Key Organizational Climate Elements Influencing Employees' Creativity in Government

Mohamed Sherief

Johnson Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy, University of Saskatchewan, 101 Diefenbaker Pl, Saskatoon, SK Canada

Key Organizational Climate Elements Influencing Employees' Creativity in Government

Mohamed Sherief

ABSTRACT

Public servants are critical assets to a government's success. And governments are seeking more creativity in their public services to deal effectively with wicked and complex issues. There is hope that creative public servants can create opportunities by generating novel and useful ideas, products, services and procedures. Prior research shows that an organizational climate impacts how public servants perform in their relevant job tasks and is a salient antecedent of public servants' creativity. The current research generates an inventory of organizational climate elements that are likely to boost public servants' creative behaviour. Based on a series of in-depth interviews with 13 carefully selected public servants working at Saskatchewan Government ministries; the research findings recommend eight relevant organizational climate elements: meaningful work, organizational vision, autonomy, slack resources, supervisory support, deliberation, diversity, and organizational willingness to takes risks, in order to advance individual creativity at the public sector. Implications of the current study findings for public sector institutions are thoroughly discussed.

Key Words: employee behaviour, creativity, organizational climate, government, public sector innovation

Introduction

If the public sector is to become highly creative, it will need to take advantage of the skills and abilities of public servants in order to create and innovate. In today's world, many jobs turned out to be highly knowledge concentrated and not rigidly delineated. In this case, public servants can contribute to maintain and enhance government service standards by supplying creative ideas and using them as major components for novel and improved services, products, and/or managerial procedures. Many academics and specialists now adopt the viewpoint that employee creativity helps in achieving overall organizational prosperity and success (Axtell et al., 2000: 265-267). Thus, to attain a constant flow of new and useful governmental services/products, public servants should be interested in and capable of creation and innovation. Employee creativity is integral to different organizational practices, such as corporate learning programs and continuous development tactics (Gertsen, 1998). In this paper, the researcher will address how the public sector organizational climate may affect individual creativity.

Individual creativity has been researched in different ways, for instance the discipline has been studied as a genetic personality trait, and as a behavioural characteristic (Janssen, 2000). However, not many behavioural inquiries exist on individual creativity (Gow, 2014), such as how the organizational climate affects an employee's creative behaviour. Therefore, the researcher shall adopt the behavioural viewpoint and study the effects of organizational climate on employee creative behaviour.

Organizational climate is defined as the characteristics of a workplace as observed by its employees, which is suggested to have a powerful effect on various forms of their behaviour in the work environment (James and Sells, 1981: 279). Prior research has shown that staff creative behaviour relies in a big part on the organizational climate. Isaksen et al. (1999) for instance, assert that the continuous creation of new services and methods of work are highly impacted by the staff cognitive perceptions of their workplace environments "rather than to the environments per se" (James and Sells, 1981: 279). While there's consensus on the significance of organizational climate in stimulating individual creative behaviour, inquiries into the relationship between climate elements and public servant creativity are scarce (Demircioglu and Audretsch, 2017). Most research that investigated the linkage between organizational climate and staff creativity has done so utilizing theories and samples drawn from the private sector realm. It is suggested that the private and public sectors differ greatly, and that there is not much benefit in seeking findings from management literature in the private sector (Boyne, 2002).

The present research intends to provide a clearer understanding about the role of public sector organizational climate in public servant's creative behaviour. It utilizes a blend of face-to-face and over the phone interviews, and literature review to specify a set of organizational climate elements that hold the potential to enhance organizational staff creativity. The research is being administered to the public servants of Saskatchewan government. Public sector institutions have a salient role to economic development and trade in modern market economies (Shogren, 1993), and they add notably to the citizen's wellbeing. Compared to the private sector, public sector organizations have a different and more complex nature (Scott, 2002). Such a sector has a solid need for creative additions and enhancements to their current administrative procedures and product/service offerings, making public servants' creative behaviour essential in this context (OECD, 2012).

