Cooking under Fire: Managing Multilevel Tensions between Creativity and Innovation in Haute Cuisine

Christel Lane

Daniela Lup

Abstract

This inductive study of Michelin-starred restaurants in Britain and Germany examines how organizations attend to tensions between idea creation and implementation that characterize innovation processes. Based on the analysis of in-depth interviews with forty chefs-de-cuisine we identify tensions at two distinct levels of analysis. The first tension, situated at the individual level, occurs between the artistic identity of the chefs-de-cuisine and their work identity; the second one, at the organizational level, arises because creativity and implementation are equally important for the organizational success, thus making it impossible to disentangle chefs' contribution from that of the kitchen brigade. Case evidence shows that effective tactics for managing these tensions simultaneously emphasize distinctions and create synergies between the contradictory elements of each tension. Moreover, our cross-national sample allows us to show how differences at the national institutional level affect the management of tensions and thus shed light on the mechanisms through which institutional environments affect innovation. These insights contribute to existing research in creativity and innovation.

Keywords: creativity, innovation, implementation; haute cuisine, multilevel analysis; tensions; Britain and Germany

1. Introduction

Research on organizational creativity has established that creativity and innovation are two distinct concepts and parts of the same process (West 2002, Amabile 1996). Creativity, the first stage of the innovation process, is generally conceptualized as the development of novel ideas, the "thinking about new things" (West 2002: 357). The implementation of creative ideas is the second part of the process, the stage during which novel ideas become products and services (West 2002, West and Farr 1990). Implicit in this conceptualization is that successful innovation is not reducible to the production of novel ideas, but that it requires the implementation of those ideas so that they may be deemed valuable by organizational stakeholders. Thus, successful organizations must excel at both stages.

Existing research has made considerable contributions to our understanding of factors that affect the production of ideas and of innovative outcomes in organizations (Amabile et al 1996; Damanpour 1991; Scott and Bruce 1994; Shalley and Gilson 2004). However, this body of work is only of limited use when we try to understand both stages of the innovation process. This is because, as observed by Van de Ven (1986), the conversion of novel ideas into innovation is fraught with tensions, as some of the factors that have a positive impact on one stage could have a deleterious effect on the other stage. Therefore, a more complete understanding of the innovation process requires attending to both idea creation and implementation simultaneously, as well as an understanding of the tensions that appear across the two stages.

Tensions refer to those situations in which contradictory demands need to be considered and managed simultaneously. For instance, creativity calls for high work autonomy (Amabile et al. 1996), regardless whether the creative outcome is an artistic product or an original solution to a difficult problem. In turn, implementation requires the

participation of many actors, as well as close and frequent interactions among them; it, therefore, calls for the creative individuals to engage in intensive interpersonal exchanges (Baer 2012; Fleming, Mingo, Chen 2007), thus sacrificing some of their autonomy (Elsbach and Hargadon 2006).

Although there are recent calls for researchers to examine tensions more directly, studies of tensions between idea creation and implementation still suffer from a number of limitations. First, many of the studies that raise the question of tensions between creativity and implementation are theoretical (Anderson, Potočnik, Zhou 2014; Crossan and Apaydin 2010; West 2002). Second, empirical work typically consists of case studies of highly successful organizations and therefore cannot fully elucidate the link between tensions and organizational innovation. For instance, studies of tensions in the haute cuisine sector are primarily cases of exceptional chefs, such as Ferran Adria who built an exceptional business model that enabled him to push the innovation frontier in haute cuisine (Svejenova, Planellas, Vives 2010; see also Bouty and Gomez 2009; Messeni Petruzzelli, Savino 2012; Slavich, Capetta, Salvemini 2014 for other examples of prominent chefs engaged in gastronomic enterprise). Thus, more evidence is needed to shed light on tensions that occur in more typical restaurants in this sector, with varying levels of performance. Third, empirical studies primarily look at tensions that take place at the organizational level (Svejenova, Mazza, Planellas 2007; Slavich et al. 2014), overlooking the fact that innovation is a multilevel phenomenon (Gupta, Tesluk, Taylor 2007) and thus tensions could appear simultaneously at different levels of analysis. Last, but not least, as the production of innovation by organizations is affected by environmental factors, more research is needed on the multilevel effects of institutional environments on innovation (Hitt et al. 2007), particularly on how differences in the institutional environments affect the efficacy with which organizations

manage lower-level tensions. Thus, our understanding of the antecedents of tensions as well as of management strategies that could successfully address them is still incomplete.

In this study we aim to address some of these limitations by investigating tensions between creativity and its implementation in the context of haute cuisine in Britain and Germany, specifically looking at the work that takes place in restaurants that have been awarded Michelin stars. Creativity and implementation matter greatly in the haute cuisine sector because they affect the evaluations received from gastronomic guides and, in consequence, are crucial determinants of sustainable competitive advantage (Lane 2013). Thus, tensions across the two stages need to be understood and managed effectively, else the performance of the restaurants suffers. The relatively large number of cases, twenty head-chefs interviewed in each country, allows us to search for common patterns regarding tensions and their management. Moreover, differences in the institutional environments of the two countries enable us to shed light on the impact of the national context on the effective management of tensions.

In this study we identify and analyze two such tensions. The first one, situated at the individual level, occurs between the artistic identity of the chefs-de-cuisine and their work identity. The second one, situated at the organizational level, arises from the distinct organizational rationale of creativity and implementation, as defined by gastronomic critics. Specifically, because the Michelin inspectors put equal emphasis on creative style and perfect execution of dishes it is impossible to adjudicate who is most critical for the organization: the head-chefs or their brigade. For each tension we study its antecedents as well as the tactics use to manage it. Moreover, our cross-national comparison allows us to show how differences in the institutional environment affect the management of tensions and to link differences in the management of tension to differences in the performance outcomes, thus

contributing to a better understanding of the mechanisms through which national institutions affect innovation.

Overall, our analysis of the management of tensions across stages of the innovation process and at different levels of analysis allows us to reconsider existing views and assumptions about the strategic management of creativity and innovation in organizations, thus making a theoretical contribution to this literature. In addition, our study makes an empirical contribution by offering a grounded understanding of the management of culinary innovation. Further implications for theory and practice are discussed in the concluding section.

2. Literature review

2.1. Creativity, Implementation, Innovation

Although there is agreement in the literature that creativity and innovation are distinct concepts, most of the studies do not make this distinction explicit. Instead, creativity and innovation are either treated as interchangeable or, when the distinction is acknowledged, a positive relationship between the two is assumed. For instance, much of the literature on organizational creativity focuses on factors that facilitate idea generation by individual members in organizations: from individual factors, such as previous knowledge and personality (Raja and Johns 2010), to social-contextual factors, such as climate and culture (Scott and Bruce 1994), supervision and leadership (Shalley and Gilson 2004; Zhou 2003), and networks (Perry-Smith 2006) and the use of incentives and creativity training programs (Burroughs et al. 2011) . Yet, this literature generally overlooks whether and how organizations translate in-house inventions into marketable products. In turn, innovation scholars are primarily preoccupied with understanding the factors that affect the successful

commercialization of in-house inventions. Indeed, the existing innovation literature has shown that the crucial factors for innovation performance are the production of in-house knowledge, primarily through R&D activities (Ahuja and Katila 2001), and the existence of organizational structures and processes that facilitate a more efficient exploitation of current knowledge and resources (Takeishi 2002; Tushman & O'Reilly 1996).

