


Article

Workplace Innovation and Organizational Performance in the Hospitality Industry

Jol Stoffers ^{1,2,3,*} , Klaes Eringa ⁴, Jamie Niks ⁵ and Anne Kleefstra ^{1,4}

¹ Research Centre for Employability, Zuyd University of Applied Sciences, 6131 MT Sittard, The Netherlands; anne.kleefstra@zuyd.nl

² Faculty of Management, Open Universiteit, 6419 AT Heerlen, The Netherlands

³ Research Centre for Education and the Labour Market (ROA), Maastricht University, 6211 LM Maastricht, The Netherlands

⁴ Academy of International Hospitality Research, NHL Stenden University of Applied Sciences, 8917 DD Leeuwarden, The Netherlands; klaes.eringa@nhlstenden.com

⁵ HMSHost, 3818 LE Amersfoort, The Netherlands; jamieniks@hotmail.com

* Correspondence: jol.stoffers@zuyd.nl

Abstract: Change has become continuous, and innovation is a primary approach for hospitality, i.e., hotel companies, to become or remain economically viable and sustainable. An increasing number of management researchers are paying more attention to workplace rather than technological innovation. This study investigates workplace innovation in the Dutch hotel industry, in three- and four-star hotels in the Netherlands, by comparing them to other industries. Two samples were questioned using the Workplace Innovation survey created by the Dutch Network of Social Innovation (NSI). The first was conducted in the hospitality industry, and these data were compared with data collected in a sample of other industries. Results suggest that greater strategic orientation on workplace innovation and talent development has a positive influence on four factors of organizational performance. Greater internal rates of change, the ability to self-organize, and investment in knowledge also had positive influences on three of the factors—growth in revenue, sustainability, and absenteeism. Results also suggest that the hospitality industry has lower workplace innovation than other industries. However, no recent research has assessed to what degree the hospitality industry fosters workplace innovation, especially in the Netherlands. Next to that, only few studies have examined management in the Dutch hotel industry, how workplace innovation is used there, and whether it improves practices.

Keywords: workplace innovation; organizational performance; hospitality industry



Citation: Stoffers, J.; Eringa, K.; Niks, J.; Kleefstra, A. Workplace Innovation and Organizational Performance in the Hospitality Industry.

Sustainability **2021**, *13*, 5847. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13115847>

Academic Editor: Andrea Cirà

Received: 27 March 2021

Accepted: 17 May 2021

Published: 22 May 2021

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2021 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Workplace Innovation in the Hospitality Industry

Between 50% and 80% of economic growth is the result of innovation and knowledge [1–3]. Innovation relates to renewal, change, and doing things differently, with the purpose of improving processes, goods, and services. According to a McKinsey Global Survey of over 1400 corporate leaders worldwide, more than 70% listed innovation as a top-three priority in their organizations [4,5]. Tourism and hospitality literature characterizes innovation as the development of goods and services, or the implementation of processes, that differ from business-as-usual to achieve competitive advantages [6–8]. In comparison to other hospitality sub-industries, hotels were found to be the least innovative [9], and in comparison to other service-industry firms, Dutch hotels had the lowest percentage of innovation [10]. Hotel innovations consist primarily of technological innovations, such as digital applications, and hardware innovations, such as wellness areas [6,11,12]. Many organizations excel at technological innovation and knowledge development [13,14], but they fail at identifying, distributing, and applying such knowledge among employees [15,16]. An increasing number of management researchers suggest greater focus on workplace—rather than technological innovation [17–20]; the emphasis should be on employees and

their competences, who are often forgotten among managerial processes because the major concerns are economics and technology [2,21,22]. Volberda et al. [9] argue that investment in workplace innovation should be given greater priority, because 77% of innovation success derives from workplace innovation. Workplace innovation represents an approach allocated to organizational change that encourages participative practices and leads to better performance [23,24]. During the past decade, the topic has garnered increased attention and arisen frequently during discussions on innovation [25–27].

In the last decade, it was apparent that technological innovation requires workplace innovation [18,20,28], and although the relevance of the concept has been recognized, research suggests that Dutch organizations do not exploit opportunities fully [16,27,29]. The hotel industry is not very innovative; a firm's size, its employees' level of education, and its structure influence innovation, and thus a firm's characteristics affect innovation [30]. Barriers to innovation that entrepreneurs experience in the Dutch hospitality industry include low awareness of innovation's importance, too great a focus on technological innovations, and insufficient attention given to innovation in other sectors/industries that serve innovation inspiration [10]. Workplace innovation differentiates organizations from competitors and makes them more effective [18,31]. Heezen [32] found that businesses that continued workplace innovation remained innovative, becoming more productive, improving competitiveness, and increasing performance [33]. Oostdam [34] reported that only 2% of employees in hospitality organizations are motivated by managers to think innovatively. Workplace innovation has thus become a research topic among researchers, companies, hospitality management schools, and the hospitality industry [23,35]. However, few studies have examined management in the Dutch hotel industry, how workplace innovation is used there, and whether it improves practices. Research that addresses these gaps supports the traditional hotel industry by connecting it with a contemporary concept such as workplace innovation, making such research suitable in hotels that experience difficulties remaining innovative and competing with innovative companies such as Airbnb [36].

In the literature review, workplace innovation and components of workplace innovation are discussed. This study assesses the relationship between workplace innovation and organizational performance, and differences between the hospitality and other industries regarding workplace innovation. Two samples were questioned using a Workplace Innovation survey created by the Dutch Network Social Innovation's (NSI) in 2012. Since 2012, the survey has been conducted annually, with six components of workplace innovation remaining the same throughout the years.

The next section includes an overview of the literature on the relationship between workplace innovation and organizational performance. Differences between hospitality and other industries regarding workplace innovation are then discussed, followed by the hypotheses tested in this study. Methods are outlined and results of preliminary analyses are reported. Two samples are examined, findings are discussed, and practical implications of the study are identified. Limitations of the study and future research directions are discussed.

