

How Brands Determine Organizational Creativity

by Nicholas Ind and Cameron Watt

Creatively defining and managing boundaries—especially the boundaries defined by brand—is essential to innovative success. Nicholas Ind and Cameron Watt explore the sources and nature of these constraints and, using specific examples, suggest how a company can leverage its brand to innovate in ways that strengthens its position in the marketplace and in the minds of consumers.

One of the core myths about creativity and innovation is that they require freedom from constraint. In this conception, freedom means the ability to make choices without prejudice. This type of pure freedom is, however, a mirage. There are always constraints, whether they are imposed by outside bodies or by internal limitations, and this is true for both individuals and organizations. An organization must recognize that it is limited by its sense of identity, its competitive position, its resources, its knowledge, and its people. However, this limiting of scope is not necessarily negative: Freedom needs order to be successful. Our research among highly creative organizations shows that understanding their constraints provides a focus for their creativity. The positive use of constraints (or as we refer to them—



Nicholas Ind, Author and Consultant



Cameron Watt, PhD, Innovation Consultant, Author

boundaries) enables these organizations to engage members with the idea of creativity and to develop relevant, value-adding innovations. In this paper, we argue that boundaries—largely determined by the idea of an organization's brand—are the key to continuous and successful innovation.

Creativity and innovation unmasked

There has been a great deal written about the nature and meaning of creativity and innovation, and although this paper will not review such literature in depth, in order to provide a conceptual foundation it is necessary to provide working definitions of creativity and innovation. We propose the following definition: *Creativity is a complex process based on stakeholder relationships and results in the genera-*

tion of ideas deemed to be original and valuable within their context. Innovation extends this definition by introducing the concept of implementation and production. In other words, innovation is the realization of the creative idea.

Much early research into creativity and innovation focused on the individual within an educational or military context. However, we have

We have identified a number of core constructs found in creative cultures: valuing creativity and innovation, trust, a desire to learn, diversity, and fun or enjoyment.

come to believe that context has a greater impact on creativity and innovation, and this has led to our moving away from research that focuses on the individual and toward a greater emphasis on social, environmental, and contextual factors. Indeed, recent research into creativity and innovation has placed greater emphasis on issues relating to leadership

style, communication systems, culture, knowledge, social frameworks, and team dynamics.¹

Our own research has confirmed the importance of contextual factors and their effect on stakeholder relationships and perceptions, as well as the resulting impact on stakeholders' willingness and ability to be creative. We have identified a number of core constructs found in creative cultures: valuing creativity and innovation, trust, a desire to learn, diversity, and fun or enjoyment. However, we also found an important additional factor, common among the organizations we researched: a clear understanding and belief in the brand. This realization led us to pose the question of whether an awareness of the brand among employees forms another core cultural construct in the creative dynamic.

Branding and people

We articulate a brand as follows: Although a brand is related to a physical product or service, it is itself immaterial. It is a transforming idea that converts the intangible into something of value. A brand only exists in a buyer's mind, and

it is the buyer who has the power to begin, sustain, or terminate a relationship with it. On this basis, we assert that creating a brand is about employees, their perceptions, their actions, and the consequent relationships they build with customers or stakeholders. Organizations and their products and services are defined and communicated by the assumptions, perceptions, and behavior of employees. It is their interpretation of the organizational ideology that determines personal and group disposition that in turn affects actions and relationships. For example, the way in which people interact with brands like Amazon.com, Quiksilver, and Volvo is largely determined by the beliefs of the employees of these companies, who determine what it is that will engage customers. To ensure a relative consistency of delivery for products and services, there needs to be a common view of the brand ideology—as defined in its vision and values. If this does not exist, key business units, such as marketing, logistics, and customer interface, will not be cohesively presented, and external stakeholders will become confused or disillusioned, which in turn weakens relationships and brand value.

