Search on Web of Science with search terms: “innovative work behavior” and “innovative employees” on June 6, 2020.

Screenshot 6: Search on Web of Science with search terms: “innovative work behavior” and “employees” on June 6, 2020.
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Screenshot 7: Search on Web of Science with search terms: “innovative work behavior” and “experiences” on June 6, 2020.

Screenshot 8: Search on Web of Science with search terms: “innovative employees” and “experiences” on June 6, 2020.
Appendix B | Announcement to recruit respondents

The following announcement has been published on the LinkedIn profile of the researcher. The announcement is written in Dutch, as the respondents of the study were also assumed to speak Dutch.

“Hallo allemaal!

Helpen jullie mij afstuderen?

Ter afronding van mijn master Innovation & Entrepreneurship aan de Radboud Universiteit schrijf ik momenteel mijn masterthesis. Ik doe onderzoek naar innovatief werkgedrag. In dit kader ben ik op zoek naar innovatieve respondenten: mensen die zich op hun werk (beroepsmatig) met innovatie bezighouden en die mee willen werken aan een interview van ongeveer 30-45 minuten. Gelet op de huidige situatie omtrent COVID-19 zal ik de interviews via Skype afnemen. Praktisch, want u kunt dus gewoon vanuit huis achter uw laptop/telefoon/tablet deelnemen aan mijn onderzoek!

Wie zoek ik?

Ik ben op zoek naar mensen die:

(1) zich niet beroepsmatig met innovatie bezighouden, maar wel innovatief werkgedrag vertonen op het werk,

(2) zich beroepsmatig met innovatie bezighouden (denk aan engineers/innovatiemedewerkers),

(3) als innovatiemanager/-expert (en soortgelijke functieprofielen) werkzaam zijn.

Voldoet u aan één van deze criteria? En wilt u meewerken aan mijn onderzoek? Of kent u iemand die dat kan en wil? Geweldig! Neem contact met mij op in de reacties op dit bericht, via een LinkedIn Message of via jm.paijmans@student.ru.nl.

Hartelijk dank voor het meedenken!”
The following announcement has been published on the Facebook profile of the researcher. The announcement is written in Dutch, as the respondents of the study were also assumed to speak Dutch.

“Hallo allemaal!

Helpen jullie mij afstuderen?

Ter afronding van mijn master Innovation & Entrepreneurship aan de Radboud Universiteit schrijf ik momenteel mijn masterthesis. Ik doe onderzoek naar innovatief werkgedrag. In dit kader ben ik op zoek naar innovatieve respondenten: mensen die zich op hun werk (beroepsmatig) met innovatie bezighouden en die mee willen werken aan een interview van ongeveer 30-45 minuten. Ik zou de interviews graag in persoon af willen nemen, maar gelet op de huidige situatie omtrent COVID-19 zal ik alle interviews via Skype afnemen. Super praktisch, want je kunt dus gewoon vanuit huis achter je laptop/telefoon/tablet deelnemen aan mijn onderzoek!

Wie zoek ik?

Ik ben op zoek naar mensen die:

(1) zich niet beroepsmatig met innovatie bezighouden, maar wel innovatief werkgedrag vertonen op het werk,

(2) zich beroepsmatig met innovatie bezighouden (denk aan engineers/innovatiemedewerkers),

(3) als innovatiemanager/-expert (en soortgelijke functieprofielen) werkzaam zijn.

Voldoe je aan één van deze criteria? En wil je meewerken aan mijn onderzoek? Of ken je iemand die dit kan en wil? Geweldig! Neem contact met mij op in de reacties op dit bericht, via een Facebook Message of via jm.paijmans@student.ru.nl.

Enorm bedankt voor het meedenken!”
Appendix C | Semi-structured interview guideline

This appendix presents the interview guideline that has been used during the conducted interviews. The guideline has been written in Dutch, as all interviews were also conducted in Dutch.

**Inleiding van het interview**

Goedemorgen, -middag, of -avond! Mijn naam is Jan Paijmans. Geweldig dat u mee wilt werken aan mijn onderzoek. Ik verricht dit onderzoek in het kader van mijn Master Innovation & Entrepreneurship, een specialisatie van de Engelstalige Master Business Administration aan de Radboud Universiteit. Het onderzoek, en daarmee dit interview, gaat over innovatief werkgedrag onder ‘innovatieve’ werknemers: werknemers die zich (niet) beroepsmatig met innovatie bezighouden, werknemers die zich beroepsmatig met innovatie bezighouden en managers die zich beroepsmatig met innovatie bezighouden. Het onderzoek richt zich op de ervaringen van deze innovatieve werknemers met het vertonen van innovatief werkgedrag (IWB). Ik zal u vragen stellen over uw werk als ‘innovatieve’ werknemer en uw innovatief werkgedrag.