Literature Review

Creative Behaviour

The terms employee innovation and creativity are utilized interchangeably in academic inquiry. However, many innovation management scholars define employee innovation as a process consisting of two core steps: exploration/creation and exploitation (Axtell et al., 2000: 266-268). The demarcation between the two steps is perceived to be the time when the new item is granted management acceptance to be diffused and integrated in the current organizational system. The initial step ends when a new and useful idea is created and turned into an artifact, prototype, or the like. While the second step ends once this newly created item is fully adopted and effectively used by organizational members.

To create new ideas, organizational staff can be involved in different forms of behaviour such as surveying external opportunities and threats, spotting performance discrepancies, or providing solutions for current problems. The opportunity to generate novel and useful ideas stems from the difference between expectation and reality in terms of working procedures, client satisfaction, and the like. In the exploitation step, organizational members can convince others about the potential benefits and value of the new item, mobilize resources needed for designing and execution, and test the innovated item against current standards.

Not much of the literature investigates the exploration/creativity dimension of innovation (Gow, 2014), yet it is a distinct process from exploitation. In this research, the author defines creative behaviour as any behaviour aimed at initiating novel and practical work-related ideas (Farr and Ford, 1990). In the current study, the center of attention is on the first core step of innovative behaviour: exploration/creation behaviour.

Organizational Climate

Organizational climate is generally perceived to be reflected in the staff's impression of, or convictions about work environmental characteristics that shape assumptions about requirements, possibilities, outcomes, and communications in the workplace (Ekvall, 1991). It has also been described as a collection of shared impressions with respect to employees' views of work-related policies, strategies, and practices. Therefore, the organizational climate can be seen as a guiding tool that assists staff in choosing the proper behaviour in a given circumstance. Individuals for the most part tend to adjust to values and standards, and conform to the socially acceptable conduct (Asch, 1956).

Schneider and Reichers (1983: 21) mentioned that the term organizational climate is too generic and thus, "to speak of organizational climate per se, without attaching a referent, is meaningless". It is hardly possible that all of the elements included in a general organizational climate model are relevant to the elements of interest for a particular research study. As a result, the research concerning this matter has taken varying domains, for instance the ethical climate, service climate, and procedural justice climate have all been investigated (Naumann and Bennett, 2002). In the previous 20 years, innovation climate has picked up in prevalence. The researcher restricts himself to the first step in the innovation domain (i.e. creativity) and tackles the question of how the public sector organizational climate impacts public servants' creative behaviour.

Many of the available studies on the link between workforce creative behaviour and institutional climate have relied on different theories, such as intrinsic motivation, team interactions, and psychological dispositions (Hunter, Bedell and Mumford, 2007: 70). Intrinsic motivation (i.e. doing something for its own sake) is hypothesized to boost creativity because it stimulates employees to perceive problems and difficult situations from different angles, and aids them in advancing to their maximum capacity. Intrinsic motivation most commonly brings about the enhanced creativeness of staff members. Amabile and Grykiewicz (1989) adopted the intrinsic motivation framework and advanced an organizational climate model consisting of eight elements as follows: Freedom, work group support, organizational encouragement, organizational impediments, supervisory encouragement, challenging work, sufficient resources, and workload pressure.

Team interaction theory concentrates on the social exchange relationships among team members. It recommends that the nature of connection among team members impacts work related outcomes such as creativity, commitment, and performance (Hunter, Bedell and Mumford, 2007: 70). West and his fellow researchers (Burningham and West, 1985; Anderson and West, 1988) utilized the team interaction theory to develop a four-element organizational climate model: challenging objectives, support for innovation, participative safety, and task orientation. Bain, Mann and Pirola-Merlo (2001) conducted a study among 193 scientists and indicated a direct correlation between the four elements of organizational climate (i.e. challenging objectives, support for innovation, participative safety, and task orientation) and employees' creativity.

Dispositions theory concentrates on the personal, mental, and emotional elements that are impacting a person's ability to engage in creative behaviour. Ekvall and Ryhammer (1999) used this theory and identified nine dispositions: freedom, risk taking, idea support, challenge, debate, conflict, humor, idea time, and trust. In accordance with this theory, Isaksen and Lauer (2002) indicated a direct association between these elements and employee creativity in a study among 154 workers in a huge worldwide professional service organization.