2. Literature Review

Change has become continuous, and innovation is a primary method for hospitality companies to become or remain economically viable and sustainable because innovative companies develop new products, deliver better quality, and consequently operate more efficiently [10,37]. However, in many cases, firms in the hotel industry are small- and medium-sized family firms characterized as traditional companies [11]. Clarke et al. [38] argue that remaining innovative is challenging, but Heezen [32] suggests that involving employees in management creates engagement, understanding, and enthusiasm. Li and Hsu [39,40] found that employee innovative behaviors are paramount to improving the quality of both service and customer satisfaction. A lack of skilled employees, and a lack of employee engagement, represent primary barriers to hotel service innovation [41]. By listening to the ideas of others, innovation regarding the organization of work and

labor relationships leads to improved organizational performance and the development of talent [22,42,43]. Hotel chains have more financial resources to invest in innovation and professionalization than independent hotels [44]. HRM in the hotel industry affects innovation positively [45], and enhancement of human capital is critical to the readiness to adopt innovations and the acceleration of innovation [46]. Workplace innovation thus requires cocreation, during which managers and employees must work together [47,48].

Workplace Innovation and Organizational Performance

Workplace innovation became a topic of interest in the Netherlands during the early 21st century. Volberda et al. [16] (p. 31) define workplace innovation as the “development of new management skills (dynamic management) to make use of flexible organization principles (flexible organizing) and to realize high-quality forms of labor (smart working) to increase competitiveness and increase productivity”. Workplace innovation represents innovative ways of how production and work are designed, and thus stresses new ways of deploying people [49]. Another approach to workplace innovation is including innovation in the work process to increase labor productivity and participation [50] by organizing work differently, introducing health policies, working to create knowledge and employability, and modernizing employment creation by linking social policy to business objectives; investing in both people and the organization is essential [48]. Volberda and Van den Bosch [48] divide workplace innovation into three components—dynamic management, flexible organizing, and smart working—and combined, these components result in workplace innovation. Stoffers et al. [51] (p. 11) define workplace innovation as changes to organizations and new ways of cooperation that result in better development and use of employees’ competences to increase organizational performance and enhance other organizational, societal, or employee goals. Stoffers et al. [51] distinguish six components of workplace innovation—strategic orientation on workplace innovation, speed of internal change, the ability to self-organize, development of talent, investment in knowledge, and sustainable employment. Combined, these components result in workplace innovation.

Workplace innovation is garnering increasing attention, creating organizational performance [33,52–55]. Volberda and Van den Bosch’s [48], Stoffers et al.’s [51], and Black and Lynch’s [56] theories and models result in increased organizational performance. Stoffers et al. [51] analyzed organizational performance concerning revenue growth, new product development, sustainable development, and yearly absenteeism. Therefore:

Hypothesis 1 (H1). *Workplace innovation has a positive relationship with organizational performance.*

Both Volberda and Van den Bosch’s [48] and Stoffers et al.’s [51] models consist of various components of workplace innovation. The current study assesses the six components that Stoffers et al. [51] suggest. Organizations that have clear strategic orientations perform better economically, according to Porter [57]. Rizan et al. [58] argue that strategic orientation correlates positively with organizational performance, and Stoffers et al. [51] represent strategic orientation on workplace innovation as the extent to which such innovation is embedded strategically in an organization, arising from underlying indicators of social orientation, cost awareness, networking, knowledge absorption, and open innovation. Grimmer et al. [59] assess various strategic orientations (i.e., prospector, defender, analyzer, and reactor) and organizational performance, finding those prospector strategies which focus on innovation, being a pioneer, and launching new products, have the strongest positive relationship with organizational performance. Therefore:

Hypothesis 2a (H2a). *Strategic orientation on workplace innovation has a positive relationship with organizational performance.*

Stoffers et al. [51] argue that if organizations want to remain innovative, they must create a work structure in which employees at all levels are able to make quick decisions

and have the freedom and responsibility to perform as they perceive necessary. The second component of workplace innovation, self-organization, can be measured using leadership, entrepreneurship, transparency, trust, policy flexibility, trust, and cocreation between departments and teams [60,61]. Phills et al. [62] argue that the most effective and efficient ideas for complex situations and operational problems are created in the operations of an organization, because those employees know exactly what is happening. When employees have sufficient freedom to act, the result is motivation, creativity, commitment, and entrepreneurship [61]. Ibus [63] and Kariuki and Kiambati [64] argue that employee empowerment through autonomy, involvement in decision-making, access to information, and management support, among others, have a positive influence on organizational performance. Trust also has a positive relationship with organizational performance [65]. Therefore:

Hypothesis 2b (H2b). *The ability to self-organize has a positive relationship with organizational performance.*

Volberda et al. [16] suggest that organizations that want to be innovative need a flexible way of organizing, and such organizations are characterized by a high internal speed of change. Stoffers et al. [51] corroborate Volberda et al. [16], suggesting that it is important for organizations to adjust their business routines and competences constantly and adapt to changes in the market to remain competitive, because change is continuous. An organization's internal speed of change indicates ability and flexibility regarding managing human resources [51,66]. The degree of workplace innovation is measured using indicators of decentralized decision-making, flexibility with customizing procedures, goals, cooperation, flexible organization of work (e.g., flexible contracts), self-scheduling, and flexible work hours. This does not mean that maximum flexibility is best. According to Abad [67] and Heezen [32], freedom should remain inside the boundaries of its function to avoid negative results. Several studies found a positive relationship between organizational flexibility through flexible work arrangements and organizational performance [63,68–70]. Therefore:

Hypothesis 2c (H2c). *Internal speed of change has a positive relationship with organizational performance.*

Employability enhances individual innovative behaviors in the workplace [51]. Employability is 'the continuously fulfilling, acquiring or creating work through the optimal use of competences' [71] (p. 453). Employability or sustainable employment therefore influences not only the employee, but has a positive effect on the adaptability organization as well. In this research, we focus on older employees, because aging of the working population is a societal concern in the Netherlands [72,73]. Physical and cognitive aging is inevitable, but it can be accelerated or delayed by work quality [74]. Organizations should invest in the sustainable employment of aging personnel. Besides keeping employees' knowledge and skills updated, a firm should give employees sufficient chances and motivation to do work that is not yet part of their tasks, enhancing sustainable employment and their chances for development [73], because these actions, adjusted to the age of employees, have a positive influence on employees' competences and attitudes and thus on organizational performance [75]. Therefore:

Hypothesis 2d (H2d). *Sustainable employment has a positive relationship with organizational performance.*