It seems obvious that for an organization to be successful, it needs to be genuinely buyer-centric. However, this process requires a significant amount of listening and signalling; it's only partially controllable, and as such cannot be an exact science. The traditional way for an organization to listen is through market research. This can provide insight and help reduce risk, but how good is it as a means of creating genuinely original and valuable ideas? Our research over the past eight years has illustrated that traditional market research cannot always be relied on if brands are to innovate because such research is by definition an abstraction, not a reality. When managers see statistics, they often stop seeing people; they lose their tacit, intuitive understanding of their customers and default instead to the supposed certainty of mathematics. This, combined with the blinkered and inward-looking nature of many companies, creates an organ-

1. Some of these include work by T.M. Amabile, as well as Csikszentmihalyi and Sawyer, Hennessey and Amabile, Sethia, and Oldham and Cummings (see the Suggested Readings section at the end of this article).

ization that is seller-centric. Alan Mitchell summarizes this point, arguing:

The source of marketing ineffectiveness and waste, therefore, lies in its seller-centric preoccupations. Marketers say the acid test of good value is to find out what your customers want and need and give it to them. When it comes to marketing communications, this is the one thing marketers do not do. Marketers seem to believe that the only people who do not need to practice what marketing preaches are... themselves.²

Our research indicates that another key flaw of market research is that it often relies on customers clearly articulating what they need now or might want in the future. However, we have found that customers are rarely able to understand or articulate complex needs; nor are they always capable of envisioning the future. In addition, the research contexts and processes can often skew answers through biased perceptions of peers or researchers that apply external pressures to customers. We would argue that these

issues create particular problems in the area of creativity and innovation, because they can hinder the willingness and ability of organizations to challenge customer expectations and to take creative risks.

Even when organisations listen well by openly interacting with their customers, or as managers for sportswear company Quiksilver describe it, “connecting through a free-flowing culture that blurs the boundaries between employee and customer,” they have to ensure the brand delivers on its promises. The problem is that many people have become cynical about advertising and other corporate messaging and are more liable to listen to noncontrollable, and perhaps more-authentic, voices.³ As figure 1 illustrates, brand messages reach the customer from a broad range of sources. When this is cohesive, the buyer has a

2. Alan Mitchell, *Right Side Up: Building Brands in the Age of the Organized Consumer* (London: HarperCollins Business, 2001).

3. In a study of consumer trust by Yesawich, Pepperdine, and Brown/Yankelovich Partners National Travel Monitor, 2001, US adults recorded a trust figure of only 3 percent for messages received through advertisements.



Figure 1. Sources of brand messages. From N. Ind and C. Watt, *Inspiration: Capturing the Creative Potential of Your Organization* (Basingstoke, UK: Palgrave Press, 2004), p. 25.

clear picture of what is offered. However, if the messages are confused, the buyer either ignores them or is confused, as well. This occurs when there is a lack of clear brand ideology within the organization.

Brands with a clearly agreed-upon internal ideology are more likely to present a clear brand image and interface with customers in a consistent and positive manner. Such interaction over time enhances the brand reputation and increases the value of a brand's intangible assets. This is significant when you consider that much of a business's capitalization is contained within its intangible assets: the collective knowledge and skill of employees, the relationships with customers, and the ability to innovate.

To summarize: Having a strong understanding of the brand not only ensures clarity of image, but also enhances customer experience. Internally, it increases intrinsic motivation, organizational knowledge, and stakeholder trust—all of which improve internal performance and facilitate creative behavior.

How brands, creativity, and innovation connect

Branding, creativity, and innovation connect for two key reasons. First, because they are concerned with adding value and delivering a rewarding experience for the customer. To do so, we propose that creativity and innovation need to be framed by customer-focused boundaries. For example, it would not benefit sportswear brands such as Quiksilver, Patagonia, and Nike if the creative output of their designers or communications staff lacked cohesion in terms of ranges, styles, and products. Similarly, if the Tate Modern or Saatchi Gallery started holding exhibitions of twelfth-century religious art, their clear brand positions would be lost. We believe that branding provides the clarity, focus, and boundaries that apply to major strategic decisions, as well as the everyday actions of employees and stakeholders.

