

EDITORIAL**Editorial**

“Never tell people how to do things. Tell them what to do and they will surprise you with their ingenuity.” –
General George Patton

We have chosen this quote as leitmotif for our second issue of 2017. The papers we have selected for this issue circle around the topics of cognition vs. emotion and creative genius vs. (standardized) processes and methods. Both sides are needed for creativity to flourish and innovation to happen, but how much of which do we need and how do we decide on the right mixture? We see more and more experts telling us “how to make innovation happen”, “how to foster creativity”, “how to create the innovative organization”, etc. While many of these articles, blogs, books, presentations, seminars, and workshops have their *raison d'être*, they often don't tell us anything new. In the end, it's up to the individual and the organization to decide which aspects and tools to include in the innovation process and how to balance the different characters in creative organizations. What we do promise you, though, is that you will find some thought-provoking ideas in the articles in this issue. Furthermore, this issue also contains a special section with three articles based on papers presented at the 16th International CINet conference, organized by KTH The Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm in September 2015.

The first paper, “How my product works and how it looks: Effects of functional and aesthetic co-creation and the role of product expertise” by Benedikt Schnurr, looks at aspects of customers' self-identity and the design of the co-creation process. He shows how the customer's experience of the co-creation process influences their perception of the quality of the final co-created product. The author finds that this perception is driven mainly by aesthetic co-creation and the overall satisfaction with the process. Based on a field study in a snowboarding company, the author proves that the customer's product expertise positively moderates the relationship for the functional but not for the aesthetic co-creation with the final perception of the quality of the co-created product. Here, we see that aspects that speak to our affect and emotions more strongly influence our rational process than aspects that speak to our cognitive mode. The implications for research are obvious: we have to take into account the soft side of decision making and evaluation and focus not only on the cognitive, i.e. often easier to measure, side.

The cognition of what is possible and how to use visual tools to support business model thinking is the topic of Karl Täuscher and Nizar Abdelkafi's paper on “Visual tools for business model innovation: Recommendations from a cognitive perspective”. The authors look at how managers use visual representations of business models to

support their understanding and development of new business models. Building on a systematic literature review of 95 visual representations from the academic and non-academic literature, they build a visual business model representational framework that classifies business model understanding based on the elements' view, a transactional view, and a causal view. Not only do they create with this overview a first comprehensive set of business model visualizations, but they also open up the research agenda on how these visualizations actually influence managers' selection and evaluation processes. Again, some further research needed!

The third paper takes a rather methods-oriented stand to understand whether and how tools we know from lean management influence the innovative behavior of individual employees. In their paper “Lean tools promoting individual innovation in healthcare”, Pernilla Lindskog, Jens Hemphälä and Andrea Eriksson take a longitudinal look at three public service organizations in Sweden to better understand the influence of lean tools and innovation-enabling job resources on promoting healthcare employees' individual innovation at work. Theory and practice tell us that lean tools like visual follow-up boards, standardized work, 5S (housekeeping), and value stream mapping (VSM) improve the ability of individuals to advance their work. The question the authors aim to answer is to what extent these tools foster not only exploitative but also explorative work. Furthermore, they are interested to learn what contextual factors (i.e., innovation-enabling job resources) support employees' innovation when lean is implemented in the organization. In summary, lean tools facilitate individual innovation – but not all tools, only select ones. Furthermore, in the initial phase of implementing lean, these tools empower employees to do small-step process innovations in their organizations, even if other job resources are scarce. Time for development and information are important innovation-enabling resources.

The fourth paper takes a deeper look at entrepreneurial processes in big corporations and how these are best organized. In his paper “Organizing for success in internal corporate venturing: An inductive case study of a multinational consumer goods company”, Alex Makarevich has the unique possibility to study two internal corporate venturing programs in a large multinational corporation and identify success factors of integrated internal corporate venturing programs. The author finds that seemingly more bureaucratized organization structures and formalized processes of decision making and operation result in a lighter administrative burden on, and a more supportive environment for, new ventures. Consequently, this unit created better conditions for successful venturing and could take better advantage of the creativity of its employees. Other success factors identified are

close involvement of mainstream functions, broad managerial involvement, and a rotating membership in the internal corporate venturing board. Not only practice but also academia should look more deeply into these qualitative results and transfer them to other organizations.

The last regular paper, "Reality bites: Managing identity ambiguity in an advertising agency" by Heather Round and Alexander Styhre, looks at self-identity and work structures. The creative industries attract a large number of individuals with quite high identity needs who usually do not like to feel restricted and bound by organizational guidelines. Here, management must balance their needs with those of other organizational actors, including those responsible for allegedly "non-creative" processes. Their study examines an Australian advertising agency and demonstrates how individuals and groups within the organization handle ambiguities and tensions inherent in their work. Their research finds that, in order to strike a balance and to facilitate heedful interactions within the organization, the management team needs to provide supporting frameworks in the form of codified practices in the organization, legitimizing functions through structural alignment while at the same time paying attention to the identity-related needs of the different groups within the organization.

The next three articles come from the CINet 2015 conference in Stockholm, starting with the article by Fábio Gama, David Rönnberg Sjödin, and Johan Frishammar, which dives into the struggles many companies face with managing interorganizational technology development projects. In particular, understanding each other and

aligning project management practices accordingly proves to be problematic. The authors studied three companies in depth and identify important coordination and control practices for both market-based and science-based partnerships. In the second article in this section, Anna Karlsson and Jennie Björk study the relationship between social networks and innovation. In particular, they ask how companies can design and use networks to achieve continuous innovation. Based on a longitudinal study in a multinational firm, they reveal how internal networks can be established and managed to make innovation really happen. Autonomy, self-organization, and mutual expectations between management and employees play a crucial role. In the last article of this special section, Lucie Puech and Thomas Durand discuss the role of "time" in intrapreneurial processes. Instead of treating time quantitatively they take a qualitative approach. On the basis of an in-depth case study, they conclude that different kinds of time contribute differently to the identification, exploration, and development phases of intrapreneurial processes. All three articles make important contributions to advancing theory and managerial practices.

Katharina Hölzle
Jennie Björk
Anders Richtnér
Sofia Ritzén
Klaasjan Visscher