Focusing on either creativity or innovation is not highly problematic, as long as idea creation is seen as a precondition and positive predictor of organizational innovation (Scott and Bruce 1994; Shalley & Gilson 2004; Zhou 2003; Ardito et al. 2015 for a review). Although there is evidence that some of the most innovative organizations are places that actively encourage members' creativity (Hargadon and Sutton 1997), the link between creativity and innovation may not be as positive as often assumed. Indeed, West (2002) suggests that factors that have a positive impact on idea creation could often have an opposite effect on idea implementation. In a similar vein, Crossan and Apaydin (2010) note that, because most of the existing studies have focused on only one dimension of the organizational innovation, we are at risk of 'missing the large picture' of what organizational innovation entails and set as an important goal for future innovation studies the understanding of "the inherent tensions that exist between the various types of innovations and the underlying processes" (Crossan and Apaydin 2010: 1179; see also Gruber et al. 2015 for similar calls for a better understanding of tensions across innovation dimensions). The importance of understanding tensions between creativity and innovation (and, implicitly, of what we miss by overlooking these tensions) is aptly illustrated by Baer's (2012) analysis of the link between creativity and implementation. Baer (2012) proposes that creative ideas are risky and uncertain and that they are unlikely to become innovative products, unless the creative individuals engage in intensive interpersonal exchanges with other organizational members. Baer's study shows therefore that whether creative ideas eventually become

6

innovation depends on ways in which individuals solve specific tensions that appear across the two stages of the innovative process, in this particular case the tension between the demand for novelty in the idea creation stage and the demand for predictability that facilitates implementation (see also Chandy et al. 2006 for evidence that a large number of novel ideas does not necessarily translate in high innovation performance).

2.2. Tensions of creativity and innovation

Although a number of studies have advanced the idea that numerous tensions may affect the link between creativity and innovation, this line of research still has its limitations. Recent reviews of the literature on creativity and innovation in organizations have analyzed the antecedents of creativity and innovation and proposed that some of these antecedents are clearly in opposition to one another. Anderson et al. (2014) discussed a wide range of such antecedents and raised questions related to their management (see also Shalley and Gilson 2004). For instance, their review of the literature on the relationship between individuals' own perception of creativity and creative outputs suggests that the more individuals view themselves as capable of being creative, the more creative they become over time. Instead, a high perception of one's creativity is not necessary for high performance implementation and, at the limit, the routine of implementation can be harmed by too much creativity. Although theoretical studies that identify potential tensions between idea creation and implementation are important, most of their propositions are still awaiting empirical verification.

Empirical studies that engage directly with tensions and their management are few and also suffer from limitations. Specifically, current research focuses primarily on tensions that occur at the organizational level in successful organizations, often overlooking the fact that creativity and innovation are multi-level phenomena (Gupta et al. 2007). By far the most

studied organizational-level tension is the one sparked by differences in resource allocation and knowledge management processes related to creativity and implementation: while creativity requires resources for exploratory activities and the development of new knowledge, implementation calls for the more efficient exploitation of current resources and knowledge (Andriopoulos and Lewis 2009; Tushman and O'Reilly 1996). Existing evidence shows that organizations that successfully manage tensions related to competing resource allocation and knowledge demands typically aim to separate contradictory activities and place them in separate organizational units (Adler, Goldoftas, Levine 1999; Smith and Tushman 2005). This solution appears to be favored by elite chefs as well. For instance, Slavich et al (2014) found that two of the most famous Italian chefs have employed structural solutions and separated organizational practices of creativity and implementation such that specific resources, time and space could be dedicated to the two types of activities (for similar findings related to Ferran Adria's organizational model see Svejenova et. al 2007). Although these studies speak about efficient approaches to the management of tensions by exceptional organizations, their results are not always applicable to more typical organizations, which tend to be smaller and with fewer resources available (Lubatkin et al. 2006).

More importantly, studies that propose separation between idea creation and implementation as a way to address tensions (an organizational level solution) do not consider the possibility that tensions at individual or group level could simultaneously affect the conversion of new ideas into products and services (although see Andriopoulos and Lewis 2009 for an exception). Therefore, results that show a positive impact of structural solutions to tensions on organizational performance offer an incomplete account of how different level tensions affect organizational performance (Hitt et. al 2007).

Last, but not least, the efficacy with which solutions to tensions are implemented at any level may depend on the environment in which organizations operate (Smith and Lewis 2011; Gupta et. al 2007). Indeed, there is strong evidence from institutionalist theory, particularly the version developed by Hall and Soskice (2001), that coordination within business organizations is affected by the national institutional environment in which firms are situated. Institutions are held to structure behavior by providing both support for and constraints to particular courses of action. Innovation, for Hall and Soskice, is one crucial area of behavior shaped by institutions, and they see the British liberal market economy as providing better conditions for innovation than the German coordinated market economy. Since 2001 the institutionalist framework has been applied to the study of a range of innovative industries, though not the high-end restaurant industry, but the findings are contradictory. While, for instance, Vasudeva, Zaheer and Hernandez (2013) show that the innovativeness of firms is enhanced by their location in a coordinated market context (see also Lehrer 2000 and Lange 2009), Casper, Lehrer and Soskice (1999) and Casper (2009) suggest that the institutional environment of British firms might be more conducive to innovation than the German one. These contrasting findings may be due to the fact that the specific impact of national institutions on the management of innovation tensions has not been sufficiently accounted for. Our data allows us to address some of the above limitations and thus contribute toward a more complete understanding of the innovation process.

3. Research Setting and Analytical Approach

We carry out our research in the context of haute cuisine in Britain and Germany. The choice of countries has been influenced by two considerations. First, Britain and Germany are similar in the sense that, in contrast to France, a sustained indigenous tradition of fine dining

developed relatively late, i.e. from the 1970s to the 1990s. Second, the focus on these two countries enables the comparison of two different "varieties of capitalism" (Hall and Soskice 2001) and therefore of different national institutional contexts in which innovation occurs, namely Germany's "coordinated market economy" versus Britain's "liberal market economy".

The focus on Michelin starred restaurants is motivated by the main objective of our project, namely to understand tensions and successful management approaches of tensions. Thus, we are taking Michelin status as a proxy for a restaurant's successful implementation of creative ideas, an approach also recommended by Amabile (1996: 28-30). Amabile suggests that, because creativity cannot be assessed by objective analysis alone, studies have held products to be creative where expert observers familiar with the products have judged them to be creative. Hence, reliance on the Michelin rating of restaurants is justified to the extent that the award of stars is based on lengthy and thorough evaluation processes by trained inspectors with industry knowledge. Moreover, Michelin's main criteria for awarding stars are originality or an individual signature of chefs, together with the consistently high quality of dishes prepared. These criteria clearly relate to both creativity and its successful implementation, in as far as consistently high quality of meals signifies the successful implementation of creative ideas. Michelin's assessment of mainly these two factors results in the award of one, two or three stars. Each new star awarded signifies a higher level of originality and implementation quality (for details on the rating process see Lane 2014).