The second reason is that brands, creativity, and innovation

rely on people and their relationships with one another. As we illustrate in figure 2, customers can only build relationships with an organization through the ideas and actions of employees. Customers want to be understood, have their expectations met, and be treated as individuals. We argue that this is not achievable with a purely system-based approach that defines and attempts to rationalize behavior. Rather, we propose that if employees are to act in brand-appropriate ways, there must be meaningful employee identification with the organizational brand, and that this in turn helps develop and direct organizational culture. The outputs of this connection are increased levels of trust, enhanced employee commitment, a focus on creativity and innovation, an empathetic understanding of customers, significant value creation, and improved performance.⁴

Freedom and Order

The balance between boundaries and freedom is a delicate one, but it is crucial if creativity is to be encouraged. We suggest that while the brand

4. As evidence for the benefits of this, "Commitment: Characteristics, Causes, and Consequences," a global study published in September 2002 by International Survey Research, presented evidence, based on employee feedback from 362,950 employees in 40 countries, that organizations with highly committed employees outperformed low-commitment organizations in operating margin by more than 5 percentage points.



Figure 2. Customer relationship building. From *Living the Brand: How to Transform Every Member of Your Organization into a Brand Champion*, by Nicholas Ind (London: Kogan Page, 2004), p. 54.

sets the boundaries for creativity, both strategically and operationally, people should be encouraged to question and test the validity of those boundaries. As Henrik Sjödin argues, “If brands are to remain relevant, marketers and consumers need a certain degree of tolerance for deviants and inconsistencies. If purity becomes a fixation, brands could lose the vigor that companies and consumers require.”⁵ Tension in a brand is critical because it enables staff to test the validity and meaning of an organization’s strategic paradigms and increases perceptions of personal autonomy. In addition, it helps ensure that the organization remains flexible and reflective, thus increasing its ability to compete in highly dynamic environments where there is pressure to differentiate in a significant and meaningful way.

Our work has led us to conclude that defining boundaries is in itself a creative process. Boundaries should focus creative energy rather than limit it by being dogmatic and inflexible. One of our case organizations, the innovation consultancy IDEO, also illustrates our argument. As IDEO president Tim Brown noted in an interview with us:

It’s becoming more and more clear that the behaviour of products is one of the biggest brand building things that companies have. And also the relationship between products and the brand is absolutely crucial. You have to get that connected loop to work really well...we are trying to make sure the innovation is brand driven and that innovation drives the brand too.

What Brown is highlighting is the idea that the brand has always had an implicit impact on setting innovation boundaries, but that as companies have begun to understand the value of their brands and have become self-conscious about them, it has become explicit. For instance, when organizations begin to explore and understand the meaning of their brand, more meaningful innovation can occur. When a lifestyle brand like Quiksilver or Patagonia investigates new opportunities, it uses its brand as a benchmark and vision guide. This helps to direct innovation activity and to evaluate the resulting initiatives to determine their validity for the

brand. As an example, when Volvo developed its hybrid car, the Cross Country, it used the brand as an explicit input into the process, both in terms of defining a unifying brief that everyone could work to and as a reference point against which decisions could be made. The brief stimulated arguments, but it also settled them. When there was discussion about the cost of the interior of the car, it was the importance of this element to the consumer that determined the resolution. When a feature was suggested that would enable the driver to control the ground clearance manually, there was a safety argument against it—and, because safety is at the top of the Volvo brand pyramid, the idea was rejected. These different thoughts were partly the result of radically different viewpoints that people brought to the project. This encouraged people to fight for their ideas, but because competencies were clearly defined, the team working on the project would tend to defer to expert opinion and to the authority of customer-driven success factors. This was important, because brand values in themselves can sometimes seem nebulous. What does it really mean, for instance, to be innovative or challenging? With the Cross Country, attention was paid to thinking through the implications of these concepts. Sara Öhrvall, who was the concept manager on the project, believes this is a major problem in most companies because people don’t know how to use the brand values when it comes to product or service development, leading to a gap between the philosophical-sounding brand values and the everyday, critical decisions in a project.

