

Special issue call for papers
MANAGEMENT INTERNATIONAL

Guest editors:

Guy Parmentier - IAE de Grenoble

Bérangère Szostak - Université de Lyon 2

Charles-Clemens Rüling - Grenoble Ecole de Management

**Organizational creativity: challenges for strategic management in
globalized world**

Creativity has been studied for a long time in the social sciences. Business studies however have been more timid in exploring organizational level creativity. In business practice, an increasing number of organizations emphasize creativity as a core aspect of their strategy. Renault, for instance, has emphasized "creative technology", Michelin relied on "creative communities" to develop its global environmental strategy (Chassagnon & Haned, 2013), and a core characteristic of so-called creative industries such as videogames or the performing arts is firms' capacity to manage intangibles such as aesthetics, imagination, and art within a financially and economically constrained space (Massé & Paris, 2013). On a similar note, organizations in the social economy are exposed to multiple values and logics, which they have to combine to create new and original ideas, products and services (Binder, 2007). Last but not least, a recent IBM CEO Study, "Capitalizing on complexity" (2010), has found that more than two thirds of the more than 1500 international business leaders interviewed for this study considered the management of creativity one of the main future challenges for organizations.

Past research on organizational creativity has proposed interactionist (Woodman et al., 1993), evolutionary (Ford, 1996), and organizational climate perspectives (Ekvall, 1996), among others, and studies creativity on individual, group and organization levels (Amabile, 1988; Shalley et al., 2004). Taking a slightly different approach, the entrepreneurship literature has studied entrepreneurial behaviors to introduce novel ideas and business models (Napier & Nelsson, 2006; Kremer & Verstraete, 2014). Building on these literatures, three main aspects

warrant further exploration: (1) the management of organizational boundaries, (2) the management of ideas, and (3) the role of organizational capabilities and resources.

The first aspect, *management of organizational boundaries*, has traditionally been one of the key questions addressed by organizational design. Normally looked at from the vantage points of efficiency, power, competence or identity, organizational boundaries also play a critical role in organizational creativity. Research on open innovation, for example, highlights the possible gains of opening up design and innovation processes to outside inputs, especially ideas (Chesbrough, 2003). In doing so, organizations engage in co-creating with other firms or users (Pisano & Verganti, 2008). The involvement of external users enhances idea creation (Franke et al., 2008; Jeppesen & Frederiksen, 2006), and new approaches such as user toolkits (Parmentier & Gandia, 2013) or the interaction with virtual user communities (Burger-Helmchen & Cohendet, 2011; Parmentier & Mangematin, 2014) involve user creativity in the co-creation of products and services, while raising, on the other hand, numerous questions about the conditions under which such forms of "collective bricolage" actually succeed (Duymedjian et Rüling, 2010).

In addition to crossing external boundaries, ideas also need to cross internal organizational boundaries to enhance processes of creation and organizational change. Incentives for contextual ambidexterity (Brion et al., 2008) enable organizations to manage both exploitation and exploration, even within very small creative industry firms (Parmentier & Mangematin, 2009). Network positions and ties, both internal and external, play an important role in individual and organizational creativity (Perry-Smith, 2006; Hargadon & Sutton, 1997). Networks extending into "creative territories" (Simon, 2009) facilitate the development of organizational creativity. These territories can take the form of physical spaces (e.g., Fab labs, co-working initiatives, or geographic clusters) or consist of virtual networks, for example social media communities. Both question established firm boundaries and at the same time also recognize the importance of some form of boundaries for the emergence of creative solutions. In other words, boundaries must be managed in order to favor the emergence of ideas and to favor their transformation into new products and services. These new creative territories challenge existing organization of work, especially in the context of well-established multinational firms.

The second direction for research focuses on the *management of ideas*. Psychologists have studied idea generation for a long time, looking in particular at the contexts and the resources favoring both individual (Amabile, 1996) and organizational creativity (Drazin et al, 1999). Over time, individual and organizational creativity gained attention in management research as firms' capacity to create new knowledge has been increasingly recognized as a strategic challenge (Dechamp & Szostak, 2014). Methods and tools for creative thinking abound, and their effectiveness has been studied to some extent (e.g., Carrier et al., 2010), however without yielding clear results. Entrepreneurship research has considered ideation as a fundamental step in the entrepreneurial process (Tremblay, 2014). It has also studied the connection between creativity and business models, for instance by analyzing the role of mental maps as tools of learning and creativity in entrepreneurial business model design (Kremer & Verstraete, 2014). More generally, design thinking (Brown, 2010), has been proposed to encourage firms to develop multidisciplinary approaches, rapidly test new ideas, and to recognize serendipity as a source of organizational creativity. In intercultural groups, diversity can provide opportunities to promote the emergence of new ideas. But we still need to design methods to produce both diverge and converge in such contexts while ensuring the necessary level of trust and shared understanding. Whereas idea generation has been addressed in the literature, idea selection as a subsequent step closely related to ideation has received much less attention outside the traditional innovation management literature (e.g., in the context of stage gate models). Both researchers and management practitioner have a shared interest in building on early work (e.g., Lubart, 2001; Faure, 2004; Putnam & Paulus, 2009) to further our understanding of processes of organizational creativity and the management of ideas.

