

# Editorial

*When we engage in what we are naturally suited to do, our work takes on the quality of play and it is play that stimulates creativity.* – Linda Naiman

With this quote we start the final issue of 2016 and think of all the engagement and hard work that makes CIM what CIM is today, a 25-year-young journal with an impressive journey behind and with an exciting road ahead. We think of the creators and first editors of CIM Tudor Rickards and Susan Moger, and of Petra de Weerd-Nederhof, Olaf Fisscher and Klaasjan Visscher who continued their hard work and engagement. We also think of all of our authors, reviewers and guest editors who contribute, shape and drive the journal every single day. Finally, we want to express our deepest gratitude to Jeannette Visser-Groeneveld, our core keeping everything together. We had the great pleasure of celebrating the 25th anniversary of CIM this October at University of Potsdam in Germany with many of you and to discuss hot topics and exciting new research.

In this issue, we have seven articles that reflect the main areas of CIM: the first two articles are in the area of individual and group creativity, two more focus on design and design management, and finally, our yearly IPDMC special section edited by Petra de Weerd-Nederhof and Nuran Acur consists of three articles. One from the 2015 Copenhagen conference hosted by John Christiansen, and two from Limerick in 2016, where Ann Ledwith and Regina McNally did the honours.

In the first article, Anna-Maija Nisula and Aino Kianto address the antecedents of individual innovative behaviour in temporary group innovation settings and find that this behaviour is indeed different from the behaviour expressed in conventional organizational settings. One finding that stands out is that individual self-efficacy and the perceived contextual factors of task orientation and experimentation have an impact on individual innovative behaviour, while participative safety, support for innovation and vision were found not to be related to individual innovative behaviour in this setting. The second article deepens our understanding of individual and

team creativity further as Atif Açıkgöz and Ayşe Günsel specifically look at individual creativity and team climate in software development projects and the mediating role of team decision processes. The results show how team decision processes partially mediate between individual creativity and team climate and illustrate that the role of individual creativity plays an important part for the formation and evolution of a positive team climate. While these team decision processes are usually purposely structured by the team itself or the organization around it, the third paper in this issue shows that intentional designing interdependencies between market and technology can be as successful as the regular trial-and-learning strategies. In a case study in an R&D centre, Sophie Hooge et al. show that organizational patterns help to build a 'design of exploration' phase, where creativity and design shape the development of new technologies. The role of design innovation capabilities is also addressed in the fourth paper. Here, Paulo Landoni and co-authors address the situation of SMEs and how their investments in design shape the overall competitive performance, taking into consideration five different design innovation capabilities.

The first of the IPDMC special section is the report by John Christiansen and Marta Gasparin on their research into managing controversies in the fuzzy front end (FFE). Their analysis investigates the micro processes around the controversies that emerge during the fuzzy front end. Five different types of controversies are identified: profit, production, design, brand, and customers/market. Each controversy represents a threat, but is also an opportunity to search for new solutions in the unpredictable non-linear processes. The authors use the phrase 'managing' the controversies in the FFE in the title, and some might find that somewhat presumptuous, but the analysis shows how the meaning of management – or the skills needed – changes from one controversy to another, so managing becomes a call for heterogeneous skills and activities that are needed to deal with the controversies.

Next, the contribution of Maria Annosi et al. concerns an abductive study of the dark side of agile software development focused on social

conduct, learning and innovation. Their results indicate that the time pressure induced by the implementation of Agile impedes team engagement in learning and innovation activities. Time pressure is affected by a set of different control strategies, more specifically concertive, belief, diagnostic and boundary controls, and these need to be adequately addressed in order to minimize the potential dark side of Agile.

Last but not least, the original study on democratizing journalism by Michael Zeng et al. concludes this special section, subtitled: how user-generated content and user commu-

nities affect publishers' business models. A worthwhile read not only for those interested in innovation and changing business models, but also for journal publishers and editors!

September 2016

Jennie Björk

Katharina Hölzle

Petra de Weerd-Nederhof

Nuran Acur