This underlines our core theory that a well-thought-through brand provides constraints that do not hinder creativity or innovation but instead generate clarity, vision, and focus for staff. If the brand is well understood, it should

*Our work
has led us to conclude
that defining
boundaries is in itself
a creative process.*

5. H. Sjödin, “Dirt!—An Interpretive Study of Negative Opinions About a Brand Extension,” paper given at the European Association for Consumer Research Conference, Gothenburg, June 2005.

provide the starting point for creativity and innovation and allow for the intuitive decision making that is formed from a deep and empathetic understanding of the brand and its relationship with customers. The brand also provides the benchmark against which decisions are evaluated. Such a paradigm helps organizations balance the tensions between the rational and irrational paradox of the innovation process. In practice, this means that leaders and managers need to encourage the smooth and efficient running of operations while stimulating questioning and creative behavior. Unfortunately, most managers are biased toward the former idea, which focuses on encouraging normative behavior. The outcome of this is a management obsession with quantitative measurements that attempt to categorize the acceptable, punish failure to conform, and rationalize intuitive behavior. But in a creative context there is a problem with this, as Gordon MacKenzie points out:

Corporate Normalcy derives from and is dedicated to past realities and past successes.... To be of optimum value to the corporate endeavour, you must invest enough individuality to counteract the pull of Corporate Gravity, but not so much that you escape the pull altogether⁶

This belief in rationality is endemic throughout academia and industry. Both business practice and theory often promote quasi-scientific methods, laws, rules, and systems in order to justify action or rationalize complex irrational concepts. We would argue that a key leadership role lies in the recognition that reliance on such ideas is creatively harmful and that there is a need to accept that uncertainty and irrationality can be used to generate competitive advantage. We suggest that what the organization believes to be true can and should be challenged; new ways of doing things can and should be found to prevent corporate stagnation.

We are not suggesting that rationality give way to chaos; on the contrary, we believe that structure, boundaries, and systems are key to a successful creative operation. What our research has shown is that successful innovative organizations also inject some irrationality or opportuni-

ty for creativity into the organizational culture while using their brand as a foundation, benchmark, and rallying standard. One of our interview subjects, from the online gaming company Funcom, cited the writer Rollo May on creativity:

He said that creativity isn't chaos. Creativity isn't structure. Creativity isn't ideas. Creativity is letting chaos meet structure. That is where creativity is found. To me that's really true... It's not the idea itself, it's the meeting with reality, that is true creativity.

Such a strategy is long-term and represents a shift away from the traditional "creative away-days" that let staff escape from the norms of the office environment for short brainstorming sessions. We accept that these may result in interesting ideas but argue that once employees return to their uncreative workplaces, most of these ideas become lost and motivation decreases even further, resulting in a breakdown of trust and potential withdrawal of cooperation. Our research highlights that the ideal is for irrationality and creativity to be incorporated into the organizational culture. Many of the organizations we studied have achieved this through capable and confident leadership and the development of a clear brand ideology.

Conclusion

The premise of this paper is that when the brand is clearly understood, it provides the structure and boundaries that encourage creativity and innovation to flourish. It means that people can be genuinely empowered to use their abilities to be creative. And it means overt control mechanisms can be reduced—the brand ideology helps people understand how to set their own controls. In these environments, the brand allows the rational and the irrational to coexist.

Unfortunately, this approach to creativity and innovation is relatively rare. Most organizations and managers still default to a control-conform paradigm either on a day-to-day basis or when they are faced with a new product development

6. Gordon MacKenzie, *Orbiting the Giant Hairball* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1998), pp. 31, 35.