In each country, the first author conducted twenty interviews with Michelin-starred chefs. They are the chef patrons of, or are employed head-chefs in starred restaurants, ranging from very small husband-and-wife operations to larger, highly professionalized ones. The restaurants are situated in a range of geographical locations, from small and relatively remote villages to large cities. Restaurants in all three star categories were selected. We made an

effort to interview a variety of chefs, despite the fact that, particularly in Britain, we encountered many rejections from chefs due to their busy schedule. Overall, we believe that the relatively large number of detailed interviews and the purposeful selection of chefs from different types of restaurants in most parts of each country lend the study considerable validity. The distribution of the restaurants by country, locality type, head-chef's employment status and number of stars is presented in Table 1.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Interviews with chefs-de-cuisine lasted between ninety minutes and two hours and took place in their restaurants, between 2010 and 2012. The interviews were semi-structured, permitting more extended answers from chefs where they raised particularly revealing comments. Each interview included questions which allowed the chef to describe elements of their biography, their personal and professional identity, the various roles that head-chefs play, their opinion on creativity and innovation (in general and regarding their own restaurant), their relations to the restaurant staff and their hiring criteria, as well as their opinion on external evaluators such as food critics, food guides and customers. Only some of the very extensive material collected was used for this paper.

These forty interviews with current *chefs-de-cuisine* were supplemented by four interviews with former Michelin chefs and two interviews with a representative of *Michelin Great Britain* and *Michelin Germany*, respectively. In addition, we read materials publicly available written by or about the chefs in our sample. During the visits, the first author also sampled the food produced in some of the forty restaurants and visited some of the kitchens.

We adopted an inductive qualitative method. We used our interviews as cases and sought to discern and interpret cross-case industry patterns (Eisenhardt 1989). We analyzed

the material collected during the interviews and, guided by existing literature, identified a number of thematic categories. We also noted emerging themes. Once a number of tensions became apparent we revisited the material searching for evidence regarding the elements of the underlying tensions and the attempts to manage the tensions. For each theme identified, we also checked for cross-country similarities and differences.

To organize our findings we search for a lens that allows us to account for the many contradictions in the way chefs describe the activities in which they participate. We found it useful to relate to the paradox literature (Cameron and Quinn 1988; Poole and van de Ven 1989; Lewis 2000; Smith and Lewis 2011). Paradox is defined as a set of "contradictory yet interrelated elements that exist simultaneously and persist over time" (Smith and Lewis 2011) and create tensions across different activities. A paradox view allows for a focus on elements that "seem logical in isolation, but absurd and irrational when appearing simultaneously" (Lewis 2000).

For our study, the paradox lens offers a number of advantages. First, by focusing on chefs' own description of tensions, we can identify not only the existence of a paradoxical situation, but also the forces that pull actors in opposite directions (Lewis 2000). Second, with a paradox lens we are able to gauge whether the respondents are aware of all competing forces, whether they try to actively manage them or feel frustrated by them, as well as whether they have developed defensive reactions to tensions (Lewis 2000). Moreover, where active management is identified it allows for an investigation of the rationale behind specific solutions. In this respect, a paradox lens is a powerful framework for understanding the path to achieving successful solutions for managing tensions as well as the factors that could cause further disruptions (Smith and Lewis 2011). Last but not least, because we have information about chefs in two countries with different institutional environments we can investigate the role of environments in the management of paradoxical tensions.

4. Empirical Results

Our empirical presentation follows the framework of Lewis (2000) and Smith and Lewis (2011). Specifically, for each tension, we present the sources of tension and the management tactics used to address the tension. We use chefs' accounts to define both the sources of tensions and the tactics used to manage them. For each tension we also indicate whether it is treated the same by British and German chefs or whether there are differences across the two national settings. In doing this we aim to showcase not only common managerial approaches, but also to understand the effects of contextual variation. Unless specified otherwise, all quotes presented below are taken from the interviews.

4.1. Identity Tensions

Identity tensions arise when individuals have to perform opposing roles (Ashforth and Johnson 2001; Roberts 2005). During interviews most chefs in both Britain and Germany strongly emphasized their personal creative-artistic identity. "My own nature [inspires me to be innovative], I am an artist" says a one-star British chef. While not all chefs openly called themselves artists, implicitly they all signaled their belonging to the creative-artistic domain. Thus, they emphasized that a good chef-de-cuisine must have vision and inspiration, as well as an individual, original style. They also mentioned that their cooking reflects primarily their passion and not their desire to please clients. All these are requirements congruent with the definition of artists and creators (Becker 1982; Fine 1996). Moreover, similar to creators in other domains, the chefs in our sample mentioned that, in their search for inspiration, they tress-passed into other artistic domains, such as architecture and music, as well as let themselves "inspired by nature". Some other times they just seem to stumble upon creativity: "I myself [am the inspiration]. Surprising things always occur to me. I read, I look around

and then comes my own idea" (German one-star chef). Moreover, like artists, they insist on the aesthetic characteristics of their creations: "I try to offer my guests […] something special, served on beautiful china" (German one-star chef); "our plates of food are beautiful but through simplicity and in a natural way" (British two-star chef). Overall, when describing what they want to convey through their food, chefs from both countries mentioned dimensions such as "visual beauty", "creating delight" and "creating excitement" and sometimes surprise in taste and appearance.

In stark contrast to chefs' personal creative identity is their work identity. In the kitchen the head-chef is not an artist anymore, but becomes part of an organized group whose only goal is the production of perfect dishes and service. The rationality of the implementation process, the almost military discipline in the kitchen and the fact that they have to create and impose that discipline place the head-chefs in a role void of artistic claims. As they move from talking about their creative self to describing their workday our respondents' vocabulary changes. They talk vividly, and sometimes painfully, about what happens in the kitchen.

First, chefs described the military discipline in the kitchen and how they must impose that discipline. Some of them openly owned up to "an authoritarian style". "Yes, you have to be disciplined. I insist on clean uniforms and clean shoes" (British one-star chef). "It is a military-type organization: there has to be discipline, organization and respect. There have to be boundaries and rules." (British two-star chef) Moreover, chefs confessed that to enforce the discipline they often go to extremes and shout, swear or even engage in some low-level violence. They were very open about this behavior: "I shout, and there is a little bit of abuse" (British two-star chef). "I do shout occasionally if I have said something before and before that" (German three-star chef). "I shout if I have to […] It happens once per service" (British

two-star chef). Although not all chefs go to these extremes, they all accept that their style is essentially controlling.

In addition to the pressurized work process, the work conditions are also not conducive to creativity. As noted during visits in the restaurants, kitchens are often small, crowded and hot. British two-star chef Raymond Blanc aptly summarizes the work environment of the fine-dining kitchen: "... then there is the extreme sauna-like heat of the kitchen which batters your senses, along with the movement all around you. Then there is the noise and the swearing... the professional kitchen brings out savage characteristics. The environment is so unyielding it will extract the worst out of anyone. At the end of the service you are sweating like a pig, you are burnt out and you are pale, turned white by the sheer intensity of the heat and the pressure" (Blanc 2009: 204).

Second, as manager of the whole restaurant, the chef-de-cuisine has to perform many more humdrum roles. S/he manages the performance of brigade members not only in the kitchen but also at the front-of-house, liaises with producers and suppliers, and is responsible for menus, accounts management and staff recruitment. Many chefs confessed that this work environment was very stressful: "It is very long hours and days off are spent recuperating instead of on recreation" (British one-star chef). A German two-star chef agrees that "the number of hours I work is very difficult to maintain and very strenuous – you always have to maintain the highest possible effort".