Het interview duurt ongeveer 30-45 minuten. De antwoorden die u geeft, zullen uitsluitend worden gebruikt voor onderzoeksdoeleinden. Daarnaast worden uw antwoorden volledig geanonimiseerd en aan niemand (uitgezonderd mijzelf) ter beschikking gesteld. Ik zal dit interview transcriberen (tekstueel uitwerken) ten behoeve van mijn onderzoek en het transcript van dit interview zal ik desgewenst ter inzage aan u toesturen om het op correctheid te controleren, tenzij u, aan het einde van het interview, aangeeft dat u dat niet wenst. Indien u het transcript wenst te ontvangen, stel ik u in de gelegenheid uw antwoorden aan te passen als u dat wenst.
**Topic list**

Tijdens het interview komen verschillende onderwerpen aan bod omtrent uw ervaringen met het tonen van innovatief werkgedrag:

- het innovatieproces;
- ervaringen tijdens het vertonen van innovatief werkgedrag;
- ervaringen na afloop van het vertonen van innovatief werkgedrag;

_Hieronder staan de vragen opgenomen die in ieder geval aan de respondenten zullen worden gesteld. Gelet op het semigestructureerde karakter van dit interview zal ik doorvragen waar nodig en relevant. Beantwoording van deze interviewvragen moet leiden tot een gedegen toetsing van de in de studie geformuleerde proposities. Deze proposities worden niet met respondenten gedeeld._

**Vragen:**

**Inleidende vragen:**

**Vraag 1:** Wat is uw leeftijd, uw hoogst genoten opleiding, uw huidige functie en uw arbeidsverleden?

*Met deze inleidende vraag wordt inzicht verkregen in de leeftijd van de respondent, zijn/haar huidige functie en zijn/haar (recente) arbeidsverleden. Deze informatie wordt verzameld om in de methodologie sectie een overzicht te kunnen geven van de respondenten.*

**Vraag 2:** Wat houden uw dagelijkse werkzaamheden in?

*Met deze inleidende vraag wordt inzicht verkregen in het werk dat de respondent dagelijks uitvoert. Daarmee wordt informatie verzameld over wat er onder het functieprofiel van de respondent valt en wat de respondent daadwerkelijk dagelijks doet voor werk.*
Vraag 3: Bij hoeveel innovatieprojecten/-processen binnen uw organisatie bent u betrokken geweest?

*Met deze inleidende vraag wordt inzicht verkregen in de ‘ervarenheid’ van de respondent met innovatieprojecten en -processen. Hoewel het announcement een criterium bevat voor de ervarenheid van een respondent, wordt middels deze vraag bevestigd dat de respondent inderdaad (enige) ervaring heeft.*

**De volgende vragen hebben betrekking op (/toetsen) propositie 1:**

“Innovative employees experience the process of showing innovative work behavior (IWB) as a reiterative and chaotic process rather than a consecutive and smooth process.”

Vraag 4: Hoe ervaart u het innovatieproces als u innovatief werkgedrag vertoont?

*Met deze vraag wordt propositie 1 getoetst. Antwoord op de vraag moet inzicht geven in hoe de respondent het innovatieproces ervaart wanneer hij/zij IWB vertoont. Er kan altijd doorgevraagd worden indien de respondent niet begrijpt dat de vraag gaat over het verloop van het innovatieproces.*

Vraag 5: Hoe start u doorgaans met het vertonen van innovatief werkgedrag en hoe ziet het vervolg van dat traject eruit?

*Met deze vraag wordt propositie 1 getoetst. Met deze vraag wordt informatie verkregen over hoe de respondent start met het vertonen van IWB en hoe het vervolg van het innovatieproces is. Met andere woorden: is er een gestructureerd verloop, worden er fasen doorlopen, etc.*

Vraag 6: Onderscheidt u fasen in het vertonen van innovatief werkgedrag, en zo ja, welke fasen onderscheidt u?

*Met deze vraag wordt propositie 1 getoetst. Verschillende auteurs onderscheiden fasen, terwijl anderen dat niet doen. Antwoord moet inzicht geven in of de respondent het innovatieproces ervaart als een gestructureerd en gefaseerd proces als hij/zij IWB vertoont.*
De volgende vragen hebben betrekking op (/toetsen) propositie 2:

“Innovative employees experience showing innovative work behavior (IWB) as role behavior and not as extrarole behavior.”

Vraag 7: Hoe ervaart u het vertonen van innovatief werkgedrag?

(Ervaart u het als (onderdeel van) uw werk?)

Met deze vraag wordt propositie 2 getoetst. Antwoord moet inzicht geven in of de respondent het vertonen van IWB ervaart als rolgedrag. Met de antwoorden op deze vraag kan (hoogstwaarschijnlijk) onderscheid worden gemaakt tussen de drie categorieën medewerkers die onderscheiden worden.

Vraag 8: Welke medewerkers vertonen innovatief werkgedrag in de organisatie waarvoor u werkt?

Met deze vraag wordt propositie 2 getoetst. Antwoord moet inzicht geven in de wijze waarop innovatie wordt uitgevoerd in de organisatie waarin de respondent werkt, door wie IWB wordt vertoond en of de respondent zich bewust is van een verdeling van deze taken in de organisatie.

Vraag 9: Welke verwachtingen heeft uw werkgever van u met betrekking tot het vertonen van innovatief werkgedrag?

Met deze vraag wordt propositie 2 getoetst. Antwoord moet inzicht geven in of de respondent weet wat zijn/haar werkgever van hem/haar verwacht met betrekking tot het vertonen van IWB en wat die verwachtingen van de werkgever daadwerkelijk zijn.

De volgende vragen hebben betrekking op (/toetsen) propositie 3:

“Innovative employees experience the organization in which they work has a proinnovation bias with regard to their innovative work behavior (IWB).”
Vraag 10: Hoe denkt u zelf over innovatie en innovatief werkgedrag?