Routine activities are increasingly replaced with knowledge-intensive work under the influence of technology. Such work thus becomes dominant, requiring combining and interpreting information to resolve new, daily problems in cocreation with others [76]. This type of work is characteristic of learning, generating, and applying knowledge. Work

then becomes a primary source of learning [77], requiring the continuous development of knowledge and new ways of learning [78]. Investing in knowledge represents a willingness to invest in the development of employees' knowledge, reflected in policies and investment in knowledge inside a company, which, in turn, indicates increasingly knowledge-intensive processes [76,79]. Organizations must thus invest in employees' knowledge, which requires self-initiation from employees and stimulating their capacities to be innovative during learning. This leads to the optimal use of talent, creating new energy for the firm and employees, and good corporate results [32,80]. Therefore:

Hypothesis 2e (H2e). *Investment in knowledge has a positive relationship with organizational performance.*

Knowledge circulation and talent development are crucial for creating innovation in an organization [79]. Employees need to have the ability to build on the knowledge and skills of others and help them develop and achieve their potential to succeed and grow [81]. When employee expertise is not improved or broadened, talents cannot be developed or used fully, either for employees or the firm [82]. Talent development occurs largely on the job by challenging employees and giving them more authority, power, and duties, and involving them during decision-making [61]. Research suggests a positive effect of talent development and organizational learning climate on organizational performance [83–85]. Therefore:

Hypothesis 2f (H2f). *Talent development has a positive relationship with organizational performance.*

Workplace innovation does not occur randomly; it must be encouraged through strategic orientations on workplace innovation, speed of internal change, self-organization, talent development, investment in knowledge, and sustainable employment. Using these components, workplace innovation can be recognized as changes to organizational structures that have a positive effect not only on the organization, but also on employees and society [86]. Organizations are experiencing increased competition, especially those in hospitality, and they must remain innovative to compete [87]. The hospitality industry must be able to attract and retain new customers by satisfying demands to acquire new, unique experiences [88]. Innovation is essential to meeting these demands, but only the effective use of employees allows continuous improvement [89]. People and their competences thus become the most important resource, which must be managed effectively [90,91]. The literature is clear that the hospitality industry cannot survive without innovation, specifically, workplace innovation, and calls have been made for more research related to innovation in the industry [92]. Extant studies suggest that workplace innovation in hospitality remains underdeveloped [34,93]. Therefore:

Hypothesis 3 (H3). *The hospitality industry has lower workplace innovation than other industries have.*

3. Methodology

In this quantitative study, two samples were questioned using a Workplace Innovation survey created by the Dutch Network of Social Innovation (NSI) in 2012. The current study used the survey to examine workplace innovation and test several hypotheses related to the topic. The survey measures six components of workplace innovation—strategic orientation on workplace innovation, speed of internal change, the ability to self-organize, development of talent, investment in knowledge, and sustainable employment. The survey also collects information regarding organizational performance, including revenue growth, new product development, sustainable development, and annual absenteeism percentage [51]. Items pertaining to the six components of workplace innovation remained the same throughout the years (see [51,94,95] for applications of the survey). The ques-

tionnaire was originally administered in Dutch so that respondents were able to answer the questions accurately and with full comprehension. Appendix A of this publication identifies the six components of workplace innovation, with example questions for each component. For use in this current study, the questions were translated into English. The translation–back translation method was used to guarantee linguistic quality [96]. The six components of workplace innovation were translated into English by Translator A and then back-translated into Dutch by Translator B. A dialogue then occurred between the translators to ensure that the components and items reflected the original content and meaning of the questions.

This study was conducted in two parts. The first was conducted among executive staff members in the hospitality, i.e., hotel industry in the northern part of the Netherlands. Sampling criteria included a geographical representation of the 3–4-star hotel firms in the northern part of the Netherlands. The hotels were approached through the researchers' personal contacts, in association with the Academy of International Hospitality Research of NHL Stenden University of Applied Sciences (i.e., non-probability, convenience sampling). These data were compared with data collected among executive staff members of other industries in the southern part of the Netherlands. Sampling criteria included a geographical representation of the other industries in the southern part of the Netherlands. The organizations were approached through the researchers' personal contacts, in association with the Limburg Employers Association (i.e., non-probability, convenience sampling).

Organizations, especially those in hospitality, must remain innovative to compete [87], and therefore a comparison between hospitality and other industries was conducted. Three- and four-star hotels were chosen because they represent the majority of hotels in the northern part of the Netherlands.

All items were scored using a 5-point, Likert-type scale that ranged from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree.” Using this method, subjectivity was possible due to the self-scoring of organizations, and participants might have chosen middle scores, thereby influencing final scores. However, research using the survey has been reproduced for several years, and each year scores were comparable, contributing to the reproducibility of the study. Hypotheses were analyzed statistically using regression and independent *t*-tests.

4. Results

Two samples were questioned; the first was conducted in the hospitality, i.e., hotel industry (108 executive staff members participated), and additionally, 201 executive staff members of other industries participated in this research. The samples were combined before analysis and were assessed for outliers, additivity, linearity, normality, homoscedasticity, and homogeneity of variance [97]. Data were assessed for internal consistency using Cronbach's alpha coefficient. The strategic orientation on workplace innovation subscale consisted of 28 items ($\alpha = 0.83$), internal speed of change consisted of 11 items ($\alpha = 0.80$), ability to self-organize 12 items ($\alpha = 0.73$), talent development 9 ($\alpha = 0.84$), investment in knowledge 6 ($\alpha = 0.77$), and sustainable employment 4 ($\alpha = 0.53$). All subscales were internally valid, except for sustainable employment. The scale of workplace innovation thus consisted of 70 items ($\alpha = 0.93$) and was valid to use in this study. Thirty-five percent of organizations operated in the hotel industry, and the remaining 65% were from other industries. The companies came from the manufacturing industry (13%), commercial services (79%), and non-commercial (8%) industries (governmental, hospitals and educational institutions). The extent to which organizations reported their own organizational performance predicted and explained significant variance in workplace innovation and its six components is shown in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Regression beta coefficients for organizational performance and workplace innovation.

	Growth in Revenue		New Products		Sustainability		Absenteeism %	
	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>t</i>
Workplace innovation	0.435 **	8.633	0.148 *	2.569	0.455 **	8.885	−0.327 **	−6.044
Strategic orientation	0.348 **	6.644	0.223 **	3.940	0.436 **	8.670	−0.198 **	−3.28
Self-organization	0.312 **	5.871	0.075	1.293	0.256 **	4.729	−0.268 **	−4.864
Internal speed of change	0.336 **	6.374	0.043	0.748	0.296 **	5.537	−0.324 **	−5.981
Investment in knowledge	0.381 **	7.364	0.099	1.705	0.446	8.907	−0.227 **	−4.066
Talent development	0.385 **	7.464	0.136 *	2.356	0.331 **	6.271	−0.331 **	−5.722

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.**Table 2.** Regression variance for organizational performance and workplace innovation.