In conclusion, most of the research linking organizational climate and employee creativity has investigated the role of theory-based creativity climate elements, primarily advanced to serve the for-profit sector rather than the non-for-profit sector (i.e. government entities). They did not endeavor to create models pointed particularly at discovering how public sector organizational climate could stimulate the creative behaviour of public servants. Organizational climate models developed for the private sector may not generalize to the public sector. According to Boyne (2002: 102), public and private institutions "are widely believed to differ in a variety of important respects". Therefore, the researcher investigated how public sector organizational climate may trigger the creative behaviour of public servants.

Methodology

In this research, the author combined face to face interviews and organizational creativity literature studies to advance the inventory of creativity climate elements. The interview technique is a qualitative inquiry method that is especially helpful for investigation objectives (Crouch and Mckenzie, 2006). This research technique is considered suitable for generally unexplored issues (Eisenhardt, 1989). The reliance on earlier research work is imperative for supplementing the investigation outcomes. Along these lines, the researcher utilized data from the innovation and creativity fields for theorizing on organizational creativity climate and employee creative behaviour. Since the study focuses on public servants, the researcher initially starts by defining who public servants are, and the process by which participators were pursued for the face to face interviews. The researcher will then portray how interview data was gathered, and how both the interview data and literature were utilized to reach the organizational creativity climate inventory.

Study Respondents

Due to the focus of this research on a very specific organizational behaviour (i.e. employees' creativity), and the fact that employees' creativity is less common among public servants, especially when compared to their counterparts in the private sector (Borins, 2001), a purposive sampling approach was adopted to identify research participants who are aware of workplace creativity, and had a chance to experience it in their daily work routine. The public servants' views and opinions reported in this study is not intended to reflect the views and ideas held by the majority of Saskatchewan public sector employees, but rather those who experienced creative tasks and behaviours in the workplace. According to Shalley et al. (2004), because a creative task and behaviour is distinct from any other routine task and behaviour, it is affected by a unique set of individual and organizational elements. By studying the elements related to creative behaviours, it was thought that these elements could be recognized and used by other employees who are interested in public sector creativity.

In order to arrive at a decision on the appropriate sample size, the researcher followed the recommendations of several scholars (e.g. J. Morse, A. Kuzel, N. Denzin, and Y. Lincoln) who recommended 8-10 samples as an applicable size for sound qualitative results. These recommendations are not intended to suit all qualitative research; rather it is only for research studies directed at understanding the nature and elements of a commonly experienced phenomenon within a certain set of the workforce population. In this case, it is the workplace creative behaviours experienced by employees working in the public sector.

The researcher contacted 14 top management staff that is in charge of major public sector institutions under the provincial government of Saskatchewan, in order to pursue appropriate participators. Saskatchewan Government intends to stimulate creativity in its processes and procedures by encouraging employees to engage in organizational creative behaviours. The researcher requested their cooperation in recommending fellow public servants from their relevant institutions who had exhibited excellence in creativity relevant behaviours. The recommendations enabled the researcher to select 13 public servants from a wide range of business units.

The researcher selected 13 participators by the means of purposive sampling, and each participator was a public servant. Public Sector is an applicable yet under-researched setting in employee creativity research (Demircioglu and Audretsch, 2017). The public sector is normally comprised of institutions that are established, owned, and managed by the government to supply goods and/or services for its citizens. The Merriam Webster dictionary (2018) defines a public servant as: "a government official or employee." According to this definition, an expansive scope of individuals may be named as public servants, as white- and blue-collar public sector workers. However, this research is restricted to white-collar public-sector workers.