Met deze vraag wordt propositie 3 getoetst. Allereerst moet duidelijk zijn wat de respondent zelf vindt van innovatie en IWB, alvorens te kunnen vragen wat in de organisatie waarin de respondent werkt gedacht wordt van IWB.

Vraag 11: Wat ervaart u met betrekking tot hoe de organisatie waarvoor u werkt tegenover innovatie in het algemeen staat?

Met deze vraag wordt propositie 3 getoetst. Antwoord moet inzicht geven in hoe de houding van de organisatie jegens innovatie in het algemeen door de respondent wordt ervaren.

Vraag 12: Wat ervaart u met betrekking tot de vraag hoe de organisatie waarvoor u werkt tegenover uw innovatief werkgedrag staat?

Met deze vraag wordt propositie 3 getoetst. De vraag leidt tot inzicht in de houding van de organisaties waarin de respondenten werken en of de respondenten die houding jegens IWB ervaren als een proinnovation bias.

De volgende vragen hebben betrekking op (/toetsen) propositie 4:

“Innovative employees have negative experiences with showing innovative work behavior (IWB).”

Vraag 13: Als u terugkijkt op de innovatieprojecten waarin u betrokken bent geweest, met wat voor gevoelens kijkt u dan op die projecten terug?

Met deze vraag wordt propositie 4 getoetst en wordt duidelijk wat de respondent heeft ervaren door het tonen van IWB en wat voor gevoelens de respondent aan die projecten heeft overgehouden. De respondent wordt uitgenodigd te vertellen over zijn ervaringen met het tonen van IWB.
Vraag 14: Hoe reageerden/reageren collega’s en managers op het door u vertonen van innovatief werkgedrag?

Met deze vraag wordt propositie 4 getoetst. Antwoord moet inzicht geven in welke reacties de respondent kreeg van collega’s en managers tijdens het vertonen van IWB.

Vraag 15: Heeft uw innovatief werkgedrag geresulteerd in tastbare resultaten? Zo ja, Hoe reageerden/reageren collega’s en managers op de resultaten van uw innovatief werkgedrag?

Met deze vraag wordt propositie 4 getoetst. Antwoord moet inzicht geven in wat voor reacties de respondent kreeg van collega’s en managers op de resultaten van het vertonen IWB.

Vraag 16: Hoe heeft u de reacties die u heeft gehad op het vertonen van / de resultaten van innovatief werkgedrag ervaren?

Met deze vraag wordt propositie 4 getoetst. Antwoord moet inzicht geven in hoe de respondent de reacties (vraag 15/16) heeft ervaren.

De volgende vraag heeft betrekking op (/toetst) propositie 5:

“The experiences of showing innovative work behavior (IWB) differ among innovative employees based on environmental factors.”

De ervaringen van de respondenten met het vertonen van IWB worden al gemeten door eerdere vragen. Vraag 17 ziet daarom enkel op de ‘environmental factors’, vertaald als ‘omgevingsfactoren’ die de respondent ervaart.
Vraag 17: Hoe omschrijft/typeert u de organisatie waarin u werkt?

Denk daarbij aan organisatiecultuur, leiderschapsstijl, etc.

De volgende vraag heeft betrekking op (/toetst) propositie 6:

“The experiences of showing innovative work behavior (IWB) differ among innovative employees based on personality traits.”

De ervaringen van de respondenten met het vertonen van IWB worden al gemeten door eerdere vragen. Vraag 18 ziet daarom enkel op de ‘personality traits’, vertaald als ‘persoonlijkheidskenmerken’, die de respondent zegt te hebben.

Vraag 18: Als u uzelf moet omschrijven in termen van ‘persoonlijkheidskenmerken’, over welke persoonlijkheidskenmerken beschikt u dan?

Met betrekking tot propositie 7:

“The experiences of showing innovative work behavior (IWB) differ among innovative employees based on gender.”

De ervaringen van de respondenten met het vertonen van IWB worden al gemeten door eerdere vragen. Het geslacht van de respondent wordt de onderzoeker aan het begin van het interview duidelijk. Het ‘gender-gedeelte’ van propositie 7 wordt daarom niet getoetst met een specifieke vraag.
Afsluitende vragen:

Vraag 19: Heeft u nog overige opmerkingen over uw ervaringen met innovatief werkgedrag?

Met deze afsluitende vraag worden eventueel onbesproken ervaringen met innovatief werkgedrag alsnog besproken.

Vraag 20: Heeft u opmerkingen of vragen naar aanleiding van dit interview?

Met deze afsluitende vraag worden eventueel onbesproken (relevante) onderwerpen alsnog besproken.

Vraag 21: Wenst u het transcript dat ik naar aanleiding van dit interview opstel te ontvangen en door te nemen, waarmee u ook eventuele veranderingen kunt aanbrengen?

Met deze afsluitende vraag wordt teruggegrepen naar de start van het interview en wordt de respondent in de gelegenheid gesteld om aan te geven het transcript wel/niet te willen ontvangen.

Indien vraag 21 bevestigend is beantwoord:

Vraag 22: Wat zijn uw contactgegevens?