	Growth in Revenue		New Products		Sustainability		Absenteeism %	
	R^2	<i>F</i>	R^2	<i>F</i>	R^2	<i>F</i>	R^2	<i>F</i>
Workplace innovation	0.189 **	74.530	0.198 *	6.601	0.198 **	78.939	0.107 **	36.530
Strategic orientation	0.121 **	44.148	0.500 **	15.520	0.190 **	75.177	0.390 **	12.450
Self-organization	0.097 **	34.474	0.006	1.673	0.065 **	22.364	0.072 **	22.663
Internal speed of change	0.113 **	40.633	0.002	0.560	0.087 **	30.655	0.105 **	35.770
Investment in knowledge	0.145 **	54.227	0.010	2.908	0.199 **	79.327	0.051 **	16.533
Talent development	0.148 **	55.709	0.018 *	5.551	0.331 **	6.271	0.097 **	32.739

* $p < 0.05$. ** $p < 0.01$.

Workplace innovation and organizational performance had a positive relationship. Workplace innovation also had a positive relationship with the extent to which the organizations assessed their revenue growth, in comparison to similar organizations, the number of new products introduced in the market during the past year, and the extent to which the organizations assessed themselves as leaders of sustainability. Thus, when workplace innovation increased, growth in revenue, the number of new products, and sustainability also increased. Workplace innovation had a negative relationship with absenteeism, which means that when workplace innovation increased, absenteeism decreased. Results suggest a positive relationship between workplace innovation and organizational performance, supporting H1.

For H2, organizational performance was tested against subscales of workplace innovation, except for sustainable employment, because its Cronbach's alpha coefficient was too low. All components of workplace innovation had positive relationships with the extent to which the organizations assessed their own growth in revenue in comparison to similar organizations, and the extent to which the organizations assessed themselves as leaders in sustainability. Strategic orientation on workplace innovation and talent development had positive relationships with the number of new products introduced in the market during the past year. Self-organization, internal speed of change, and investment in knowledge did not correlate with the number of new products introduced in the market during the past year. All components of workplace innovation had negative relationships with absenteeism during the last year.

Results suggest that greater strategic orientation on workplace innovation (a), and talent development (d), correlated with four factors of organizational performance. Greater internal speed of change (b), ability to self-organize (c), and investment in knowledge (e) correlated with three factors of organizational performance—growth in revenue, sustainability, and absenteeism—supporting H2a, H2b, and H2f. H2c and H2e were partially supported because organizational performance was significant, except for new products. H2d could not be tested; therefore, it was not supported.

An independent-samples *t*-test was conducted to compare workplace innovation across hospitality and the other industries, during which a difference was found for workplace innovation between hospitality ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 0.26$) and other ($M = 3.51$,

$SD = 0.33$; $t(319) = 9.93$, $p < 0.001$) industries. Hospitality scores were lower for workplace innovation than in other industries, supporting H3.

5. Discussion

This study found a positive relationship between workplace innovation and organizational performance, corroborating extant studies conducted on the topic [16,33,54]. The subscales of workplace innovation were correlated positively with indicators of organizational performance, except for absenteeism, which had a negative relationship, as hypothesized. Self-organization, internal speed of change, and investment in knowledge did not correlate with the number of new products introduced in the market. The number of new products introduced in the market is an indicator representing the concept of innovation [98]; therefore, this result is unexpected because extant research reports a positive effect of self-organization [61], internal speed of change [31], and investment in knowledge [99] on innovation. One explanation for this result is that the participating organizations varied greatly in the number of new products introduced into the market because of the different industries they represented. The literature is clear on the importance of innovation in hospitality [88–90,93]; the hospitality industry cannot survive without innovation, specifically, workplace innovation. The current study demonstrates that the hospitality industry has lower workplace innovation than other industries.

5.1. Theoretical Implications

Results suggest that the hospitality industry has lower workplace innovation than other industries. Innovation in Dutch hotels is less formalized, less often budgeted, and less explicitly managed than, for example, innovation in manufacturing firms [10]. Gehrels [35] argues that workplace innovation has become a research topic of interest to researchers, companies, hospitality management schools, and the hospitality industry. However, few studies have examined management in the Dutch hospitality industry, and more research should be conducted to build grounded theoretical models on workplace innovation for the hospitality industry. Models from Volberda and Van den Bosch [48] and Stoffers et al. [51] suggest an increase in organizational performance, and the current study suggests a positive relationship between workplace innovation and organizational performance. Therefore, investment in workplace innovation components, especially strategic orientation on workplace innovation, internal speed of change, the ability to self-organize, talent development, and investment in knowledge, increases organizational performance. Future research should assess the relationship between sustainable employment as a subscale of workplace innovation and organizational performance [100]. In the current study, the sustainable employment subscale comprised only four items, and thus represented only a small portion of the total scale. Another factor that should be studied is innovation indicators in the context of an organizational performance measure [101], because the number of new products varies greatly across organizations, limiting in-depth research. Additionally, the findings of this study cannot be generalized and applied to the entire hospitality industry because the study sample included only 3–4-star hotel firms in the northern part of the Netherlands.

5.2. Practical Implications

This study suggests that organizations should invest more in workplace innovation to increase organizational performance. As several studies discuss, workplace innovation makes it possible to enhance technological innovation in an organization [33,54]. Hospitality should especially invest in workplace innovation because the industry demonstrates a need for innovation to keep up with innovative competitors [36]. Njoroge et al. [102] and Kavoura [87] argue that the ability to innovate in hospitality represents a necessary business capability to derive long-term economic value, especially technological innovation.

The six components of workplace innovation from Stoffers et al. [51] can guide organizations regarding workplace innovation. For example, the current results suggest that

greater strategic orientation on workplace innovation and talent development influence four organizational performance measures. Grimmer et al. [59] argue that the prospector strategy has the strongest positive relationship with organizational performance. Strategic orientation on workplace innovation is a sound place to start for organizations that want to improve their performance.