Data Gathering

A series of in-depth interviews were conducted, and each interview is comprised of two main sections. For the introductory section of the interview, the researcher requested that every respondent depict his/her work duties, and how s/he is engaged with the creativity process. The researcher then urged the interviewees to speak freely about the organizational climate in their relevant institutions. The interviewee's initial response and through probing for an elaboration decided the interview direction. The researcher always endeavored to develop the potential effect of an interviewee's self-portrayed organizational climate on his/her creative behaviour. In the next section of the interview, interviewees were informed about the objective of the interview. At that point in the interview, more straight forward inquiries were made about how an institution could promote or demote an employee's creativity. In general, each interview lasted for about 30 minutes. Interviewees' responses were noted during each interview.

Data Analysis

The interviewees' responses were researched intensively to spot prevalent classes of meaning. Earlier and current research studies were both used as a foundation for this research. Hunter, Bedell and Mumford's (2005: 112) general taxonomy was utilized as a principal categorization of organizational climate elements because it is considered a standout amongst the most inclusive and thoroughly established organizational climate measures (Byrne et al., 2009). The general taxonomy involves 14 organizational climate elements: "1. positive supervisor relations, 2. resources, 3. mission clarity, 4. positive peer group, 5. challenge, 6. autonomy, 7. intellectual stimulation, 8. positive interpersonal exchange, 9. flexibility and risk-taking, 10.

product emphasis, 11. participation, 12. reward orientation, 13. organizational integration, and 14. top management support" (Hunter, Bedell and Mumford, 2005: 112). The taxonomy portrays employees' perceptions of the properties of their work setting. The researcher utilized information and perceptions from the interviews along with current literature, in order to consider possible new categorizations and test for the appropriateness of existing ones.

Analysis of both the interview results and current literature was used to develop an inventory of 8 organizational creativity climate elements identified with public servants' creative behaviour. One of Hunter, Bedell and Mumford's (2005: 112) climate elements was retained in the researcher's final review, "autonomy". The other elements were discarded each time the researcher perceived that they were repetitious, redefined, or did not adequately represent what the interviewees said. The author redefined Hunter, Bedell and Mumford's (2005: 112) elements of "positive supervisor relations" as supervisory support, "resources" as slack resources, "intellectual stimulation" as deliberation, and "flexibility and risk-taking" as organizational willingness to take risks in order to more accurately reflect the current study setting. Finally, a few other elements that were signaled in the interviews and found in the innovation literature were included, for example, meaningful work and providing organizational vision.

Results and Discussion

Eight public sector organizational climate elements were thought to relate to public servants' creative behavior: 1. meaningful work, 2. organizational vision, 3. autonomy, 4. slack resources, 5. supervisory support, 6. deliberation, 7. diversity, and 8. organizational willingness to take risks.

Meaningful Work

The study respondents believed that meaningful and important job duties and/or goals improve creativity. Some relevant statements of respondents include, "We were passionate about the idea of helping citizens to move from their current status to a better one, and this motivated us to make creative recommendations for enhancements in the service", "I understand the importance of my role, and believe in it", and, "The bottom line is to have a sense of meaning behind what you are doing".

Past research shows that meaningful job duties stimulate employee creativity. In one study, for example, a group of young composers were requested to fill out a survey questionnaire before composing a poem (Amabile, 1985). The survey was intended to have them concentrate on either the meaning or the impact a good poem can have on their lives and anyone who reads the poem, or the financial remuneration they can get out of composing a good poem. The composers then composed poems that were later evaluated by specialists in creative poem writing. The youth composers who had focused on the meaning and impact of a poem composed poems that were regarded as very creative. However, the other composers who had focused on external motivations behind (i.e., cash), composed poems characterized by a lower level of creativeness. A questionnaire-based investigation conducted by Oldham and Cummings (1996) found that individuals generated the most novel work while they considered how their tasks were important and meaningful.

Organizational Vision

Most interviewees believed that a clear organizational vision is essential to focus public servants' efforts when attempting to develop a new business idea. They mentioned two main reasons behind their belief: (a) It supplied a frame of reference that demonstrated what kind of conduct would be valued; and (b) what sort of creative ideas and thoughts would be accepted. This was demonstrated in the statements of two respondents, "They (the organization) don't let you feel lost… they always talk about the organizational goal and vision…. they'll try to mention it frequently… when we look at what we're doing and attempt to do it better, we are guided by our organizational vision and long-term goals", and "To solve problems I think of solutions that are not traditional, however could fit within the overall organizational vision".