Met deze afsluitende vraag wordt de onderzoeker in de gelegenheid gesteld het uitgewerkte transcript aan de respondent toe te sturen, indien dat zijn/haar voorkeur geniet.
Appendix D  |  Overview of open codes

As mentioned in section 3.3 were all twelve transcripts read thoroughly. Following the principles of the inductive analysis approach, all twelve transcripts were open coded by highlighting text fragments and ascribing a code to the text fragment. The open coding process resulted in a list of 493 unique codes. The list is displayed in the table (Table 3) below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aangenomen om processen te verbeteren en te versnellen</th>
<th>Gebrek aan structuur biedt ruimte</th>
<th>Kleine teams</th>
<th>Projecten worden stopgezet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afgunst en sceptisch over werkwijze</td>
<td>Geduldig</td>
<td>Knelpunt identificeren</td>
<td>Protocol werkt niet overal voor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afkeer en afgunst</td>
<td>Geen 9-5 mentaliteit</td>
<td>Knokken om te iets voor elkaar te krijgen</td>
<td>Reacties persoonlijk aantrekken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alles moet blijven zoals het is</td>
<td>Geen erg sterk leiderschap</td>
<td>Knokken om te krijgen wat je wil</td>
<td>Reacties persoonlijk aantrekken is lastig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse, idee, concept, testen</td>
<td>Geen innovatieprotocol vastgelegd</td>
<td>Kritisch</td>
<td>Reacties stimuleren om meer IWB te vertonen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyseren van processen en verbeterpunten aanstippen</td>
<td>Geen persoonlijk belang</td>
<td>Langzaam en moeizaam</td>
<td>Reacties wisselen per (soort) project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytisch</td>
<td>Geen R&amp;D bedrijf</td>
<td>Langzaam/sloom</td>
<td>Reacties zijn niet persoonlijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticiperen op de markt en flexibel zijn</td>
<td>Geen vaste route</td>
<td>Langzame projecten</td>
<td>Reacties zijn ook persoonlijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertief</td>
<td>Geen vloeiende beweging van idee, uitwerking, implementatie</td>
<td>Laten leiden door waan van de dag</td>
<td>Reacties zijn zwaar en verschrikkelijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomie en vrijheid wordt geboden</td>
<td>Geen vloeiende beweging, wel lijn</td>
<td>Lef/moedig</td>
<td>Reiteratiefheid leidt tot beste resultaat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bang en onzeker door IWB</td>
<td>Gefrustreerde mailtjes van collega’s</td>
<td>Leiderschapsstijl is heel plat</td>
<td>Rekening houden met collega’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedenken is gemakkelijker dan het op papier krijgen en draagvlak creëren</td>
<td>Geloof in eigen kunnen en in projecten</td>
<td>Leiderschapsstijl is motiverend, veel autonomie en vrijheid</td>
<td>Respondent is erg positief over innovatie en denkt dat het momentum ervoor is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedenken is gemakkelijker dan het verkrijgen van financiering en draagvlak</td>
<td>Gepassioneerd</td>
<td>Leidinggevende is blij met IWB</td>
<td>Resultaat zonder budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedrijf slaat soms door in denken in mogelijkheden</td>
<td>Geslacht maakt gevoelig</td>
<td>Leidinggevende snapt goed dat vooruitgang niet vanzelf komt</td>
<td>Risico op overregulering bestaat bij het innovatieproces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begint meestal met de vraag wat het idee is en wat ermee opgelost wordt</td>
<td>Geslacht: man</td>
<td>Leuk als collega's wat aan IWB hebben</td>
<td>Ruimte voor humor en lol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behulpzaam</td>
<td>Geslacht: vrouw</td>
<td>Leuk dat er geïnnoveerd wordt</td>
<td>Ruimte voor IWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belang wordt nog weleens onderschat</td>
<td>Gestructureerd, omdat respondent veel structuur aan wil brengen</td>
<td>Leuk om andere dingen te doen</td>
<td>Ruimte voor mensen die ruimdenkend zijn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belangen afwegen</td>
<td>Gestructureerd/planmatig</td>
<td>Leuke en goede ideeën</td>
<td>Scenario's denken is taak van respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belangrijk dat je zelf innovatief werkgedrag vertoont, resulteert in een stapje voor</td>
<td>Gevaren niet inzien van bepaalde projecten</td>
<td>Leuke projecten, een grote puzzel</td>
<td>Sceptisch, negatief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belangrijk om ideeën af te kaderen</td>
<td>Gevoelens anderen hebben invloed</td>
<td>Lineair proces is onzin</td>
<td>Serious wanneer het moet, los wanneer het kan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belangrijk om veel draagvlak te creëren voor een idee om weerstand te beperken</td>
<td>Gevoelens hangen af van de reacties</td>
<td>Littekens overgehouden aan bepaalde projecten</td>
<td>Snel in de waan van de dag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belangrijk, maar er moet een balans zijn</td>
<td>Gevoelens hangen af van het project</td>
<td>Lobbyen en politiek bedrijven</td>
<td>Snel positief bij laagdrempelige veranderingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belangrijk, mag er echt zijn</td>
<td>Gevoelsmens, houdt van warme sfeer</td>
<td>Loyaal</td>
<td>Sociaal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belonend gevoel door IWB</td>
<td>Groep bang overbodig te worden</td>
<td>Luisteren naar de markt</td>