5.3. Conclusions

The results of this study suggest that greater strategic orientation on workplace innovation and talent development has a positive influence on four factors of organizational performance, including revenue growth, new product development, sustainable development, and annual absenteeism percentage. Greater internal rates of change, the ability to self-organize, and investment in knowledge also had positive influences on three of the factors—growth in revenue, sustainability, and absenteeism. The results of this study also suggest that the hospitality, i.e., hotel industry has lower workplace innovation than other industries.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, J.S., K.E., J.N., A.K.; methodology, J.S., K.E., J.N., A.K.; software, J.S., K.E., J.N., A.K.; validation, J.S., K.E., J.N., A.K.; formal analysis, J.S., K.E., J.N., A.K.; investigation, J.S., J.N.; resources, J.S., K.E.; data curation, K.E., J.N., A.K.; writing—original draft preparation, J.S., K.E., A.K.; writing—reviewing and editing, J.S., K.E., A.K.; visualization, J.S., A.K.; supervision, J.S.; project administration, J.N. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Appendix A

Table A1. Two example questions per component of workplace innovation from the Dutch Network of Workplace Innovation questionnaire.

Component	Question
Strategic orientation on workplace innovation	My organization is constantly up to date with the latest developments
	In my organization, support in developing new ideas is always directly available
Speed of internal change	In my organization, objectives are adapted to changing circumstances
	In my organization, procedures can be easily adjusted
The ability to self-organize	In my organization, the way of working is constantly being renewed
	In my organization, cooperation between different departments is very effective
Development of talent	In my organization, employees experience their work as challenging
	In my organization, employees see themselves constantly improving
Investment in knowledge	In my organization, employees are strongly encouraged to further develop their skills
	In my organization, employees have a personal development plan (PDP)
Sustainable employment	In my organization, the following applies to older employees (over 60 years of age): older employees are highly employable
	In my organization, the following applies to older employees (older than 60 years): the job content of older employees is geared to any physical or mental disabilities

Table A1. Cont.

Component	Question
Organizational performance	My organization is seen as a leader in the field of sustainability
	Compared to other organizations in the industry, the revenue growth of my organization in YEAR is higher
	How many new products or services did your organization introduce to the market in YEAR?
	What was the absenteeism rate in YEAR for your organization?

The authors encourage use of the questionnaire during research across multiple contexts (e.g., national and sectoral). Contact Prof. Jol Stoffers (jol.stoffers@zuyd.nl), member of the Dutch Network of Social Innovation (NSI), for more information. At time of publication of this paper, the full questionnaire is available only in Dutch, but the research group will be translating and validating the questionnaire during 2021 and 2022.

References

- Gherghina, C.; Botezatu, M.A.; Hosszu, A.; Simionescu, L.N. Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises (SMEs): The engine of economic growth through investments and innovation. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 347. [CrossRef]
- Mulgan, G. The process of social innovation. *Innov. Technol. Gov. Glob.* **2006**, *1*, 145–162. [CrossRef]
- Pradhan, R.P.; Arvin, M.B.; Nair, M.; Bennett, S.E. The dynamics among entrepreneurship, innovation, and economic growth in the Eurozone countries. *J. Policy Model.* **2020**, *42*, 1106–1122. [CrossRef]
- Barsh, J.; Capozzi, M.M.; Davidson, J. Leadership and innovation. *McKinsey Q.* **2008**, *1*, 37–47.
- Coletti, M.; Landoni, P. Collaborations for innovation: A meta-study of relevant typologies, governance and policies. *Econ. Innov. New Technol.* **2017**, *27*, 493–509. [CrossRef]
- Kallmuenzer, A. Exploring drives of innovation in hospitality family firms. *Int. J. Contemp. Hospit. Manage* **2018**, *30*, 1978–1995. [CrossRef]
- Hjalager, A.-M. A review of innovation research in tourism. *Tour. Manag.* **2010**, *31*, 1–12. [CrossRef]
- Zehrer, A.; Muskat, B.; Muskat, M. Enablers of corporate innovation in tourism. In *Competence-Based Innovation in Hospitality and Tourism*; Pechlaner, H., Innerhofer, E., Eds.; Gower Publishing: Farnham, UK, 2015.
- Trigo, A.; Vence, X. Scope and patterns of innovation cooperation in Spanish service enterprises. *Res. Policy* **2012**, *41*, 602–613. [CrossRef]
- Hertog, P.D.; Gallouj, F.; Segers, J. Measuring innovation in a ‘low-tech’ service industry: The case of the Dutch hospitality industry. *Serv. Ind. J.* **2011**, *31*, 1429–1449. [CrossRef]
- De Massis, A.; Frattini, F.; Pizzurno, E.; Cassia, L. Product Innovation in family versus nonfamily firms: An exploratory analysis. *J. Small Bus. Manag.* **2013**, *53*, 1–36. [CrossRef]
- Grissemann, U.; Pikkemaat, B.; Weger, C. Antecedents of innovation activities in tourism: An empirical investigation of the alpine hospitality industry. *Tour. Int. Interdiscip. J.* **2013**, *61*, 7–27.
- Diaconu, M. Technological innovation: Concept, process, typology and implications in the economy. *Theor. Appl. Econ.* **2011**, *10*, 127–144.
- West, D.M. *Technology and the Innovation Economy*; Brookings Institution Center for Technology: Washington, DC, USA, 2011.
- Rampa, R.; Agogué, M. Developing radical innovation capabilities: Exploring the effects of training employees for creativity and innovation. *Creat. Innov. Manag.* **2021**, *30*, 211–227. [CrossRef]
- Volberda, H.W.; Van den Bosch, F.A.J.; Jansen, J.J.P. *Slim Managen & Innovatief Organiseren*. Erasmus Concurrentie & Innovatie Monitor 2005; Erasmus University: Rotterdam, The Netherlands, 2005.
- McMurray, A.J.; Muenjohn, N.; Scott, D. Measuring workplace innovation: Scale development. *J. Small Bus. Manag.* **2021**, 1–20. [CrossRef]
- Howaldt, J.; Kopp, R.; Schultze, J. Why industry 4.0 needs workplace innovation—A critical essay about the german debate on advanced manufacturing. In *Workplace Innovation*; Oeij, P., Rus, D., Pot, F., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2017; pp. 45–60, ISBN 978-33-1956-333-6.
- Oeij, P.R.; Dhondt, S.; Rus, D.; Van Hoetegem, G. The digital transformation requires workplace innovation: An introduction. *Int. J. Technol. Transf. Commer.* **2019**, *6*, 199–207.
- Rus, D.; Oeij, P.R.; Pot, F.D.; Totterdill, P. Workplace innovation: A review and potential future avenues. *Int. J. Technol. Transf. Commer.* **2019**, *16*, 208–227. [CrossRef]
- Stoffers, J.; Kleefstra, A.; Wijnen-Amannchar, J.; Gerards, R.; Hendriks, M.; De Grip, A. *Sociale Innovatie Monitor 2019: Economie 4.0, Werken aan Digitale Vaardigheden*; Presented at Zuyd Lectoraat Employability/Maastricht University ROA: Heerlen/Maastricht, The Netherlands, April 2019. Available online: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/333852164_Sociale_Innovatie_Monitor_2019 (accessed on 21 May 2021).
- Stoffers, J.; Van Der Heijden, B.; Schrijver, I. Towards a sustainable model of innovative work behaviors’ enhancement: The mediating role of employability. *Sustainability* **2019**, *12*, 159. [CrossRef]

