



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Advances in Research |
| Manuscript Number: | 2014_AIR_15533 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | MEASURING INNOVATION CULTURE: DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF A MULTIDIMENSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE |
| Type of the Article | Original Research Article |

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i> |
|--|---|---|
| <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments | | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | <p>I have no clue on the term “Radiography” . Can you think of an alternative ?</p> <p>Add over 100 spaces between words that currently stick together.</p> <p>78: little attention to relevant factors such AS the behavior of members of the organization [add as]</p> | <p>We understand that the term “radiography” could sound odd. But we are interested in the use of the questionnaire as a diagnostic tool, and in that sense, it sounded appropriate to us.</p> <p>Corrected</p> <p>Corrected. Thank you very much.</p> |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | <p>You introduced a tricky contradiction: innovation culture in organizations – which is a collective entity - from the perspective of individuals. I expected more depth on this issue.</p> <p>57/58: We are therefore interested in three dimensions via which these 58 factors could contribute to fostering innovation: society, organization, and the individual. → you might consider to apply Ken Wilber’s integral AQAL model, describing three supportive quadrants: individual intentions, individual behaviour and the (social) system, the fourth being culture.</p> <p>For a next study I would introduce two additional dimensions on Safety. You have linked it to the</p> | <p>We agree with you. It is difficult to fully address all the relevant questions included in the paper. Probably the importance of individuals should be more deeply explained. We will consider it in future studies.</p> <p>Thank you very much for the input. We will consider Wilber’s model in the future.</p> <p>We are very grateful for this suggestion. It sounds very interesting. We will take into</p> |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>organization's openness to the proposals. To my knowledge this is great but not sufficient : safety should also be measured as (1) social and psychological safety and (2) economic safety. Employees will not be creative when the results will jeopardize their employability.</p> <p>The topic is highly relevant as it introduces contexts to the effectiveness of innovation, as well as the individual motives and skills.</p> | <p>account.</p> <p>We are very grateful for your inputs, comments and opinion. Thank you very much.</p> |
|--|---|---|