In literature, the term organizational vision reflects future strategies an organization should follow, as well as the aspirations it portrays for itself (Schwarz and Nandhakumar, 2002). Most inquiries on organizational creativity showed a positive empirical relationship between providing a clear vision and individual creative conduct. For instance, Sosik, Kahai and Avolio (1998, 110-115) demonstrated the importance of a clear vision in improving creativeness on a brainstorming activity. Furthermore, a recent meta-analysis of employee creativity predictors proposed and discovered a direct association between an organizational vision level of clarity, and staff involvement in creative conduct (Hülsheger, Anderson and Salgado, 2009: 1136 - 1138).

Autonomy

The interviewees mentioned that experiencing autonomy motivates and helps them in supplying creative ideas. One respondent announced that, "The organization encourages autonomy and freedom...If they limit me, I would not be able to develop the (omitted) system". Others stressed that, "To be creative, it is important to have enough space, and to deal with people who have open minds for accepting new ideas", "Creativity cannot live in a micromanagement atmosphere, it is impossible to formalize creativity, or limit it in a set of structured procedures.", and "Also we have a down up culture, meaning that employees have the ability and freedom to come up with ideas and improve the system currently in place".

Workplace autonomy refers to the extent to which institutions enable employees to reach the highest possible extent in work freedom; taking ownership over their job-related tasks and ideas. (Langfred, 2004). More specifically, it enables employees to determine the order of job assignments, methods for fulfilling those assignments, planning, and coordination with other staff members. Different research work relates autonomy to employee creative conduct. For instance, Andrews and Farris (1967) investigated the impact of workplace autonomy on NASA staff members' creativity. They found that a loose management style, characterized by providing staff with appropriate levels of freedom is a main driver for staff superior creative behaviour. Likewise, Krause (2004) studied whether middle level managers can influence the creativity process through allowing subordinates to coordinate and execute job duties with more freedom. She discovered that providing employees with more freedom was positively correlated to creative behaviour; particularly ideation. Other research conducted in various work environments lead to similar results, these studies cover work in the biotechnology sector, primary care services, and transportation (Gupta and Singh, 2012).

Slack Resources

The interviewees felt that the availability of excess resources is relevant, and that they should be accessible whenever needed. For instance, one interviewee stated, "Once there were extra available resources, I was able to come up with creative solutions to my unit". Others stated that "A major strength would be the department ability to offer seed funding for creative ideas to be further developed and tested", and "There is an endless discussion about extra resources. The citizens' demands nowadays are increasing and more complex than before, and that is why the government should consider providing extra resources than normal for employees to use in finding better ways of doing business". The interviewees also mentioned that creative concepts regarding new systems, processes, and services would be enhanced by ensuring those who are creating them that they would have access to extra resources.

Slack is defined as surplus resources that are accessible for an institute amid a specific period (Nohria and Gulati, 1996). In contrast to the study respondents' statements, some earlier research demonstrated that slack may not be the optimal strategy to trigger creativity. A study by Latham and Braun (2009) showed that some employees with more available slack dedicated significantly less efforts for exploration. Nevertheless, the majority of studies recommended and found a positive correlation between slack and staff creative behaviour. It is proposed that slack empowers institutions to take attention far from "firefighting" activities to concentrate rather on the generation of creative business concepts and converting them into novel and useful services and products with conceivably high returns (Nohria and Gulati, 1996).

In a study using faculty participants, Ekvall and Ryhammer (1999) found a direct association between the availability of extra resources and faculty creative behaviour. A well-known example of supplying slack resources for staff is the strategy developed by Google Corporation, where employees are motivated to dedicate 20% of their weekly working hours toward tasks of their own selection. Google founders, Larry Page and Sergey Brin, highlighted that this strategy "empowers them to be more creative and innovative……. many of our significant advances have happened in this manner." (D'Onfro, 2015).