23. Csaba, M.; Miklós, I.; Róza, S.; Judit, S. Workplace innovation: Concepts, regulation and increasing role of knowledge management: Theoretical considerations and European experiences. *Pro Publico Bono Magyar Közigazgatás* **2020**, *8*, 96–123.
24. Oeij, P.; Preenen, P.T.; Van Der Torre, W.; Van Der Meer, L.; Eerenbeemt, J.V.D.; TNO—Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research. Technological choice and workplace innovation: Towards efficient and humanised work. *Eur. Public Soc. Innov. Rev.* **2019**, *4*, 15–26. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
25. Borzaga, C.; Bodini, R. What to make of social innovation? Towards a framework for policy development. *Soc. Policy Soc.* **2014**, *13*, 411–421. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
26. Degelsegger, A.; Kesselring, A. Do non-humans make a difference? The actor-network-theory and the social innovation paradigm. In *Challenge Social Innovation*; Franz, H.-W., Hochgerner, J., Howaldt, J., Eds.; Springer: Mannheim, Germany, 2012; pp. 57–72, ISBN 978-36-4232-879-4.
27. Nizit, R. Sociale Innovatie van Levensbelang. 2014. Available online: <https://www.deondernemer.nl/nieuwsbericht/761/sociale-innovatie-van-levensbelang> (accessed on 23 March 2021).
28. Pot, F.D.; Totterdill, P.; Dhondt, S. European policy on workplace innovation. In *Workplace Innovation*; Oeij, P., Rus, D., Pot, F., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2017; pp. 11–26, ISBN 978-3-319-56333-6.
29. Oeij, P.R.; Dhondt, S.; Kraan, K.; Vergeer, R.; Pot, F. Workplace innovation and its relations with organizational performance and employee commitment. *Lifelong Learn. Eur.* **2012**, *4*, 1–15.
30. Backman, M.; Klaesson, J.; Öner, Ö. Innovation in the hospitality industry: Firm or location? *Tour. Econ.* **2017**, *23*, 1591–1614. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
31. Preenen, P.T.; Vergeer, R.; Kraan, K.; Dhondt, S. Labour productivity and innovation performance: The importance of internal labour flexibility practices. *Econ. Ind. Democr.* **2015**, *38*, 271–293. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
32. Heezen, G. Sociale Innovatie. 2013. Available online: <https://www.effactory.nl/auteur/Guido%20Heezen/?page=1> (accessed on 23 March 2021).
33. Volberda, H.W.; Heij, C.V. *Innovatie 4.0*; Vakmedia: Alphen aan de Rijn, The Netherlands, 2016.
34. Oostdam, F. Rabobank Horeca Network Group. 2015. Available online: <https://www.rabobank.nl/bedrijven/cijfers-en-trends/horeca/frank-oostdam-07072015/> (accessed on 23 March 2021).
35. Gehrels, S.A. *Entrepreneurship & Innovation—ENIN Module Handbook 2015/2016 for the MA/MSc in International Hospitality & Service Management*; Stenden University of Applied Sciences: Stenden, The Netherlands, 2016.
36. Oskam, J.; Boswijk, A. Airbnb: The future of networked hospitality businesses. *J. Tour. Futur.* **2016**, *2*, 22–42. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
37. Nuryyev, G.; Wang, Y.-P.; Achyldurdyeva, J.; Jaw, B.-S.; Yeh, Y.-S.; Lin, H.-T.; Wu, L.-F. Blockchain technology adoption behavior and sustainability of the business in tourism and hospitality SMEs: An empirical study. *Sustainability* **2020**, *12*, 1256. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
38. Clarke, S.H.; Lamoreaux, N.R.; Usselman, S.W. *The Challenge of Remaining Innovative: Insights from Twentieth-Century American Business*; Stanford University Press: Palo Alto, CA, USA, 2009; ISBN 978-08-0475-892-5.
39. Li, M.; Hsu, C.H. A review of employee innovative behavior in services. *Int. J. Contemp. Hosp. Manag.* **2016**, *28*, 2820–2841. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
40. Li, M.; Hsu, C.H.C. Customer participation in services and employee innovative behavior: The mediating role of interpersonal trust. *Int. J. Contemp. Hospit. Manage* **2018**, *30*, 2112–2131. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
41. Sacramento, P.M.; Teixeira, R.M. Implementação de ações inovadoras e empreendedorismo: Estudo de múltiplos casos em empresas hoteleiras de pequeno porte. *Cad. Virtual De Tur.* **2014**, *14*, 183–203.
42. Nauta, A.; Blokland, K. Sociale Innovatie, kern van HRM. *Tijdschr. Voor HRM* **2007**, *3*, 55–71.
43. Putnik, K.; Oeij, P.; Dhondt, S.; Van Der Torre, W.; De Vroome, E.; Preenen, P. Innovation adoption of employees in the logistics sector in the Netherlands: The role of workplace innovation. *Eur. J. Work. Innov.* **2019**, *4*. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
44. Sobaih, A.E. Human resource management in hospitality firms in Egypt: Does size matter? *Tour. Hospit. Res.* **2018**, *18*, 38–48. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
45. Nieves, J.; Quintana, A. Human resource practices and innovation in the hotel industry: The mediating role of human capital. *Tour. Hosp. Res.* **2016**, *18*, 72–83. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
46. Tugores, M.; García, D. The impact of innovation on firms' performance: An analysis of the hotel sector in Majorca. *Tour. Econ.* **2015**, *21*, 121–140. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
47. Ehlen, C.; van der Klink, M.; Stoffers, J.; Boshuizen, H. The co-creation-wheel: A four-dimensional model of collaborative interorganizational innovation. *Eur. J. Train. Dev.* **2017**, *41*, 628–646. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
48. Volberda, H.W.; Van den Bosch, F.A.J. Ruim baan voor de Nederlandse innovatie agenda: Naar nieuwe managementvaardigheden en innovatieve organisatieprincipes. *Tijdschr. Voor Manag. Organ. Innov.* **2005**, *59*, 41–63.
49. Oeij, P.R.A.; Dhondt, S. Theoretical approaches supporting workplace innovation. In *Workplace Innovation*; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2017; pp. 63–78. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
50. Vaessen, M. Sociale Innovatie. Mensen Maken het Verschil. *P-pers, blad voor Human Resources Professionals* **2007**, *16*, 1–36.
51. Stoffers, J.; Hendriks, K.; Habets, O.; Van Der Heijden, B. Employability and innovative work behaviours in SMEs in a Euroregion. *Pers. Rev.* **2019**, *49*, 167–187. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
52. Costantini, A.; Sartori, R.; Ceschi, A. Framing workplace innovation through an organisational psychology perspective: A review of current WPI studies. In *Workplace Innovation*; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2017; pp. 131–147. [\[CrossRef\]](#)