Chefs discussed how difficult it was to remain creative in such a harsh organizational environment, often hinting directly at the tension between creative work and more humdrum execution of ideas: "Menus change every six weeks which means you constantly have to innovate in your head. The daily business, however, does not afford sufficient calm. The big problem with creativity is to create space for oneself" (German two-star chef). "One gets the best ideas when one holds the head free but it is difficult to hold your head free" (German

three-star chef). "It's so stressful and so hard. It's like laboring - you just burn yourself out. You get to the point where the ideas aren't coming. It's like writer's block, and sometimes I think 'pack it in now, the story's over'…" (British one-star chef).

Managing tactics: To manage tensions between personal-artistic and work identity chefs use both separating and integrating tactics (Adrianoupolos and Lewis 2009; Poole and Van de Ven 1989). Separation ensures that their personal creative identity is reinforced outside the kitchen. All our respondents told us that they find creativity and inspiration primarily outside the organization and not from people with whom they were connected at work. The separation is not just temporal – which could be regarded as normal, given the heavy work load – but involves a completely different social network. Chefs get in touch with their creative side only when they are in the company of other chefs-de-cuisine and, sometimes, with trusted customers or suppliers. When asked explicitly about sources of creativity, a majority of chefs mentioned sampling the inspirational cooking of colleagues in other Michelin-starred restaurants at home and abroad (thirty-two out of forty). When it is not possible to visit the restaurant of an admired colleague, studying his/her cookery book is a related way to seek inspiration. A smaller numbers of head-chefs – seven - let themselves be inspired by art/artists and, in one case, science, or look towards customers – five, or nature – five. These figures refer to all forty chefs interviewed, and no significant differences between British and German chefs are discernible in the sources of creativity mentioned. In contrast, brainstorming with staff in own organization was mentioned *only by one chef*.

Above we described how chefs separate their creative and artistic identity from their identity as leaders of the restaurant kitchen. However, we noted that chefs also described how they bring their personal self into the kitchen (integration). One way to bring their creativity back to the kitchen is, for instance, explaining to younger chefs how certain recipes come to be and what philosophy guides their search for ingredients, thus re-enacting and also

transmitting the joy of creativity to younger chefs. The head-chef may also ask a young chef "to review his own work, to check the seasoning, the balance of flavors in a dish and refine it …and to know just when it is right for its intended purpose" (Gordon Ramsey, in Wright 2006:144).

We also noted another way in which the creative identity and the operational demands are integrated, that is by framing implementation work as "craft". This reference to their 'craft' attitudes, competences and habits was evident in the fact that some chefs referred to themselves as "craftsmen" with artistic leanings. In some other cases we noted that in describing their work they switched from a more artistic vocabulary (when describing the creative part of their work) to one that includes clear references to craftsmanship. Framing implementation as craft was particularly pronounced in Germany. "Dishes may be works of art but they are also a craft product. It is possible to execute craft artistically" (German three-star chef). Describing creative work as a high order challenge, a German chef noted that routine implementation was not less of a challenge, but a different kind of challenge; he also noted that the two were inter-related: "I cannot imagine working at something that does not challenge me intellectually…or with regard to craftsmanship. I believe in perfectly executed craftsmanship" (German three-star chef). "Without a craft basis you cannot become an artist" (German one-star chef). Thus it appeared that German chefs manage to integrate the two identities more easily into a coherent persona by invoking a "meta-identity" (Pratt and Foreman 2000) of artistic craftsman or craftsman with artistic leanings.

4.2. Performance Evaluation Tensions

During interviews we encountered a tension between chefs' asserting the crucial importance of their unique creativity for the success of their restaurants and their acceptance that the

success of their restaurant depends on their kitchen staff. "One's own creative power is the most important thing [for success]" (German three-star chef); "…and yet they [the staff] are our biggest assets" (British one-star chef). We call this performance evaluation tension because it arises from the way in which performance is assessed in the haute cuisine industry. In haute cuisine, a restaurant is awarded Michelin stars for consistently high quality food, which requires original dishes as well as flawless delivery. Thus, neither originality – which is tied to the head-chef's creative power – nor delivery – which is strongly correlated to the performance of the staff – can, in isolation, ensure that a restaurant gains and maintains Michelin stars. This dual criteria evaluation makes it impossible to clearly place the honor (or blame) for a restaurant performance on either chef or the staff.

The evaluation demands placed by Michelin are clearly acknowledged and respected by the chefs interviewed. Describing Michelin's overall assessment of quality, a British two-star chef noted: "'Michelin are very strict. No compromise.", while another British chef rated Michelin as highly influential, not the customers of the restaurant. A British chef clearly described the two aspects that form the core of Michelin's evaluation – quality of the idea and of implementation - when explaining why he got his second star: because of "the consistency of quality and cooking and [because of] the flavor of dishes". In Germany, a two-star chef acknowledged that "Michelin is more important than national guides", while another German with two stars agreed that "Michelin people are informed about cooking. The rest are mere journalists".

Managing tactics: To ensure their restaurant delivers the original style and the perfect execution needed to comply with Michelin's standards, chefs use both separating and integrating tactics. Separation ensures that the originality expectation placed by Michelin inspectors, and implicitly by knowledgeable clients who dine in Michelin-starred restaurants is met. Michelin expects that the menu in multi-starred restaurants has an original,

recognizable style – "signature dishes". Signature dishes need the application of similar templates, embodied in a distinct "philosophy" and, therefore, can only be created by the same individual or a small group. As a result, the head-chef is solely in charge of creating new dishes with the "brigade" members excluded from the stage of idea generation.

A British one–star chef made it very clear where creativity was developed: "Creativity comes from the top. I don't want any under me to be creative". Similarly, one of the interviewed British two-star chef showed concern for the maintenance of his own style when he "reined back" a Noma-trained sous-chef who tried to assert his own, more radically innovative ideas. Among German chefs, creative activity is even more unambiguously located at the top of the hierarchy and involvement from other members in creating the main dishes on the restaurant menu is discouraged. While overall it is true that German chefs in our sample asserted their unique creativity slightly more vehemently than their British counterparts, we believe this has less to do with their nationality and more with the fact that there are more chefs with two or three stars in the German sample. Because Michelin's standards become higher as new stars are awarded, multi-starred chefs tend to be more concerned with preserving the "individual signature" and therefore the least likely to allow their staff to intervene in the creative work.

Unlike idea generation, the implementation stage is collective and requires the integration of original ideas with work processes. Implementation involves the whole brigade; and while creativity is not expected from employees, high performance is. It is at this stage when the chefs seem to both acknowledge their dependence on staff and their integrative efforts. In particular, the success of integration appears to depend on four distinct mechanisms. First, the head-chef creates clear routines to ensure consistency of output. As the AA inspector Wright (2006: 12) observes, the first responsibility of the member of a prestigious kitchen is "to learn a task and keep repeating it in exactly the same way, to

precisely the same standard". Thus, to the outside observer the kitchen appears as a collection of people who execute the same moves, repeatedly. Second, the chef needs to ensure that the brigade is able to reproduce the dish that he has "cooked in his head" (Ottenbacher and Harrington, 2007). This means not only showing the brigade how to prepare and assemble different ingredients that go into a dish, but also explaining the potential of different ingredients and techniques. As noted by other researchers who study the haute cuisine, knowledge transfer is crucial for the production and reproduction of creative output (Slavich et. al 2014). Third comes the exertion of tight output control, both by the head-chefs and their sous-chef(s). The head-chef stands at the pass and checks every plate that goes out to ascertain that his/her vision has been faithfully realized. "My image would not be very high if I did not constantly exert upward pressure on achievement", confirmed a German three-star chef who believed that the presence of the chef in the kitchen was absolutely necessary. Last, but not least, the implementation team needs to act as a coherent whole. This requires more than everyone knowing their own role (routines), knowing what the chefs' idea was (knowledge transfer) and receiving feedback on work (control): it demands common values and understandings, such that integration is achieved smoothly. Thus, recruiting criteria are meant to create cohesive teams. A large proportion of the interviewed chefs stated that, when recruiting new staff, they were looking for "team players", while several chefs also mentioned that they explicitly rejected junior chefs with "big Egos".