<td>Sociaal bedrijf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beloningsstructuur noodzakelijk</td>
<td>Groep juicht IWB toe</td>
<td>Management en leidinggevende zijn heel positief over IWB</td>
<td>Sommige collega's bieden weerstand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bestaat meestal uit ongeveer vier stappen</td>
<td>Hakken in het zand bij grote omslag</td>
<td>Medewerkers die IWB vertonen verdienen promotie en worden beloond</td>
<td>Sommige collega's doen ding en verder niets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betrokken en benaderbaar</td>
<td>Handen vol aan normaal werk</td>
<td>Medewerkers krijgen de vrijheid om te innoveren</td>
<td>Sommige collega's geven heel veel energie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betrokkenheid leidt tot meer reacties</td>
<td>Heel belangrijk om draagvlak te creëren en te verbinden</td>
<td>Meerwaarde van IWB onduidelijk</td>
<td>Sommige collega's willen graag blijven doen wat ze al jaren doen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betrouwbaar</td>
<td>Heel belangrijk, als je het niet doet haak je af</td>
<td>Meeste collega's zijn positief</td>
<td>Sommige collega's willen niet verder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bij projecten komt politiek kijken</td>
<td>Heel belangrijk, moet gestimuleerd worden</td>
<td>Meeste IWB wordt vertoond door research collega's</td>
<td>Sommige projecten hebben teveel gevraagd van respondenten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bijltje erbij neergooien</td>
<td>Heel blij met project</td>
<td>Meetings organiseren om te polsen</td>
<td>Sommigen zitten echt te wachten op innovatie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blijdschap en trots als reacties positief zijn</td>
<td>Heel financieel ingesteld, meetbaar</td>
<td>Meningen stakeholders peilen</td>
<td>Soms ander idee beter en dus weer opnieuw beginnen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgettaire frictie en weerstand collega's</td>
<td>Heel moeizaam project gedraaid</td>
<td>Mensen vooraf informeren</td>
<td>Soms andere mensen vanwege expertise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgettaire redenen om projecten te stoppen</td>
<td>Heel snel innoveren en nooit tevreden met status quo</td>
<td>Mensen werken niet mee</td>
<td>Soms is iets een goed idee, maar pas voor de toekomst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capaciteit verbeteren en processen verbeteren is taak</td>
<td>Helder en transparant zijn</td>
<td>Mensen zetten het op de laatste plaats</td>
<td>Soms moet een idee terug naar de tekentafel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaotisch</td>
<td>Het is een pingpong spel, je bent constant iets aan het aanpassen</td>
<td>Met mensen gaan praten</td>
<td>Spannend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collega's bang en onzeker door innovaties</td>
<td>Het is een proces van trial &amp; error, iets proberen en dat weer verbeteren</td>
<td>Meteen handelen of overleggen met manager</td>
<td>Staat open om te leren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collega's bieden weerstand</td>
<td>Hoe dichter bij implementatie hoe meer weerstand</td>
<td>Minste IWB wordt vertoond door commerciële collega's</td>
<td>Stage Gate implementatie mislukt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collega's merken resultaten</td>
<td>Hoe meer eigen invulling, hoe leuker</td>
<td>Misschien wel aparte stappen, wel altijd een bepaalde volgorde</td>
<td>Standaard ontwikkeld, maar altijd maatwerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collega's schieten in emoties</td>
<td>Hoge verwachtingen</td>
<td>Moeizaam</td>
<td>Stap voor stap uitleggen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collega's streven ander doel na</td>
<td>Hoge verwachtingen van werknemers</td>
<td>Momentum is er voor innovatie</td>
<td>Stappen komen altijd wel voor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collega's vertonen zelden innovatief werkgedrag</td>
<td>Hoop slapeloze nachten</td>
<td>Mooie projecten</td>
<td>Stappen zetten geeft fijne energie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collega's weigeren mee te denken</td>
<td>Houding is positief</td>
<td>Na het ontstaan van het idee wordt het idee eerst uitgewerkt</td>
<td>Stappen zijn veelal hetzelfde, maar inhoud van die stappen verschilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collega's zijn enthousiast en vinden het interessant</td>
<td>Huilend op kantoor gezeten</td>
<td>Na het opschrijven kan het innovatieve idee worden verlaten</td>
<td>Stappenproces, niet per se gestroomlijnd, stapjes voor- en achteruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collega's zijn positief en geven complimenten</td>
<td>Idee - implementatie</td>
<td>Na input beslissing over verder proces</td>
<td>Start is met analyse knelpunt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collega's zijn vaak positief als ze luisteren</td>
<td>Idee kan alsnog worden aangepast of gedropt na overleg</td>
<td>Na plannen implementeren en collega's betrekken</td>
<td>Start komt door een event (positief of negatief)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimenten over structuur</td>
<td>Idee ontstaat door trigger om anders tegen dingen aan te kijken</td>
<td>Nadelen functioneel leiderschap voor IWB</td>
<td>Start komt vanuit probleem dat opgelost moet worden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complimenten van collega's zijn leuk</td>
<td>Idee ontstaat meestal buiten je eigen discipline</td>
<td>Neerleggen bij weerstand</td>