53. Howaldt, J.; Oeij, P.R.; Dhondt, S.; Fruytier, B. Workplace innovation and social innovation: An introduction. *World Rev. Entrep. Manag. Sustain. Dev.* **2016**, *12*. [CrossRef]
54. Pot, F.; Totterdill, P.; Dhondt, S. Workplace innovation: European policy and theoretical foundation. *World Rev. Entrep. Manag. Sustain. Dev.* **2016**, *12*, 13. [CrossRef]
55. Wipulanusat, W.; Panuwatwanich, K.; Stewart, R.A. Pathways to workplace innovation and career satisfaction in the public service. *Int. J. Organ. Anal.* **2018**, *26*, 890–914. [CrossRef]
56. Black, S.E.; Lynch, M.L. What's driving the new economy? The benefits of workplace innovation. *Econ. J.* **2004**, *114*, 97–116. [CrossRef]
57. Porter, M.E. *Competitive Strategy*; The Free Press: New York, NY, USA, 1980; ISBN 9780684841489.
58. Rizan, M.; Balfas, F.; Purwihedi, U. The influence of strategic orientation, organizational innovation capabilities and strategic planning on the performance of technology-based firms. *Acad. Strateg. Manag. J.* **2019**, *18*, 1–11.
59. Grimmer, L.; Miles, M.P.; Byrom, J.; Grimmer, M. The impact of resources and strategic orientation on small retail firm performance. *J. Small Bus. Manag.* **2017**, *55*, 7–26. [CrossRef]
60. Bason, C. *Leading Public Sector Innovation: Co-Creating for a Better Society*; Policy Press: Bristol, UK, 2010; ISBN 978-18-4742-635-2.
61. Homan, T. *De Verandermanagementbox deel 17: 'Veranderen als Chaotisch Process'*; MainPress: Schiedam, The Netherlands, 2008; ISBN 9789089590169.
62. Phills, J.A.; Deiglmeier, K.; Miller, D.T. Rediscovering social innovation. *Stanford Soc. Innov. Rev.* **2008**, *6*, 34–43.
63. Idua, M.P. The Influence of Institutional Factors and Job-Related Attitudes in Relationship Between Employee Empowerment and Performance of Public Universities. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Nairobi, Nairobi, Kenya, 2014.
64. Kariuki, A.; Kiambati, K. Empowerment, organizational commitment, organization citizenship behavior and firm performance. *Manag. Stud.* **2017**, *5*. [CrossRef]
65. Berraies, S.; Chaher, M.; Ben Yahia, K. Employee empowerment and its importance for trust, innovation and organizational performance. *Bus. Manag. Strat.* **2014**, *5*, 82. [CrossRef]
66. Stankevičiūtė, Z.; Savanevičienė, A. designing sustainable HRM: The core characteristics of emerging field. *Sustainability* **2018**, *10*, 4798. [CrossRef]
67. Abad, A.G. *Societies of Social Innovation: Voices And Arguments*; Sussex Academic Press: Eastbourne, UK, 2013; ISBN 978-18-4519-513-7.
68. Berkery, E.; Morley, M.J.; Tiernan, S.; Purtill, H.; Parry, E. On the uptake of flexible working arrangements and the association with human resource and organizational performance outcomes. *Eur. Manag. Rev.* **2017**, *14*, 165–183. [CrossRef]
69. De Menezes, L.M.; Kelliher, C. Flexible working and performance: A systematic review of the evidence for a business case. *Int. J. Manag. Rev.* **2011**, *13*, 452–474. [CrossRef]
70. Mwangi, R.M.; Theuri, M.M.; Sang, A. Role of types of flexible work options on organizational performance of listed companies in the nairobi securities exchange in Kenya. *Int. J. Humanit. Soc. Sci. Educ.* **2018**, *5*, 1–15.
71. Van der Heijde, C.M.; Van der Heijden, B.I.J.M. A competence-based and multidimensional operationalization and measurement of employability. *Hum. Resour. Manag.* **2006**, *45*, 449–476. [CrossRef]
72. Stoffers, J.M.M.; Van der Heijden, B.I.J.M. Participatie van oudere werknemers in innovatie. *Tijdschr. Voor Ontwikk. Organ.* **2014**, *4*, 52–57.
73. Stoffers, J.M.; Van Der Heijden, B.I.J.M. An innovative work behaviour-enhancing employability model moderated by age. *Eur. J. Train. Dev.* **2018**, *42*, 143–163. [CrossRef]
74. Zinsmeister, J.; Ballafkih, H.; Meerman, M. De Praktijk van het beleid rond oudere werknemers. ouderenbeleid en leeftijdsbewust personeelsbeleid in de regio Amsterdam. *Tijdschr. Voor Arb.* **2007**, *23*, 224–237.
75. Bontekoning, A. *Nieuwe Generaties in Vergrijzende Organisaties*; Mediawerf: Haarlem, The Netherlands, 2014; ISBN 978-94-9046-334-2.
76. Stoffers, J. *Employability, Werkend Perspectief voor de Middengroep op de Arbeidsmarkt*; Zuyd Research: Heerlen, The Netherlands, 2016; ISBN 9789462287761.
77. Kessels, J.; Poell, R. *Handboek Human Resource Development: Organiseren van het Leren*; Bohn Stafleu van Loghum: Houten, The Netherlands, 2011; ISBN 978-90-3138-564-5.
78. Kessels, J. De Kenniseconomie: Uitdagingen voor HRD. 2014. Available online: <http://www.researchgate.net> (accessed on 23 March 2021).
79. Stoffers, J.; Roos, R. Creating innovation value through networks: Knowledge circulation and talent development. *Am. J. Econ.* **2015**, *5*, 409–416. [CrossRef]
80. Grimm, R.; Fox, C.; Baines, S.; Albertson, K. Social innovation, an answer to contemporary societal challenges? Locating the concept in theory and practice. *Innov. Eur. J. Soc. Sci. Res.* **2013**, *26*, 436–455. [CrossRef]
81. Garavan, T.N.; Carbery, R.; Rock, A. Mapping talent development: Definition, scope and architecture. *Eur. J. Train. Dev.* **2012**, *36*, 5–24. [CrossRef]
82. Martin, J.; Schmidt, C. How to keep your top talent. *Harv. Bus. Rev.* **2010**, *88*, 54–61.
83. Huselid, M.A. The impact of human resource management practices on turnover, productivity, and corporate financial performance. *Acad. Manag. J.* **2013**, *38*, 635–672.