Yet, despite similarities in recruiting criteria, the interviews with chefs in the two countries revealed their brigades were very differently constituted. Employees in Germany are predominantly German-born or from German-speaking neighboring countries. In contrast, those in Britain are of highly diverse national origins, with about 60 percent being non-British. Diversity has adverse consequences in terms of a reduced ease of communication and a lesser degree of social cohesion which, in turn, increases labor turnover rates. Some British

chefs expressed their deep regret at constant labor turnover. "No other industry thinks it is acceptable that a key player in a business stays with it, maybe for a year… ", lamented a one-star British chef. In Germany, in contrast, chefs do not seem to consider labor turnover such a critical issue. Compared to British chefs, more German chefs mentioned that an important percent of their staff had been in the restaurant for very long periods. Thus, it appears that British chefs-de-cuisine have a harder task building the coherent brigade needed for high quality implementation.

A second distinction between the British and German restaurants is the level of training and skill. Of the twenty British head-chefs interviewed, six were self-taught amateurs, whereas German chefs-de-cuisine all had the basic apprenticeship qualification and 30 percent had additionally acquired the qualification of Master craftsman. The same differences appear at the level of the brigade. When asked about recruiting, German head-chefs emphasized that they valued a solid CV that showed training and an apprenticeship with a renowned chef. Instead, British head-chefs placed a high emphasis on more subjective criteria, such as the quality of the person. Thus, British chefs appeared to believe that if they found the "right people", they could train them for high quality implementation. A one-star British chef stated that: "We look for commitment and interest in food. It is not necessary to have formal training". *A* London two-star chef, as well as a one-star chef, shared this opinion: "I look at their experience, but the CV means nothing. I look at the human being first and foremost". "Above all, I look for a passion for food….. I look for very basic skills and techniques. They could be self-taught".

While it is possible for the head-chef to train all new employees to the required standard, such a task becomes impossible when there is high staff turnover. Thus, high turnover results in a significant proportion of the brigade being only partially trained at any one point in time. A constantly changing brigade and with an insufficient level of training is

not conducive to the achievement of flawless execution of the head-chef's vision and make it less likely to maintain the consistently high level of quality expected by Michelin inspectors. Regardless of the head-chef's creativity, passion and dedication, unless the implementation of his/her creative ideas is spotless success is unlikely. Thus, it appears that recruiting tactics and the resulting composition of the brigade can sometimes throw gravel into the gears of the rational knowledge transfer model discussed by previous cases studies (Slavich et al. 2014). Moreover, it also appears that it is more problematic for the British head-chefs than for their German colleagues to ensure that the kitchen brigade acts as a consistent, interdependent whole, during each service, day after day. Thus, the evaluation tension also appears stronger for the British chefs.

5. Consequences of Cross-Country Institutional Differences

In this section we expand our analysis to investigate whether the cross-country differences highlighted above bear differently on the haute cuisine sector in Britain and Germany. First, we discuss differences in the performance of the haute cuisine sector in the two countries, as reflected by two expert sources: the Michelin guide and the opinions of food experts. Second, we aim to understand the sources of cross-country differences in the way chefs approach the two tensions. Finally, we discuss how these differences might affect the performance of the restaurants in the two countries.

5.1. Cross-country Performance Differences

Although Michelin rates restaurants in Britain and Germany in exactly the same way and using the same criteria, the results of this rating in the two countries differ in a number of ways. First, comparing the number of starred restaurants in Britain and Germany, it is clear

that German restaurants are more successful in both the overall number of stars awarded and in the number earning two or three stars (Table 2). The higher number of stars in Germany is a constant feature over time.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Second, the number of demotions, i.e. restaurants loosing stars or being closed, is higher in Britain than in Germany. For instance, 45 percent of the restaurants listed as one-star in 2002 in Britain have lost stars or/and disappeared by 2009, the beginning of our study. In contrast, in Germany only 26 percent lost stars. Finally, the consistently high quality of food produced in the German high-end restaurants has been recognized by prominent industry experts. Luc Naret, the former chief executive of Michelin Publishing, praise the German achievements and comments that "the best chefs in Germany cook today in the way Germans build cars: on an absolutely perfect level" (www.spiegel.de/sptv/documentation/0,1518,749228,00.html). Similarly, in a personal communication with one of the authors, the British food critic Andy Hayler observes "For me, the top German restaurants are some of the best in the world".

5.2. Cross-country Differences and the Role of Institutional Environment

During our analyses, we noted two aspects on which German and British chefs seem to diverge: one refers to German chefs framing their work as both art and craft; the other one concerns differences in hiring practices, which affect the composition of the kitchen brigade in the two countries. We propose that these two aspects reflect differences in the institutional environments in the two countries, namely the system of vocational education and training and the cultural significance of skill enshrined in this system.

Why are German chefs keen to use the notion of 'craft' to define the implementation part of their work, while their British colleagues do not display a similar framing pattern? The notion of craft skill has had a very different history and institutionalized form in Britain and Germany. In Britain, the handicraft form and the related modes of organization disappeared, together with the guild system, early on in the process of industrialization, as did a progression from apprentice via journeyman to the level of master craftsman. In contrast, in Germany the abolition of guilds occurred much later and forms of handicraft were kept alive and institutionalized in a whole range of occupations, even after the end of the guild system. Hence the notion of skill remains strongly connected with craft knowledge and competence, acquired in a prolonged process of training and always certified. As a result, the notion of certified craft skill has turned into a key and strategic component of German business life, as well as of culture more generally. In Britain, instead, the concept of craft skill has a much lower cultural validation.

Why do recruiting requirements differ, with the German head-chefs emphasizing apprenticeship training and the British preferring good-natured individuals with "a passion for food"? The difference in recruiting seems to depend on the underlying conditions in the market for skill in the two countries. Although skill training is provided in both countries, the manner in which skill is acquired differs. First, in Britain training is based in tertiary further education colleges, and practical experience in an actual restaurant kitchen is not part of the course. The German system, in contrast, is a dual one where apprentices receive the bulk of their training in actual restaurant kitchens and get theoretical instruction during one week day in vocational schools. In fact, the majority of the German chefs interviewed for this study provided systematic apprenticeship training to one or more apprentices at the time of the interviews. Second, in Germany, apprentice chefs follow a national, legally binding curriculum which guarantees the quality and consistency of the training given. This is not the

case in Britain, where the content and the quality of training is highly uneven across colleges. Moreover, there exist only a handful of colleges with a high reputation in the industry (based on OFSTED rating[1]) and these colleges turn out insufficient numbers of young people who subsequently seek employment in professional kitchens. British chefs-de-cuisine therefore cannot always recruit chefs trained in British institutions and have to rely on foreigners. Moreover, in the very rare cases when they manage to recruit a large number of British, the qualifications of the recruits vary considerably.