<td>Steeds meer ruimte om kennis te delen door meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontatie mijdend</td>
<td>Idee stagsgewijs uitwerken</td>
<td>Negatieve ervaringen zijn leerzaam</td>
<td>Stopzetten is lastig uit te leggen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact met sommigen is worsteling</td>
<td>Idee voorleggen aan innovatiemakelaar</td>
<td>Niet altijd positieve houding jegens innovatie</td>
<td>Streberig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast is groot</td>
<td>Idee, overleg met baas, uitvoeren</td>
<td>Niet echt gestructureerd</td>
<td>Streng voor anderen/hoge verwachtingen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creatief</td>
<td>Idee, overleg, implementatie</td>
<td>Niet erg gestructureerd</td>
<td>Structuur in innovatieproces aangebracht door respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultuurverschil door geografische liggingen</td>
<td>Idee, pitch, intakegesprek, product owner</td>
<td>Niet hiërarchisch</td>
<td>Structuur ligt ook aan mensen die project draaien</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
De boer op gaan met innovatieve ideeën | Ideeën komen van medewerkers en worden dan verlegd | Niet hiërarchisch, maar wel cultuurverschil met buitenland | Structuur/gestroomlijningheid verschilt per project
---|---|---|---
De organisatie moet groeien en volwassen over moet komen | Ideeën box | Niets niet gelukt | Succes afhankelijk van product owner
Decentraal ingericht | Iedereen is toegankelijk en neemt tijd | Niets werkt optimaal | Succes idee verkopen is afhankelijk van betrokkene
Denken in mogelijkheden | Iets verbeteren/versnellen/efficiënter maken | Nieuwsgierig | Succes leidt tot blijdschap
Design thinking om proces te structureren | Impact is bepalend voor reacties op IWB | Noodzaak om dingen van je af te zetten | Suggesties en terug naar de tekentafel
Design thinking: vier stappen | Implementatie is lastig | Noodzaak wordt erkend, maar tegelijkertijd ontbreekt slagkracht | Taakstellend
Diepgeworteld geloof in innovatie | In gesprek gaan over innovatieve ideeën | Noodzakelijk | Teleurstellend dat het lang duurde
Dingen anders zien | In onmogelijkheden denken | Noodzakelijk om door te kunnen groeien | Testen en dan met feedback verder
Directie enthousiast geworden | Informeel en betrokken | Noodzakelijk om mee te kunnen met andere landen | Teveel structuur knuppelt ideeën ook dood
Directie stuurt heel erg aan op innovatie | Informeel in omgang | Noodzakelijk om niet slechter te worden | Trots op de projecten
Directie vond aanpassingen lastig | Informeel in omgang extern | Noodzakelijk, de wereld verandert en je moet mee | Trots op projecten
Directie vond idee van respondent niet nodig | Informeel in omgang intern | Noodzakelijk, dynamische omgeving vergt dat gedrag om mee te kunnen | Tussentijds dingen veranderen en finetunen
Doe maar gewoon, dan doe je al gek genoeg | Initiatiefrijk | Nuchtere en open houding | Tweedeling: positief en negatief
Doen omdat je het goed kunt | Innovatie en de bijkomende houding staan wel haaks op de traditionele cultuur | Ogenschijnlijk makkelijke verandering leidde tot veel weerstand | Tweespalt tussen wil en daadwerkelijk gedrag door capaciteitskort
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thema</th>
<th>Innovatie is belangrijk om een voorsprong te verkrijgen en te behouden</th>
<th>Omslag in perspectief</th>
<th>Uiteindelijk zien collega's voordelen in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Door de tijd heen mee om leren gaan</td>
<td>Innovatie is competitive edge</td>
<td>Ongeduldig</td>
<td>Vaak bevredigend bij geslaagde projecten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Door weerstand harder werken</td>
<td>Innovatie is een lopende race die geen finish heeft, maar je moet mee rennen</td>
<td>Onmisbaar, stilstand is achteruitgang, alles kan en moet beter/makkelijker/sneller</td>
<td>Vaak het gevecht aangaan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doorzettings-vermogen</td>
<td>Innovatie is gevaar voor baan</td>
<td>Ontwikkeling van medewerkers is belangrijk</td>
<td>Vaak niet positief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draagvlak creëren</td>
<td>Innovatie is heel belangrijk</td>
<td>Onzeker over of het allemaal wel goed gaat</td>
<td>Vaak weerstand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draagvlak creëren en mensen enthousiast maken</td>
<td>Innovatie is heel tijdssintensief</td>
<td>Oogkleppen afzetten en verantwoordelijkheid nemen</td>
<td>Vallen en opstaan, learning by doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draagvlak creëren en verbinding zoeken</td>
<td>Innovatie is noodzakelijk</td>
<td>Op de vingers getikt</td>
<td>Van respondent wordt IWB verwacht</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draagvlak creëren kost veel tijd</td>
<td>Innovatie is noodzakelijk, maar op 2e of 3e plek gezet</td>
<td>Op iemands tenen gaan staan</td>
<td>Vechten tegen de bierkaai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duidelijk en transparant communiceren</td>
<td>Innovatie vindt gefragmenteerd plaats in de organisatie</td>
<td>Op zoek naar efficiëntie</td>
<td>Veel behoedzamer en langzamer dan werkgever met innovatie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamische branche, er verandert veel en dus is innovatie noodzakelijk</td>
<td>Innovatiebudget dat wordt vrijgemaakt valt tegen</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>Veel geleerd van project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Een proces met stapjes vooruit, stapjes terug en omzwervingen</td>
<td>Innovatiemakelaars soms onbekend</td>
<td>Open staan voor mensen en ideeën</td>