Driving Creativity: Volvo

Swedish car-maker Volvo has a clearly articulated brand pyramid, at the apex of which lie its two core values: safety and excitement. These values create a tension because, in some ways, they are oppositional ideas. However, the tension itself is valuable to the brand, because the continuous attempt to resolve it is the fuel of creativity. This creative tension drove the development of a project within Volvo that led to the launch of a hybrid car (a cross between a station wagon and a sports utility vehicle) known as the Cross Country. The idea behind the Cross Country was a perceived need to expand Volvo's appeal to new customers and to make the brand more emotionally (rather than just functionally) engaging. To help the development process and to pinpoint the market opportunity, Volvo undertook a great deal of exploratory research to better understand people's lifestyles and the role transport played in them. This led to the idea of developing an on-road vehicle with off-road potential—something that was explicitly not an SUV, as these had begun to be criticized on the grounds of safety. The briefing process itself was highly detailed. The implications of the brand pyramid and the nature of Volvo-ness were thought through in detail, an exhibition of the target customer's lifestyle was developed, a brand positioning map showing Volvo versus competitive products was produced, and a clay model was created. Sara Öhrvall, who was the concept development manager, notes,

The project started with the strategy—the role of the car for the overall brand. So innovation is always done within a specific Volvo context. You start with the brand and then you ask: What is the role of this car in the brand? And then: What is the



position of this car in the market? How will you position it against other cars?

The value of developing a creative, three-dimensional brief was threefold: It was a source of inspiration for the development team; it provided a customer-focused source of accountability for decision making; and it helped in selling the concept internally to stakeholders all over the world. The brand not only set an overall direction but also influenced the detail. For example, the interior had a distinctive baseball-style stitching on the upholstery that was aimed at delivering emotional appeal and excitement. On the exterior, the bumpers (fenders) were black rather than color-matched to the vehicle—even though some managers disliked it—to demarcate the vehicle as a serious car rather than another of the style-led small SUVs. The twin values also led to ideas being vetoed: When the engineers suggested the idea of enabling the driver to change the ride height of the vehicle it seemed a clever thought, but as it also led to a reduction in safety, so the idea was rejected. As Öhrvall says,

In the brief, there were key success factors, and the law internally was that they had to be defined from a customer perspective. It wasn't a case of "it must be this engine" or "the car has to have 40 centimeters of extra height." It said that the customer must perceive the car as being higher than another car, or the customer has to perceive the car as more fuel-efficient. That was done to stimulate creativity. ■

Cultural Creativity: Tate Modern

Tate Modern is London's major modern art gallery. Like the Guggenheim network, Tate has become a brand in its own right. The original Tate gallery, which opened in 1897, was set up by sugar magnate Sir Henry Tate to house British art.

However, as the collection grew in size and stature, it became clear that there was an opportunity for expansion. This led to Tate St Ives and Tate Liverpool, and finally Tate Modern on the south bank of the River Thames. The chosen area was dilapidated and run-down, but rather than choosing to build anew, the Tate trustees acquired a disused 1930s power station and transformed it into a powerhouse of ideas. While the building itself provided a distinctive landmark, the director of Tate Modern, Lars Nittve, and his team had to build a brand.

From the outset, the Tate Modern team conceived of their brand as a place of creative tension: an art gallery that would bring together the modern and the contemporary; a place that would recognize a dual responsibility to artists and visitors; and an experience that would be professional in its delivery but also courageous and challenging. The clear feeling was that if Tate Modern did not deliver on each of these dualities, it would lose its relevance. For example, the gallery could have settled for just showing its collection of twentieth-century modern classics (Picasso, Matisse, Duchamp, Warhol, Rothko, and Pollock, among others). This would have been a safe and commercial choice, but while these artists once shocked, they are now merely modern. To find the "modern" of the future, the gallery had to present the contemporary. This was altogether more difficult. The work might be uncomfortable, its quality more difficult to evaluate, and public interest uncertain. But it could create excitement and dialogue and challenge ideas about creativity. Equally, creating a strong consumer orientation might seem the right thing to do (at least to a marketer), but it was felt that an art gallery should present challenge and a degree of discomfort—there was, after all, a responsibility toward the art itself.