5.3. Cross-country Differences and the Performance of Restaurants

Having identified cross-country differences in the management of tensions due to specific features of the national institutional environments, we further investigate whether these differences could potentially explain some of the difference in performance between the haute cuisine sectors in Britain and Germany. In doing this, our aim is to shed light on potential mechanisms through which institutional environments affect organizational innovation.

The first potential determinant of performance identified concerns the way in which tensions of identity are managed. Existing research on identity work has shown that identity tensions can have a serious impact on both personal well-being and work performance (Kreiner, Hollensbe and Sheep 2006; Pratt and Corley 2007). In contrast, a higher level of identity integration has been found to have a positive impact on performance, especially creative performance (Cheng, Sanchez-Burks and Lee 2001). Moreover, for situations in which individual performance and group outcome are highly correlated (e.g. highly interdependent tasks or being the leader of the group), individuals' inability to negotiate

---

[1] OFSTED stands for the Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills which is the national body that inspects and regulate services that provide education and skills for learners of all ages.

identity tensions negatively affect group performance. The literature also shows that those who are successful at negotiating conflicting identities have managed to create coherent stories about their multiple identities (Ibarra and Barbulescu 2010) and to crystalize them into "meta-identities" - superordinate self-categorizations with which distinct identities can relate (Pratt and Foreman 2000).

Our analysis has revealed that both British and German chefs have managed to create coherent stories about the necessity to engage with conflicting identities. However, German chefs have managed to a higher extent to reconcile the contradictions between their artistic and work identities by presenting themselves as artistic craftsmen. Because a less intense identity tension frees emotional and cognitive resources (Kreiner, Hollensbe and Sheep 2006), we can expect German chefs to have more resources available for creating and leading. Moreover, to the extent that artistic craftsmen is a status-enhancing meta-identity (compared to the "laborer" label applied by some British chefs) and because one's perception of one's own worth affects performance outcome, German chefs could be expected to deliver higher performance when compared to their British colleagues.

The second potential determinant of performance identified concerns the way in which chefs build their work groups and the resulting group characteristics. Research on the link between group characteristics and performance has shown that higher group cohesiveness is more conducive to high performance, especially in highly interdependent work groups (Beale et al 2003; Fleming, Mingo, Chen 2007), as it is the case of the kitchen brigade. In turn, high cohesion ensues in groups that are relatively stable over longer periods of time (lower turnover), have shared values, norms and knowledge.

As noted in our analyses, British and German kitchen brigades do differ along some of these dimensions. Not only it is difficult for British restaurants to find high quality personnel, but even when they manage to assemble a high-skill group, differences in cultural

and knowledge background are likely to affect group cohesion. Moreover, British chefs seem less interested than their German colleagues in finding staff with solid training and more willing to accept 'passion for cooking' as a substitute. Finally, staff turnover is much higher in Britain. Hence, British chefs-de-cuisine are less able than German chefs to draw on cohesive groups to deliver consistently high quality dishes. Given the importance attached by Michelin inspectors to implementation, British restaurants are likely to be evaluated less favorably than German restaurants.

6. Discussion and conclusions

The aim of this study was to address a number of gaps in our understanding of creativity and innovation in organizations in the light of data drawn from the haute cuisine field. In pursuing this aim, we first identified that very few studies have focused on both stages of the innovation process. The unilateral focus on either creativity or innovation, along with the implicit assumption that idea creation is positively related to organizational innovation, has led researchers to overlook the tensions likely to appear across idea creation and implementation. Second, drawing on studies that address such tensions more directly, we also identified that current empirical research focuses primarily on tensions that occur at the organizational level, overlooking the impact of tensions at other levels. Finally, the effect of institutional environments on the efficacy with which tensions are managed and further on organizational innovation is seriously understudied. In this section, we explain how our findings address each of the identified gaps, while also stressing the relevance of our findings for theories of creativity and innovation. We also produce some general propositions.

First, we showed that chefs-de-cuisine in both countries clearly identify the two stages of the innovation process and feel the tensions across them. We also showed that chefs see

these tensions as inherent to the nature of their work and understand that the effective management of the tensions is crucial for high performance. Importantly, we identify specific management tactics used by chefs in both countries to manage tensions. In line with previous studies (Andriopoulos and Lewis 2009), we noted how chefs used both separation and integration tactics: separation emphasizes the contradictory nature of the elements constitutive of the tension and focuses efforts on perfecting each side; integration emphasizes the possible synergies across conflicting elements. Thus, the mix of integration and separation tactics appear to be used in a setting different from that in which they were first uncovered (i.e. new product development industry).

This first set of findings is important for theories of creativity and innovation. As we argued upfront, existing research treats idea creation as a precondition and positive predictor of organizational innovation. Our findings reveal that this view of innovation processes is not only overly simplistic, but could also be misleading, because it ignores the fact that tensions and their management affect the link between creativity and innovation. The link between creativity and innovation in haute cuisine might be positive, but only when creativity-implementation tensions are managed effectively.

Proposition 1: The positive relationship between organizational creativity and innovativeness is mediated by the effectiveness with which tensions between idea generation and implementation are managed.

Second, our analysis shows that tensions of creativity and implementation occur at different levels. Specifically, we identify tensions at both individual and organizational levels. At the individual level we identified an identity tension, between the artistic conception of self of the chefs-de-cuisine and their work identity. At the organizational level a tension arises because creativity and implementation are equally important for the

28

organizational success, thus making it impossible to disentangle chefs' contribution from that of the kitchen brigade.

This finding informs current theories not only by describing specific tensions and their antecedents, but also by showing that the tensions between the two stages of the innovative process can be felt at different organizational levels. As we argued above, existing studies have primarily investigated tensions between creativity and implementation at the organizational level, with a particular focus on tensions related to knowledge demands posed by idea creation and implementation. These studies overlook the fact that tensions can be also felt at the individual level. Moreover, as it is the case in our study, the same actors (chefs-de-cuisine) might be called upon to provide management solutions for tensions that occur at both organizational and individual level. Investigating different manifestations of the tension between creativity and implementation at different levels is important because each manifestation can affect organizational performance in a distinct way. Also, to the extent that some actors are involved in solving tensions at different levels their personal performance could suffer as well.

Third, we noted a number of differences between chefs in Germany and Britain and linked them to differences in the institutional environments of the two countries. The impact of institutional environment appears in two ways. On one hand, Germany's strong tradition of craft offers German chefs a way to re-frame the routine, unartistic part of their work in a way that makes it compatible with their artistic claims. On the other hand, differences in the availability of skill in the two countries translate into differences in recruiting, with implications for the cohesiveness of the group responsible for implementing chefs' original ideas. Thus, the institutional environment affects the effectiveness of management tactics employed to address tensions at both individual and organizational level. Related, we also showed how differences in the way tensions are addressed could affect organizational

performance. Specifically, compared to their British colleagues, German head-chefs seem to find it easier to manage tensions and therefore display higher performance levels. This finding informs theories of creativity and innovation by specifying mechanisms through which the environment affects innovation, thus answering calls for the development of models that account for cross-level effects (Hitt et al. 2007).

