## **Editorial**

"We think, mistakenly, that success is the result of the amount of time we put in at work, instead of the quality of time we put in."- Arianna Huffington.

The new year starts and many of us have right away been burdened with conference datelines, grant proposal datelines, teaching obligations, paper revisions and many other things. While being more or less successful in fulfilling To-Do lists and ticking of urgent (and sometimes even important) things, we often feel that our ability to be truly creative or innovative is rather restrained by this (external pressure). With this, we are not alone. Many studies have shown that stress does influence overall work performance and satisfaction. Furthermore, more and more students and entry-levels look for work-life balance and search for employers that offer a surrounding and organization considering these needs. High-Tech and start-up companies praise themselves for their "Feel-Good managers" or Yoga programs. But is this really helpful? Is there indeed a relationship between stress, adverse work environment and creativity or innovation? What are the supporting factors in a work environment that lets employees be more creative? What kind of leadership do we need for innovative behaviour and to what extent can an organization create support structures that reduce the stress we feel? The first issue of Creativity and Innovation Management in 2019 gives some first answers to these questions and hopefully some food for thought.

The first paper written by Dirk De Clercq, and Imanol Belausteguigoitia starts with the question which impact work overload has on creative behaviour. The authors look at how employees' perceptions of work overload reduces their creative behaviour. While they find empirical proof for this relationship, they can also show that the effect is weaker with higher levels of passion for work, emotion sharing, and organizational commitment. The buffering effects of emotion sharing and organizational commitment are particularly strong when they are combined with high levels of passion for work. Their findings give first empirical proof that organizations can and should take an active role in helping their employees reducing the effects of adverse work conditions in order to become or stav creative. However, not only work overload is harming creative behaviour, also the fear of losing one's job has detrimental effects on innovative work behaviour. Anahi van Hootegem, Wendy Niesen and Hans de Witte verify that stress and adverse environmental conditions shape our perception of work. Using threat rigidity theory and an empirical study of 394 employees, they show that the threat of job loss impairs employees' innovativeness through increased irritation and decreased

## WILEY

concentration. Organizations can help their employees coping better with this insecurity by communicating more openly and providing different support structures. Support often comes from leadership and the support of the supervisor can clearly shape an employee's motivation to show creative behaviour. Wenjing Cai, Evgenia Lysova, Bart A. G. Bossink, Svetlana N. Khapova and Weidong Wang report empirical findings from a large-scale survey in China where they find that supervisor support for creativity and job characteristics effectively activate individual psychological capital associated with employee creativity.

On a slight different notion, Gisela Bäcklander looks at agile practices in a very well-known High Tech firm. In "Doing Complexity Leadership Theory: How agile coaches at Spotify practice enabling leadership", she researches the role of agile coaches and how they practice enabling leadership, a key balancing force in complexity leadership. She finds that the active involvement of coaches in observing group dynamics, surfacing conflict and facilitating and encouraging constructive dialogue leads to a positive working environment and the well-being of employees. Quotes from the interviews suggest that the flexible structure provided by the coaches may prove a fruitful way to navigate and balance autonomy and alignment in organizations.

The fifth paper of Frederik Anseel, Michael Vandamme, Wouter Duyck and Eric Rietzchel goes a little further down this road and researches how groups can be motivated better to select truly creative ideas. We know from former studies that groups often perform rather poorly when it comes to selecting creative ideas for implementation. The authors find in an extensive field experiment that under conditions of high epistemic motivation, proself motivated groups select significantly more creative and original ideas than prosocial groups. They conclude however, that more research is needed to understand better why these differences occur. The prosocial behaviour of groups is also the theme of Karin Moser, Jeremy F. Dawson and Michael A. West's paper on "Antecedents of team innovation in health care teams". They look at team-level motivation and how a prosocial team environment, indicated by the level of helping behaviour and information-sharing, may foster innovation. Their results support the hypotheses of both informationsharing and helping behaviour on team innovation. They suggest that both factors may actually act as buffer against constraints in team work, such as large team size or high occupational diversity in cross-functional health care teams, and potentially turn these into resources supporting team innovation rather than acting as barriers.

Away from teams and onto designing favourable work environments, the seventh paper of Ferney Osorio, Laurent Dupont, Mauricio Camargo, Pedro Palominos, Jose Ismael Pena and Miguel Alfaro looks into innovation laboratories. Although several studies have tackled the problem of design, development and sustainability of these spaces for innovation, there is still a gap in understanding how the capabilities and performance of these environments are affected by the strategic intentions at the early stages of their design and functioning. The authors analyse and compare eight existing frameworks from literature and propose a new framework for researchers and practitioners aiming to assess or to adapt innovation laboratories. They test their framework in an exploratory study with fifteen laboratories from five different countries and give recommendations for the future design of these laboratories. From design to design thinking goes our last paper from Rama Krishna Reddy Kummitha on "Design Thinking in Social Organisations: Understanding the role of user engagement" where she studies how users persuade social organisations to adopt design thinking. Looking at four social organisations in India during 2008 to 2013, she finds that the designer roles are blurred when social organisations adopt design thinking, while users in the form of interconnecting agencies reduce the gap between designers and communities.

The last two articles were developed from papers presented at the  $17^{\text{th}}$  International CINet conference organized in Turin in 2016

by Paolo Neirotti and his colleagues. In the first article, Fábio Gama, Johan Frishammar and Vinit Parida focus on ideation and open innovation in small- and medium-sized enterprises. They investigate the relationship between systematic idea generation and performance and the moderating role of market-based partnerships. Based on a survey among manufacturing SMEs, they conclude that higher levels of performance are reached and that collaboration with customers and suppliers pays off most when idea generation is done in a highly systematic way. The second article, by Anna Holmquist, Mats Magnusson and Mona Livholts, resonates the theme of the CINet conference 'Innovation and Tradition; combining the old and the new'. They explore how tradition is used in craft-based design practices to create new meaning. Applying a narrative 'research through design' approach they uncover important design elements, and tensions between them.

Please enjoy this first issue of CIM in 2019 and we wish you creativity and innovation without too much stress in the months to come.

> Katharina Hölzle Jennie Björk Klaasjan Visscher

WILEY