The third direction addressed in this call concerns the link between *organizational capabilities and resources* and creativity. Here, creativity is seen as an organizational capability partaking in an organization's overall dynamic capabilities (Teece et al. 1997 ; Teece, 2007, Napier & Nilsson, 2006). Referring to the ability to consider less evident solutions (Carrier & G elinas, 2011), creativity suggests a critical stance towards routines and depends on an organization's willingness to provide resources for creative exploration and to support perturbation of its routines. In extreme situations, such as very fast growth, managing the tension between creativity and routine allows organizations to create the conditions necessary to its own destabilization in order to anticipate uncertain future developments

(Chanut-Guieu & Guieu, 2014). Creativity implies that organizations manage paradoxical configurations (Andriopoulos, 2003), for instance by catering to employees' passions while at the same time seeking to attain financial objectives, or by encouraging personal initiatives while maintaining a strong shared vision. An highly interesting area of study concerns the question of how organizations, especially multinational firms, succeed in managing these paradoxical processes. One approach highlights the role of "creative slack" (Cohendet & Simon, 2007). Organizations need to allocate resources among several areas in order to develop projects that potentially lead to valuable ideas. In doing so, organizations constitute reservoirs of ideas and knowledge from which individuals and groups can draw. Taken together, these novel approaches highlight the need to study how creative individuals and teams in organizations are managed.

In line with these three directions, the special issue on organizational seeks to stimulate research on organizational creativity and boundaries. The range of issues suggested above, however, is not exhaustive; we also invite contributions address any other question related to the overall theme of organizational creativity, and we explicitly welcome both conceptual and empirical contributions.

Manuscripts must be submitted **by email to creativite_orga@coactis.org**. The **submission deadline is April 15th, 2016**. Submitted papers must respect the rules set out in the journal's editorial guidelines (<http://www.managementinternational.ca/en/authors-section/>).

Bibliography

- Amabile, T. (1988). A model of creativity and innovation in organizations. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, vol.10, n°2, pp.123-167.
- Amabile, T. M. (1996), *Creativity in context: Update to "the social psychology of creativity"*, Westview Press, Boulder, CO.
- Andriopoulos C., 2003, Six Paradoxes in Managing Creativity: An Embracing Act, *Long Range Planning*, vol.36, n°4, pp.375–388
- Binder, A. 2007. For love and money: Organizations' creative responses to multiple environmental logics, *Theory and Society*, vol.36, n°6, pp.547–571.
- Brown T. (2010), *L'esprit design*, Paris, Éditions Pearson.
- Brion, S., Mothe, C., & Sabatier, M. (2008), "L'impact-clé des modes de management pour l'innovation. (french)", *Revue Francaise de Gestion*, vol.34, n°187, pp. 177-94.
- Burger-Helmchen, T. & Cohendet, P. (2011), "User communities and social software in the video game industry", *Long Range Planning*, vol. 44, n°5/6, pp. 317-43.
- Chanut-Guieu C. & Guieu G. (2014), "Quelle est la place de la créativité organisationnelle dans les PME en hypercroissance ?", *Revue Internationale de la PME*, vol. 27, n°1, pp. 35-63.
- Carrier, C., Cadieux, L., & Tremblay, M. (2010), "Créativité et génération collective d'opportunités quelles techniques pour supporter l'idéation? ", *Revue Française de Gestion*, vol.36, n°206, pp. 113-27.
- Carrier C., & Gelinat, S. (2011), *Créativité et Gestion, Les idées au service de l'innovation*, Presses de l'Université du Québec, Québec.
- Chassagnon, V. & Haned, N. (2013), "Les communautés créatives pilotées au cœur de la stratégie d'innovation environnementale de michelin", *Revue Internationale de Gestion*, vol.38, n° 3, p.45-53.
- Chesbrough, H. W. (2003), "The era of open innovation", *MIT Sloan Management Review*, vol.44, n°3, p. 35-41.
- Cohendet, P. & Simon, L. (2007), "Playing across the playground: Paradoxes of knowledge creation in the videogame firm", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, vol 28, n°5, p. 587-602.
- Dechamp G. & Szostak, B. (2014), "Mobiliser le territoire créatif pour stimuler la créativité organisationnelle : un nouvel enjeu pour les PME", *Actes de congrès de l'AIMS*, Rennes, mai.
- Drazin, R., Glynn, M. A., & Kazanjian, R. K. (1999), "Multilevel theorizing about creativity in organizations: A sensemaking perspective", *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 24, n°2, pp.286-307.
- Duymedjian, R. & Rüling, C.-C. (2010), "Towards a foundation of bricolage in organization and management theory", *Organization Studies* (01708406), vol.31, n°2, pp.133-51.
- Ekvall, G. (1996), "Organizational climate for creativity and innovation", *European Journal of Work & Organizational Psychology*, vol.5, n°1, pp.105-123.
- Faure, C. (2004), "Beyond brainstorming: Effects of different group procedures on selection of ideas and satisfaction with the process ", *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, vol.38, n°1, pp.13-34.
- Ford, C. M. (1996), "A theory of individual creative action in multiple social domains", *Academy of Management Review*, vol.21, n°4, p. 1112-1142.
- Franke, N., Keinz, P., & Schreier, M. (2008), "Complementing mass customization toolkits with user communities: How peer input improves customer self-design", *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, vol25, n°6, pp. 546-559.
- Hargadon, A. & Sutton, R. I. (1997), "Technology brokering and innovation in a product development firm", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, vol.42, n°4, pp.481-484.
- Jeppesen, L. B. & Frederiksen, L. (2006), "Why do users contribute to firm-hosted user communities? The case of computer-controlled music instruments", *Organization Science*, vol.17, n°1, pp.45-63.