Supervisory Support

It was impressive that many interviewees impulsively indicated that supervisory support is necessary to focus their attempts to generate useful and novel ideas (i.e. products, services and processes). They mentioned that this support includes appreciation, consideration, and being a role model of creative behaviour. One respondent stated, "I guess...I have a manager that supports new ideas, there are managers who follow the command and control style, and however this is not going to help for creative behaviour to take place." Another respondent stated, "You know the main element for creativity is to have a leader that asks for better ways for doing business and encourages it… and at the same time does not blame you for bad ideas".

Past research proposes that supervisors ought to be keen to appreciate employees' creative contributions because such behaviour may stimulate subordinates' ideation behaviour (Andrews and Farris, 1967). From a recent case study, Jaussi and Dionne (2003) concluded that once managers behave in a creative manner they immediately make themselves accessible for creative behaviour emulation. Finally, Redmond et al. (1993: 139 - 142) studied faculty staff who either did or did not appreciate the creative behaviour of undergraduate students' performance. Faculty staff would appreciate creative behaviour through stressing and focusing on students'

competencies as they performed an advertising campaign for a certain product. The study showed a positive relationship between recognition and high performance, where better quality campaigns were developed, and more creative problem-solving skills were utilized by students who were recognized.

Deliberation

Most interviewees mentioned that they are convinced of the importance of deliberation. Also, they mentioned that when a new idea is visualized, those who have to embrace it ought to be permitted to have input. These viewpoints were demonstrated in the statements of different employees, "I contacted a group of employees from different units, engineering, operations, asset management, research, we met together and decided that we can better maintain our systems.....the thing is that through communication and continuous discussions I could understand the problems more and better look for new effective solutions", and "In the process of developing the new strategy, we made sure that all different parties who would be affected by it, either directly or indirectly, have a say… and whenever possible we made alterations based on the new inputs added.".

Deliberation in this context describes the extent by which organizational staff is free to discuss work related matters effectively, and the extent to which uncommon views are communicated and listened to. Empirical research affirms the interviewees proposed link between frequent deliberation and creativity (Evan and Black, 1967). For example, Tjosvold and McNeely (1988) investigated employee creativity in a public sector institution utilizing a series of in-depth interviews. Their findings indicated that under the condition of open and transparent deliberation, there was a flow of high-quality creative solutions for complex work issues. Finally, in a field study including five big institutions, Kanter (1982) showed that creative idea generation was more frequent among employees who always engage in deliberative activities with other staff members.

Diversity

Some of the interviewees asserted that differences in the education level, field of experience and seniority among organizational members is helpful for generating creative ideas. For example, one interviewee stated, "Having experience in a totally different industry and from a totally different culture added to my creativity…… I just looked at my previous experience for a solution that would address this problem and then tried to customize that solution as much as possible to fit the organization need". Moreover, another interviewee said "The other important point here was the group itself…. they came from different technical backgrounds and this helped me a lot in generating the (omitted) idea".

Harrison and Klein (2007, 1200) defined staff diversity "as the distribution of differences among the members of a unit with respect to a common attribute such as tenure, and ethnicity." In this context diversity extends to cover lifestyle, gender, function, language, and ability. It is suggested that the main advantage of staff diversity lies in the substantial variety of perspectives, knowledge, and skills available in a work team that can be extremely important sources of employee idea generation behaviour (Perry-Smith and Shalley, 2003).

Research evidence confirms such an association between organizational members' diversity and idea generation behaviour. For example, Shin et al., (2012) investigated 68 work teams from various Chinese institutions to study the relationship between staff diversity and

employee creativity and found that both variables were positively linked. Furthermore, Donnellon (1993) showed that organizations characterized by staff diversity have the capacity to get to more extensive networks of valuable contacts, which empowers staff to obtain useful ideas contributing to strong and creative decisions.