<td>Veel geleerd van projecten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eén protocol werkt niet</td>
<td>Innovatiepand</td>
<td>Open voor innovaties, zonder focus en daardoor wildgroei</td>
<td>Veel hangt af van houding collega's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eerst dingen uitzoeken en testen</td>
<td>Innovaties hebben grote gevolgen</td>
<td>Opschrijven van het idee/plan</td>
<td>Veelzijdig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eerst idee</td>
<td>Innovatieve houding werkgever maakt respondent soms opgejaagd</td>
<td>Organisatie moet resources vrij maken voor innovaties</td>
<td>Verandering van werkwijze stuitte op veel weerstand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eerst idee (zelf bedacht of door collega aangedragen)</td>
<td>Innovatieve ideeën komen vanuit medewerkers</td>
<td>Organisatie staat middenin de maatschappij en moet anticiperen</td>
<td>Verandering wordt als iets slechts ervaren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eerst idee, dan overleg met baas, dan plannen</td>
<td>Inspanningen worden gewaardeerd</td>
<td>Organisatie vindt geld verdienen belangrijker dan te boek staan als innovatief bedrijf</td>
<td>Veranderingen van de normale manier zijn eng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eerst idee, dan snel feedback</td>
<td>Inspirerend</td>
<td>Over het algemeen positief</td>
<td>Verantwoordelijk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eerst overleggen, zorgen voor eenheid</td>
<td>Invulling proces verschilt per project</td>
<td>Overall positief</td>
<td>Verantwoordelijkhede organisatie IWB stimuleren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eerst processen helder krijgen en uitzoeken</td>
<td>Iteratiefheid van het proces in</td>
<td>Overleg met werkgever over idee</td>
<td>Verantwoordelijkheid, respondent probeert mensen te verbinden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eerst voornamelijk basisprocessen analyseren</td>
<td>IWB als voorbeeld gebruikt</td>
<td>Overleg met werkgever over idee</td>
<td>Verbeterde proces wordt opgevolgd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigen initiatief wordt gewaardeerd</td>
<td>IWB als voorbeeld gebruikt voor collega's</td>
<td>Overleg met werkgever over idee (budgettaire redenen)</td>
<td>Verbinden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenwijs</td>
<td>IWB an sich geen selectiecriterium</td>
<td>Overleggen met collega's</td>
<td>Verder in het proces wordt het lastiger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Einddoel van IWB verandert weleens</td>
<td>IWB geen onderdeel van functie-omschrijving</td>
<td>Overleggen met een paar mensen die je vertrouwt</td>
<td>Verschillen tussen jonge en oude collega's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ene fase duurt langer dan de andere</td>
<td>IWB geen prio 1 werk</td>
<td>Overleggen met mensen en een duwtje krijgen</td>
<td>Verschillend per project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ene fase gaat gemakkelijker dan de andere</td>
<td>IWB is leuk</td>
<td>Overstag gegaan voor IWB</td>
<td>Verwachting IWB gekoppeld aan functie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energie door focus</td>
<td>IWB is noodzakelijk en onmisbaar voor innovatie</td>
<td>Pad is altijd hetzelfde</td>
<td>Verwachting IWB is persoonsgebonden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng dat ideeën verlaten kunnen worden</td>
<td>IWB is onderdeel van werk</td>
<td>Paniek door IWB</td>
<td>Verwachting oplossingsgericht werken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>IWB</td>
<td>Perfectionistische</td>
<td>Voldoening als IWB leidt tot verbetering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng getel op de grote belangen en gevolgen</td>
<td>IWB is ontwikkeld gedurende de tijd, reden onbekend</td>
<td>Perfectionistisch houding</td>
<td>Vooraf collega's inlichten voor draagvlak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiast</td>
<td>IWB is toegenomen gedurende de tijd</td>
<td>Perfectionistische trekken</td>
<td>Vooral bezig met de waan van de dag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiaste persoonlijkheid</td>
<td>IWB knappe prestatie</td>
<td>Plannen van implementatie</td>
<td>Vooral een proces dat stokt en stapjes terug behoeft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Er ontstond een wildgroei aan ideeën</td>
<td>IWB maakt werknemer onderscheidend</td>
<td>Voldoening als IWB leidt tot verbetering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Er wordt een kosten-baten analyse gemaakt van de innovatie</td>
<td>IWB vertonen zonder verwachting</td>
<td>Platte structuur</td>
<td>Vragen naar reacties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Er wordt wat gedaan met IWB</td>
<td>IWB wordt niet gebruikt</td>
<td>Politiek spel</td>
<td>Vrijheid nodig om stappen terug te zetten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erg innovatie gericht</td>
<td>IWB wordt van iedereen gevraagd</td>
<td>Positief</td>
<td>Vroeger veel ruimte voor en erg gefragmenteerd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erg positief over innovatie en innovatief werkgedrag, niet altijd zicht op gevaren</td>
<td>IWB wordt van respondent verwacht</td>
<td>Positief over innovatie en innovatief werkgedrag</td>
<td>Vroeger was alles beter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervaringen afhankelijk van reacties collega's</td>
<td>IWB wordt verwacht</td>
<td>Positief, heel erg voor</td>
<td>Waardering voor IWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervaringen betrekken op zichzelf</td>