84. Nolan, C.T.; Caravan, T.N. Human resource development in SMEs: A systematic review of the literature. *Int. J. Manag. Rev.* **2016**, *18*, 1–54. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
85. Rebelo, T.; Gomes, A.D. Is organizational learning culture a good bet? An analysis of its impact on organizational profitability and customer satisfaction. *Acad. Rev. Latinoam. Adm.* **2017**, *30*, 328–343. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
86. MacLean, M.; Harvey, C.; Gordon, J. Social innovation, social entrepreneurship and the practice of contemporary entrepreneurial philanthropy. *Int. Small Bus. J. Res. Entrep.* **2012**, *31*, 747–763. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
87. Kavoura, A. Two to tango: Entrepreneurs and robots' users in hospitality service innovation. In *Service Excellence in Tourism and Hospitality*; Thirumaran, K., Klimkeit, D., Meng Tang, C., Eds.; Springer: Cham, Switzerland, 2021; pp. 111–131, ISBN 978-30-3057-694-3.
88. Hu, M.-L.M.; Horng, J.-S.; Sun, Y.-H.C. Hospitality teams: Knowledge sharing and service innovation performance. *Tour. Manag.* **2009**, *30*, 41–50. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
89. Alkier, R.; Milojica, V.; Roblek, V. Challenges of the social innovation in tourism. *Tour. South East Eur.* **2017**, *4*, 1–13. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
90. Delgado-Verde, M.; Castro, G.M.-D.; Amores-Salvadó, J. Intellectual capital and radical innovation: Exploring the quadratic effects in technology-based manufacturing firms. *Technovation* **2016**, *54*, 35–47. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
91. Hapsari, C.; Stoffers, J.; Gunawan, A. The influence of generational diversity management and leader–member exchange on innovative work behaviors mediated by employee engagement. *J. Asia Pac. Bus.* **2019**, *20*, 125–139. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
92. Slåtten, T.; Mehmetoglu, M. What are the drivers for innovative behavior in frontline jobs? A study of the hospitality industry in Norway. *J. Hum. Resour. Hosp. Tour.* **2011**, *10*, 254–272. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
93. Martin-Rios, C.; Ciobanu, T. Hospitality innovation strategies: An analysis of success factors and challenges. *Tour. Manag.* **2019**, *70*, 218–229. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
94. Stoffers, J.; Kleefstra, A.; Gerards, R.; Canisius, E.; Hendriks, M.; De Grip, A. *Sociale Innovatiemonitor Limburg*; Presented at Zuyd Lectoraat Employability/Maastricht University ROA: Heerlen/Maastricht, The Netherlands, 2017. Available online: https://www.narcis.nl/publication/RecordID/oai:hbokennisbank.nl:sharekit_zuyd%3Aoai%3Asurfsharekit.nl%3A1789fae6-15d8-4d6d-8b19-6617d4a4da24 (accessed on 21 May 2021).
95. Stoffers, J.; Kleefstra, A.; Loffeld, R.; Gerards, R.; Hendriks, M.; De Grip, A. *Sociale Innovatiemonitor Limburg, Werken aan Employability*; Presented at Zuyd Lectoraat Employability/Maastricht University ROA: Heerlen/Maastricht, The Netherlands, 2018. Available online: <https://cris.maastrichtuniversity.nl/en/publications/sociale-innovatie-monitor-limburg-2018-werken-aan-employability> (accessed on 21 May 2021).
96. Hambleton, R.K. Guidelines for adapting educational and psychological tests: A progress report. *Eur. J. Psychol. Assess.* **1994**, *10*, 229–244.
97. Field, A. *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*, 4th ed.; Sage: Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 2013; ISBN 978-14-4624-918-5.
98. Hansen, J.A. Innovation, firm size, and firm age. *Small Bus. Econ.* **1992**, *4*, 37–44.
99. Mayfield, M.; Mayfield, J.; Wheeler, C. Talent development for top leaders: Three HR initiatives for competitive advantage. *Hum. Resour. Manag. Int. Dig.* **2016**, *24*, 4–7. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
100. Stoffers, J.M.; Van Der Heijden, B.I.; Notelaers, G.L. Towards a moderated mediation model of innovative work behaviour enhancement. *J. Organ. Chang. Manag.* **2014**, *27*, 642–659. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
101. Gault, F. *Handbook of Innovation Indicators and Measurement*; Edward Elgar Publishing Limited: Cheltenham, UK, 2013. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
102. Njoroge, M.; Anderson, W.; Mbura, O. Innovation strategy and economic sustainability in the hospitality industry. *Bottom Line* **2019**, *32*, 253–268. [\[CrossRef\]](#)