Proposition 2: The effectiveness with which tensions are managed has a stronger positive impact on innovation performance if the institutional environment supports the effectiveness of management tactics.

Based on the findings above and the corresponding propositions we suggest a multilevel framework that accounts for the complexity of innovation process (see Figure 1). Specifically, our framework emphasizes the need to open the relationship between creativity and innovation to greater scrutiny and to account for multilevel tensions that appear across stages of innovation processes. It also shows the merit of considering how environmental factors could support or hinder the management of tensions and its further impact on innovation performance. We believe that this framework could be used by practitioners in a variety of organizations in which creativity and innovation matter. Probably the most straightforward application of our study is to small organizations lead by creative individuals who seeks to implement their ideas quickly and efficiently. These organizations can be restaurants, like those in our study, artists and designers, but also start-ups in technology. Leaders of such businesses will appreciate that the road from idea generation to innovation is paved with tensions that call for ingenious solutions. The tensions described in this study could inform their actions. Moreover, to the extent that the same individuals could be called upon to manage tensions not only at the individual level, but also at the organizational and perhaps group level, creatives who lead such businesses should ensure that they understand the distinct source of each tension as well as interdependencies between tensions. Last, but

not least, the findings of this study could assist with decisions regarding business location as it suggests ways in which local institutional conditions could affect either stages of the innovation process. Our study suggests that for businesses that have been successful in countries like Germany should not assume the same smooth implementation of creative ideas when moving into countries like Britain, with a less clear and less systematic organization of skill. Given the global expansion of haute cuisine this insight is directly relevant for high end restaurants which need to understand the challenges of opening new restaurants in different countries.

We conclude by acknowledging that, although important for addressing gaps in our understanding of creativity and implementation tensions and their management, this study provides only a first step toward a better understanding of these tensions. Other tensions and contradictions are clearly there, perhaps at the group level, awaiting further research. For instance, during the interviews, head-chefs brought into discussion other contradictory aspects, such as authoritarian management style and desire to build commitment to organizational goals. While some of the chefs interviewed appeared to believe that the two aspects could be reconciled, others were less convinced. A former Michelin-starred chef went as far as suggesting that "today it's all about money". To address this kind of tensions, further research is needed, including in-depth interviews with the kitchen staff. However, we believe that such studies are necessary not only to shed light on the work that take place in haute cuisine, but also because they have the potential to inform research on creativity and innovation more widely, especially in cultural industries in which tensions across innovation stages are particularly severe (Svejenova, Slavich, AbdelGawad, 2014).

References

Adler, P. S., Goldoftas B., and Levine D.I. Flexibility versus efficiency? A case study of model changeovers in the Toyota production system. *Organization science* 10, no. 1 (1999): 43-68.

Ahuja, G. and Katila, R. (2001). Technological Acquisition and the Innovative Performance of Acquiring Firms: A Longitudinal Study. *Strategic Management Journal* 22(3):197–220.

Anderson, N. Potočnik, K., and Zhou, J. (2014) Innovation and Creativity in Organizations. A State-of-the-Science Review, Prospective Commentary, and Guiding Framework. *Journal of Management* 40(5): 1297-1333.

Andriopoulos, C., and Lewis M. W. (2009) Exploitation-exploration tensions and organizational ambidexterity: Managing paradoxes of innovation. *Organization Science* 20(4): 696-717.

Amabile, T.M. (1996). *Creativity in Context*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Amabile, T. M., Conti R., Coon H., Lazenby J., and Herron M. (1996) Assessing the work environment for creativity. *Academy of management journal* 39 (5): 1154-1184.

Ashforth, B. E., and S. A. Johnson. (2001) Which hat to wear? in Hogg M. A. and Terry D.J. (eds.) *Social identity processes in organizational contexts.* Binghamton, NY: Haworth Press: 31-48.

Ardito, L., Messeni Petruzzelli, A., & Albino, V. (2015). From Technological Inventions to New Products: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda of the Main Enabling Factors. *European Management Review* (forthcoming).

Beal, D. J., Cohen R.R., Burke M.J., and McLendon C.L. (2003) Cohesion and performance in groups: a meta-analytic clarification of construct relations. *Journal of applied psychology* 88(6): 989-1004.

Becker, H. S. (1982) *Art Worlds.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Blanc, R. (2008). *A Taste of my Life.* Transworld Publishers.

Bouty, I. and Gomez M. (2009) The Social Dimensions of Idea Work in Haute Cuisine: A Bourdieusian Perspective. No. DR 09010. *ESSEC Business School Working paper.*

Burroughs, J. E., Dahl, D. W., Moreau, C. P., Chattopadhyay, A., & Gorn, G. J. (2011). Facilitating and rewarding creativity during new product development. *Journal of Marketing, 75*(4), 53-67.

Cameron, K. S. and Quinn, R.E. (1988) Organizational paradox and transformation in Quinn, R. E. and Cameron K.S. (eds). *Paradox and transformation: Toward a theory of change in organization and management.* Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.

Casper, S., Lehrer M. and Soskice D. (1999). Can High-technology industries prosper in Germany? Institutional frameworks and the evolution of the German software and biotechnology industries. *Industry and Innovation* 6(5): 5-24.

Casper, S. (2009). Can new-technology firms succeed in coordinated market economies? A response to Hermann and Lange. *Socio-Economic Review.* 7(2): 209-215.

Chandy, R., Hopstaken, B., Narasimhan, O., & Prabhu, J. (2006). From invention to innovation: Conversion ability in product development. *Journal of Marketing Research*, *43*(3): 494-508.

Cheng, C.Y., Sanchez-Burks J., and Lee F. (2008). Connecting the dots within creative performance and identity integration. *Psychological Science* 19(11): 1178-1184.

Crossan, M. M., & Apaydin, M. (2010). A multi-dimensional framework of organizational innovation: A systematic review of the literature. *Journal of management studies*, *47*(6): 1154-1191.

Damanpour, F. Organizational innovation: A meta-analysis of effects of determinants and moderators. *Academy of management journal* 34(3): 555-590.

Eisenhardt, K.M. (1989). Building Theories from Case Study research. *Academy of Management Review.* 14(4): 532-50.

Elsbach, K. D., and Hargadon A.B. (2006). Enhancing creativity through "mindless" work: A framework of workday design. *Organization Science* 17(4): 470-483.

Fine, G. A. (1996). Justifying work: Occupational rhetorics as resources in restaurant kitchens. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 41(1): 90-115.

Fleming, L., S. Mingo, and D. Chen. (2007). Collaborative brokerage, generative creativity, and creative success. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 52(3): 443 – 475.

George, J. M. (2007). Creativity in Organizations. A*cademy of Management Annals* 1(1): 439-477.

Gibson, C. B. and Birkinshaw J. (2004). The antecedents, consequences, and mediating role of organizational ambidexterity. *Academy of Management Journal* 47(2): 209-226.

Gruber, M., De Leon, N., George, G., & Thompson, P. (2015). Managing by design. *Academy of Management Journal*, *58*(1): 1-7.

Hall, P. A. and Soskice, D. (eds.) 2001, *Varieties of Capitalism. The Institutional Foundations of Comparative Advantage*. Oxford: OUP.

Hitt, M. A., Beamish, P. W., Jackson, S. E., & Mathieu, J. E. (2007). Building theoretical and empirical bridges across levels: Multilevel research in management. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*(6), 1385-1399.