The definition of the Tate Modern brand as a meeting-place of opposites was the source of inspiration for the curation of the gallery, which bucked the norm of chronological presentation, opting instead for a thematic approach based around history/memory/society, landscape/matter/environment, nude/action/body, and still life/object/real life. Within each theme there are also sub-themes and interesting, thought-provoking juxtapositions. For instance, within the landscape theme there is a sub-theme of the geometry of nature. What is of particular interest here is the way teams were used to explore the meaning of the brand. The definition of the thematic approach emerged from a small and



cohesive core team of Lars Nittve, two curators, and an education curator, who worked to the key principles they had defined. However to avoid group-think, the group was then expanded into a diverse think-tank, with artists, philosophers, and art historians. Nittve says about this diversity:

I think we valued different voices, and we also knew that we all came from the same direction. And it's not given that that is the only direction. At certain moments in processes, it's good to have some friction, because it breaks up patterns and models of thinking. Sometimes, you're moving too automatically.... Also, we wanted to move toward having different voices in how we displayed and talked about the collection—to move away from this institutional voice to a more multiple voice.

At this stage, the boundaries of creativity were defined by the brand, but within those boundaries there was considerable latitude. Once the four themes had been realized through this interaction, the requirements changed. The goal now was to flesh out the basic themes and to test the viability of ideas. Whereas the first work group required diversity of background, the new groups, which would explore the themes, needed to have diversity of knowledge, but within a cohesive field. A series of bigger think tanks was formed with curators from the Tate's central collection. These people used their specific expertise to define how the four themes could be realized. Finally, once the bigger think tanks had reached agreement, a small group was formed to fine-tune and detail each individual room within the themes. This accordion-like process was designed to provide different levels of diversity and homogeneity at different times. At the earlier stage, when the boundaries were at their broadest, diversity was encouraged to help create connections that might not have been seen by a narrowly defined group. However, when the level of creativity in the later stages became more detailed and the boundaries narrower, homogeneity was more valuable. At this point, the requirement was not to question the fundamental approach to curating the museum, but rather to provide creativity in the specifics of installation.

The success of this approach can not only be seen in the critical plaudits the gallery received when it opened in 2000, but also in visitor numbers: During its first year the gallery received 5.25 million visitors, making it the most popular modern art gallery in the world (in comparison, the gallery at Centre Pompidou received 1.7 million visitors, MOMA in New York 1.2 million, and Bilbao Guggenheim 0.9 million).



Cool Creativity: Quiksilver

The sportswear brand Quiksilver exemplifies an approach to innovation that is both intuitive and courageous. Its intuition is a result of long-time employees who have grown up with the company and the close connection between those employees and the sports they serve. As street skater and Quiksilver creative director Natas Kaupas says, “A lot within Quiksilver happens by intuition.

That’s because it’s a bunch of surfers—people who are unstructured, but very natural. As surfers, they have to adapt to nature and the waves.”

Courage is required because Quiksilver has to be a trend-setter in the sports it serves (skateboarding, snowboarding, and surfing); otherwise it would lose its appeal and relevance for its audience of core enthusiasts. This is a fast-moving product area, in which creativity has to be continuous. The implication is that to stay ahead of its competitors, Quiksilver cannot rely on traditional market research or on detailed vision and value statements, but rather has to use its brand as an intuitive spur to creativity. What this means in practice is that innovation is driven by the search for ideas that drive forward the core concepts of quality, innovation, and something Quiksilver refers to as “protecting the roots”—designing and developing authentic products for its customers in a way that recalls the beginnings of the company as the inventor of robust surfing shorts. This approach is embedded into a culture of free-flowing connectivity and co-creativity that encourages listening, sharing knowledge, and experimentation.