- Kremer F. & Verstraete, T. (2014), "La carte mentale pour favoriser l'apprentissage du Business Model et susciter la créativité des apprenants", *Revue Internationale de la PME*, vol.27, n°1, pp.65-98.
- Lubart, T. I. (2001), "Models of the creative process: Past, present and future", *Creativity Research Journal*, vol.13, n°3/4, pp.295-308.
- Napier, N. K. & Nilsson, M. (2006), "The development of creative capabilities in and out of creative organizations: Three case studies", *Creativity & Innovation Management*, vol.15, n°3, pp. 268-278.
- Massé, D. & Paris, T. (2013), "Former pour entretenir et développer la créativité de l'entreprise: Les leçons du cirque du soleil", *Revue Internationale de Gestion*, vol.38, n°3, pp.6-15.
- Penrose, E. (1959), *The theory of the growth of the firm*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Parmentier, G. & Gandia, R. (2013), "Managing sustainable innovation with a user community toolkit: The case of the video game trackmania", *Creativity and Innovation Management*, vol.22, n°2, pp.195-208.
- Parmentier, G. & Mangematin, V. (2009), "Innovation et création dans le jeu vidéo", *Revue Française de Gestion*, vol.35, n°191, pp.71-87.
- Parmentier, G. & Mangematin, V. (2014), "Orchestrating innovation with user communities in the creative industries", *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, Vol 83, n°0, pp.40-53.
- Perry-Smith, J. E. (2006), "Social yet creative: The role of social relationships in facilitating individual creativity", *Academy of Management Journal*, vol.49, n°1, pp.85-101.
- Pisano, G. P. & Verganti, R. (2008), "Which kind of collaboration is right for you?", *Harvard Business Review*, vol.86, n°12, pp.78-86.
- Putman, V., L. & Paulus, P. B. (2009), "Brainstorming, brainstorming rules and decision making", *The Journal of Creative Behavior*, vol43, n°1, pp. 23-39.
- Shalley, C. E., Zhou, J., & Oldham, G. R. (2004), "The effects of personal and contextual characteristics on creativity: Where should we go from here?", *Journal of Management*, vol.30, n°6, pp. 933-958.
- Simon, L. (2009), "Underground, upperground et middleground : Les collectifs créatifs et la capacité créative de la ville.", *Management International*, vol.13, Numéro hors série, pp. 37-51.
- Teece D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997), "Dynamic capabilities and strategic management". *Strategic Management Journal*, vol.18, n°7, pp. 509-533.
- Teece, D.J. (2007), "Explicating dynamic capabilities: the nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance", *Strategic Management Journal*, vol. 28, n°13, pp. 1319-1350
- Tremblay, M-P. (2014), "L'identification collective d'opportunités : la créativité au service de l'entrepreneuriat", *Revue Internationale de la PME*, vol. 27, n°1, pp.99-124
- Woodman, R. W., Sawyer, J. E., & Griffin, R. W. (1993), "Toward a theory of organizational creativity", *Academy of Management Review*, vol.18, n°2, p. 293-321.