Ibarra, H. and Barbulescu R. (2010). Identity as narrative: Prevalence, effectiveness, and consequences of narrative identity work in macro work role transitions. *Academy of Management Review* 35(1): 135-154.

Kreiner, G. E., Hollensbe E.C., and Sheep M. L. (2006). Where is the "me" among the "we"? Identity work and the search for optimal balance. *Academy of Management Journal* 49(5): 1031-1057.

Lane, C. (2013). Taste makers in the fine-dining restaurant industry: The attribution of aesthetic and economic value by gastronomic guides. *Poetics*. 41(4): 342-365.

Lane, C. (2014). *The Cultivation of Taste. Chefs' organization of fine dining*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lange, K. (2009). Institutional embeddedness and the strategic leeway of actors: the case of the German therapeutic biotech industry. *Socio-Economic Review* 7: 181-207.

Lehrer, M. (2000). Has Germany finally fixed its high-technology problem? The recent boom in German technology-based entrepreneurship. *California Management Review*. 42: 89-107.

Lewis, M. W. (2000) Exploring paradox: Toward a more comprehensive guide. *Academy of Management Review* 25(4): 760-776.

Lubatkin, M. H., Simsek, Z., Ling, Y., & Veiga, J. F. (2006). Ambidexterity and performance in small-to medium-sized firms: The pivotal role of top management team behavioral integration. *Journal of management*, *32*(5): 646-672.

Messeni Petruzzelli, A. and Savino T. (2012). Search, recombination, and innovation: lessons from haute cuisine." *Long Range Planning* 47(4): 224-238.

Ottenbacher, M. and Harrington R.J. (2007). The innovation development process of Michelin-starred chefs. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management* 19(6): 444-460.

Perry-Smith, J.E. (2006). Social yet creative: The role of social relationships in facilitating individual creativity. *Academy of Management journal* 49(1): 85-101.

Poole, M. S. and Van de Ven A. H. (1989). Using paradox to build management and organization theories. *Academy of Management Review* 14(4): 562-578.

Pratt, M. G. and Corley K.G. (2007). Managing multiple organizational identities: on identity ambiguity, identity conflict, and members' reactions. In Bartel C.A., Blader S. and Wrzesniewski A. (eds) *Identity and the modern organization* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum: 99-118.

Pratt, M. G. and Foreman P.O. (2000). Classifying managerial responses to multiple organizational identities. *Academy of Management Review* 25(1): 18-42.

Raisch, S. and Birkinshaw J. (2008). Organizational ambidexterity: Antecedents, outcomes, and moderators. *Journal of Management* 34(3): 375-409.

Raja, U. and Johns G. (2010). The joint effects of personality and job scope on in-role performance, citizenship behaviors, and creativity. H*uman Relations* 63(7): 981-1005.

Roberts, L. M. (2005). Changing faces: Professional image construction in diverse organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review* 30(4): 685-711.

Shalley, C. E., and Gilson, L. L. (2004). What leaders need to know: A review of social and contextual factors that can foster or hinder creativity. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *15*(1), 33-53.

Slavich, B., Cappetta R. and Salvemini S. (2014). Creativity and the Reproduction of Cultural Products: The Experience of Italian Haute Cuisine Chefs. *International Journal of Arts Management* 16(2): 29-41.

Smith, W. K. and Lewis M.W. (2011). Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of Management Review* 36(2): 381-403.

Smith, Wendy K., and Michael L. Tushman. "Managing strategic contradictions: A top management model for managing innovation streams." *Organization science* 16, no. 5 (2005): 522-536.

Svejenova, S., Mazzo, C. and Planellas M. (2007). Cooking up change in haute cuisine', *Journal of Organizational Behavior* 28(5): 531-561.

Svejenova, S., Planellas, M. and Vives, L. (2010) An individual business model in the making. A chef's quest for creative freedom. *Long Range Planning* 43(2): 408-430.

Svejenova, S., Slavich, B. and AbdelGawad, S. (2012). Business models of creative entrepreneurs: the case of haute cuisine chefs. In Jones C, Lorenzen M. and Sapsed J. (eds) Handbook of Creative Industries. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Takeishi, A. (2002). Knowledge partitioning in the interfirm division of labor: The case of automotive product development. *Organization Science* 13(3): 321-338.

Tushman, M. L., and O'Reilly III, C. A. (1996). Ambidextrous organizations: managing evolutionary and revolutionary change. *California Management Review* 38(4): 8-30

Vasudeva G., Zaheer A, and Hernandez E. (2013). The Embeddedness of Networks: Institutions, Structural Holes, and Innovativeness in the Fuel Cell Industry. *Organization Science* 24(3): 645-663.

West, M. A. (2002). Sparkling fountains or stagnant ponds: An integrative model of creativity and innovation implementation in work groups. *Applied Psychology* 51(3): 355-387.

West, M.A., and Farr, J. L. (1990). Innovation at work. In West M. A. and Farr J. L. (eds.) *Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies*: 3–13. Chichester: John Wiley

Wright, S. (2006). *Tough Cookies*. London: Profile Books.

Table 1: Characteristics of the Restaurants and Chefs in the Sample

No. of stars	Employment status	County	Type of Location
Britain			
One star	Proprietor	Berkshire	Small town
One	Proprietor	Yorkshire	Village
One	Employed head-chef	London	Large city
One	Proprietor	West Midlands	Large city
One	Proprietor	West Midlands	Large city
One	Proprietor	Lancashire	Village
One	Proprietor	London	Large city
One	Chef patron	London	Large city
One	Chef patron	London	Large city
One	Proprietor	Scotland	Large city
One	Employed head-chef	Cumbria	Village
One	Proprietor	Norfolk	Village
One	Chef patron	Wales	Village
One	Employed head-chef	Hertfordshire	Village
Two star	Proprietor	Buckinghamshire	Small town
Two	Proprietor	London	Large city
Two	Joint proprietor	London	Large city
Two	Chef patron	London	Large city
Two	Proprietor	Nottinghamshire	Large town
Two	Joint proprietor	London	Large city
Germany			
One star	Proprietor	NRW	Small town
One	Employed head-chef	Bavaria	Large town
One	Chef Patron	Hamburg	Large city
One	Proprietor	Hessen	Large town
One	Employed executive chef	Hessen	Large town
One	Proprietor	Bavaria	Large town
One	Employed head-chef	Mecklenburg	Village
One	Proprietor	BW	Small town
One	Employed head-chef	BW	Large town
Two stars	Employed head-chef	Berlin	Large city
Two	Employed head-chef	NRW	Large town
Two	Employed head-chef	SH	Village
Two	Employed head-chef	NRW	Small town
Two	Employed head-chef	Bavaria	Village
Two	Chef patron	SH	Village
Two	Employed head-chef	NRW	Large town
Three stars	Proprietor	Hessen	Small town
Three	Employed head-chef	NRW	Small town
Three	Employed head-chef	Niedersachsen	Large town
Three	Employed head-chef	BW	Village

Table 2: Number of Michelin Stars Awarded in 2013

	Britain	Germany
One star	138	209
Two stars	20	36
Three stars	4	10
Total	162	255

Source: Based on figures in Michelin Great Britain 2013 and Michelin Deutschland 2013.

Figure 1: A Model of Managing Tensions of Creativity and Innovation