As a demonstration of this use of the brand, take the example of the Cell wet suit. Quiksilver learned about wet suits not through research but through the collective experience of employees who surf, and through conversations with the professional surfers it supports, as well as from a cadre of enthusiastic amateurs who are treated very much as insiders. As marketing director Randy Hild says, “We believe in the collaborative process, in

that input from our riders. If they’re not connecting with it, then our consumers probably won’t connect with it.... It’s our job to listen and to adjust.” The rider input and the collective sense of the brand, with its imperative for innovation and authenticity, inspired the product designers to rethink how wet suits are designed. The quality failing with many wet suits is that the seams leak, which reduces warmth. To get round this problem, the number of panels on the suit was reduced from 33 to 9, while a new fabric with better stretch was introduced to provide better performance and comfort. The Cell wet suit was then launched through an internally developed and distinctive advertising campaign using Rorschach ink-blob images; this was meant to tease and to test creativity. If the company thought of itself only in terms of a fashion sports brand, the design approach would have tended toward a cosmetic enhancement based on colors and graphics, but Quiksilver knows that its brand credibility relies on an ability to deliver genuine innovation that protects its roots. ■

project. As Mintzberg, et al., suggest,⁷ managers' main concern is ensuring strategies work and are implemented to plan. The control a manager exerts is partially defined by the nature of the operating environment. However, we would argue that it also reflects a philosophical standpoint about trust. If we believe in the ability of the individual to make free and informed choices in line with the brand, we would err on the side of freedom and in so doing capture the intellectual power of all employees. Alternatively, if we do not trust people to act responsibly, we tend to favor a rule-based regime that defines how people should behave. The impact of these negative tendencies can be inferred from research: Take, for example, Gallup's 2000 study of US workers, which found that 74 percent were either not engaged or actively disengaged in their jobs, or the research project carried out by the Tom Peters Company among 700 US business professionals, which found that 75 percent of employees do not support their company's branding initiatives and 90 percent don't understand how to represent the brand effectively.

We believe that corporate order can be delivered by brand boundaries, which leave people free to express their creativity within a defined space. This requires the brand to be determined in such a way that it is inspirational and engaging. And it also requires that employees understand and live the brand. If the definition remains a static, unfulfilled statement, it cannot guide people's thinking and behavior. Such a process also requires a high degree of trust that staff will do the right thing. Unfortunately, many organizations do not trust their employees, which is damaging for the individual, as well as for the organization. When there is a sense of trust, employees' sense of self-worth is enhanced, as are their intrinsic motivation and willingness to collaborate creatively. Such perceptions and actions have a significant impact on performance. In a world where intangible assets are so important, it makes sense to use all the intellectual capacity at your disposal.

7. H. Mintzberg, B. Ahlstrand, and J. Lampel, *Strategy Safari: The Complete Guide Through the Wilds of Strategic Management* (Harlow, UK: Pearson Education, 1998).

Suggested Readings

Amabile, T.M. "A model of creativity and innovation in organizations." In Straw, B.M., and Cummings, L.L. (eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 1988), pp.123-167.

Christiansen, J.A. *Building the Innovative Organization: Management Systems that Encourage Innovation* (Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 2000).

Collins, J.C., and Porras, J.I. *Built to Last: Successful Habits of Visionary Companies* (London: Random House Business Books, 1998)

Csikszentmihalyi, M., and Sawyer, K. "Shifting the Focus from Individual to Organizational Creativity." In Ford, C.M., and Gioia, D.A. (eds.), *Creative Action in Organizations: Ivory Tower Visions and Real World Voices* (London: Sage, 1995), pp.167-172.

Handy, C. "The Citizen Company." In Henry, J. (ed.), *Creative Management* (London: Sage, 2001), pp. 240-251.

Ind, N. *Living the Brand: How to Transform Every Member of Your Organization into a Brand Champion* (London: Kogan Page, 2001/2004).

Ind, N., and Watt, C. *Inspiration: Capturing the Creative Potential of Your Organization* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Press, 2004).

Sethia, N.K. "The Role of Collaboration in Creativity." In Ford, C.M., and Gioia, D.A. (eds.), *Creative Action in Organizations: Ivory Tower Visions and Real World Voices* (London: Sage, 1995), pp.100-105. ■

Reprint #05164WAT63