<td>Je moet een voorsprong creëren op concurrentie</td>
<td>Positief, maar wel met de vraag erbij waarom en wat het oplevert</td>
<td>Wat er is werkt, dus waarom 'change a winning team’?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervaringen en gevoelens wisselen</td>
<td>Je moet mee met je dynamische omgeving, de wereld om je heen verandert</td>
<td>Positieve reacties geven veel energie</td>
<td>Weerstand en maar half meewerken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervaringen en gevoelens wisselen per project</td>
<td>Jongeren denken vrijer</td>
<td>Positieve reacties leveren meer werk op</td>
<td>Weerstand tegen innovatie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ervaringen meestal positief</td>
<td>Kalm</td>
<td>Positieve reacties zijn fijn</td>
<td>Weerstand tegen nieuwe manier van werken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimenteren/pilote n/testen</td>
<td>Kan leiden tot een rommelte en dat het bedrijf van het pad afwijkt</td>
<td>Proactief</td>
<td>Weerstand tegen nieuwe werkwijzen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait</td>
<td>Kan zakelijk zijn, maar er moet ruimte zijn voor humor</td>
<td>Proactief, probleemoplossen d en verantwoordelijkheid zijn belangrijk</td>
<td>Wel fasen, maar het gaat wel op en neer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falen maakt een idee alleen maar beter</td>
<td>Karakter bepaalt IWB verwachting</td>
<td>Proces is vaak duwtjes naar links/rechts</td>
<td>Werk blijft door hoofd malen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falende innovaties is niet erg</td>
<td>Kennis over resultaten wordt voornamelijk gedeeld</td>
<td>Proces met veel loopjes</td>
<td>Werk mee naar huis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiaire cultuur</td>
<td>Kennis wordt gedeeld</td>
<td>Proces van aftasten en hier en daar advies inwinnen</td>
<td>Werk mee naar huis en denkt vaak aan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiaire cultuur en open houding</td>
<td>Kennis wordt gedeeld door meetings</td>
<td>Processen verbeteren en komen met opmerkingen om processen te verbeteren</td>
<td>Werkgever is enthousiast en is positief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback is positief</td>
<td>Kennis wordt gedeeld door mensen te verbinden</td>
<td>Product owner nodig om idee geïmplementeerd te krijgen</td>
<td>Werkgever is erg positief over innovatie en innovatief werkgedrag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fijn samengewerkt</td>
<td>Kennis wordt gedeeld om van elkaar te leren</td>
<td>Product owners aanwijzen</td>
<td>Werkgever selecteert op persoonlijkheid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibel</td>
<td>Kennis wordt gedeeld tot op afdelingsniveau</td>
<td>Project heeft veel opgeleverd</td>
<td>Werkgever verwacht geen IWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus ligt op geld verdienen, maar waar mogelijk wordt innovatie toegejuicht</td>
<td>Kennis wordt te weinig gedeeld, voornamelijk door tijd (en dus budget)</td>
<td>Projecten hebben resultaat gehad</td>
<td>Werkgever verwacht innovatieve mindset</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatie met collega's</td>
<td>Kennisdeling kan beter, wordt wel gedaan over proces</td>
<td>Projecten kennen horten en stoten</td>
<td>Werkgever verwacht IWB van managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustratie bij weerstand</td>
<td>Kennisdeling via vergaderingen</td>
<td>Projecten leveren veel druk op</td>
<td>Werkgever verwacht IWB van medewerkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustratie en chagrijn bij weerstand</td>
<td>Kijken waar knelpunt zit</td>
<td>Projecten moeten korter</td>
<td>Werkgever verwacht IWB van respondent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaat niet vanzelfsprekend snel, duurt meestal een tijdje</td>
<td>Klagen bij elkaar over IWB</td>
<td>Projecten uiteindelijk in praktijk gebracht</td>
<td>Werkgever verwacht van iedereen IWB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gates om innovatieproces te structureren</td>
<td>Klanten voorzien in behoeften en dus is innovatie belangrijk</td>
<td>Projecten vergen offers</td>
<td>Werknemers gaan klagen en denken zeggenschap te hebben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workaholic</td>
<td>Zakelijk</td>
<td>Zoeken naar fouten</td>
<td>Wordt nu meer gestroomlijnd</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: complete list of all open codes assigned to text fragments from transcripts*
Appendix E | Open coded transcripts

The twelve coded transcripts are presented, starting on the next page. As indicated in section 3.2, all transcripts are in Dutch as all interviews were conducted in Dutch. Every transcript has the same lay-out. All transcripts are headed by the date and time the interview was conducted. Subsequently, the initials of the researcher (JP) are displayed and the respondent indicating abbreviation corresponding with the transcript (as shown in Table 2 in section 3.1) is shown. All text fragments behind JP are questions asked by the researcher, all text fragments after the respondents’ abbreviation are answers provided by the respondents. Page numbers of the transcripts can be found in the upper right corner, page numbers of the study can be found in the bottom left corner.

The transcripts start on the following pages:

- Transcript EIE1 112
- Transcript EIE2 117
- Transcript EIE3 127
- Transcript EIE4 135
- Transcript PIE1 142
- Transcript PIE2 152
- Transcript PIE3 159
- Transcript PIE4 165
- Transcript PIM1 174
- Transcript PIM2 181
- Transcript PIM3 188
- Transcript PIM4 196