Organizational Willingness to Take Risks

The interviewees mentioned that management's positive attitude toward risk taking could motivate staff in generating novel and useful business ideas. Some of them also noted that an organizational willingness to take risks is not intended to recommend the need for a blind courage, rather an ability to accept possible risks in the face of probable negative results. For example, respondents stated that, "management is not afraid of risky decisions. I don't mean that it will approve stupid actions, rather it will just say let us start this and test, and then we will adapt and will test again, and will adapt again", and "There is nothing without risk, even what we do on daily basis...the difference between risks associated with traditional business operations and new ideas is that we fully understand the current operations and the risks associated with it because of this the organization do not neglect new ideas just because there may be potential risks".

An organizational willingness to take risks is to a great extent a new concept in the innovation literature. However, several creativity scholars have stressed the importance of such a concept (Gupta and Singh, 2012). It is proposed that even under circumstances that are favorable to staff creativity, creative behaviour will be abandoned by most employees. This is due to human beings' natural tendency to stay away from risky actions such as exploring a new business idea, and instead inclining toward safer activities such as daily job tasks (Larrik, 1993). Thus, Pfeffer and Sutton (1999) recommended organizations adopt images in favor of calculated risk taking, and a climate reflecting that the only real failure for an employee is the failure to act upon their conceptualized ideas.

Conclusion and Implications

One route for institutions in the public sector to become highly creative is to take advantage of its workforce skills and abilities to create and innovate. The current research purpose is to add to earlier research work on employee creativity, through supplying a relevant set of public sector organizational climate elements that could affect employees' creative behaviour. What sets this research apart from earlier studies is the focus on organizational climate in public sector organizations. Individual creativity has not received much attention in public sector organizations, which is shocking given the growing need for innovations in the public sector (Borins 2008, 199 - 203). This study provides insights into the organizational climate elements that public servants perceive as necessary to stimulate creativity among them.

Drawing on the innovation and creativity literature review and study interviews, the researcher identified eight organizational climate elements that are suggested to positively impact creative behaviour. Certain climate elements that can directly provoke employees' creativity were reported, however the author also underlined other general organizational climate elements found in most organizations and the influence they may have on creative behaviour. The latter stated elements are broad; meaning they do not only aim to trigger creative behaviour.

Organizations vary in the degree to which they manage elements such as meaningful work, organizational vision, and autonomy. As was demonstrated, these elements are likely to boost creative conduct. Given the current research findings; public sector organizations trying to enhance employee creativity among its staff could attempt to stress on the ultimate goal of each job assigned (i.e. better serving our citizens and country), ensure that public servants have a clear understanding of the organizational vision (e.g. our vision is to provide the best educational curricula among OECD member countries), and provide employees with a proper level of autonomy in selecting how to approach their job assignment. Developing and maintaining freedom in the workplace seems to boost creativity, however excessive autonomy may have an adverse effect. A reasonable level of autonomy could be essential in securing efficient organizational performance.

The study also reflects organizational elements with the explicit purpose of impacting individual creativity. For instance, recruiting and maintaining a pool of diverse employees may guide creative behaviour, particularly in idea generation. Bringing in employees with various cultural, educational, and professional backgrounds will contribute in a wide range of information from which to extract data and build upon new ideas. Possibilities for creative behaviour also seem to be improved by stimulating employees to engage in thoughtful discussions (deliberations), supporting transparent and open communication policies, and developing avenues for information sharing. Furthermore, communicating an organizational position in favor of spending time and money to explore bright ideas with no guaranteed returns (willingness to take risks and slack resources), may encourage creative behaviour since employees become assured that their creative efforts are not wasted, rather managed with sincerity and fairness. When employees experience supervision characterized by consideration, and appreciation (supervisory support) it could also be a trigger for creativity. Since not all public servants have equal opportunity to exhibit creative behaviour (for example public servants working with supervisors experienced in people management), top management cannot fairly expect a comparable contribution to creativity from each of the staff members.

Limitations and Future Research

The researcher was able to find an array of organizational climate elements that positively contribute to creativity. It is not yet evident, however, which of the elements is the most significant. A future descriptive analysis may be able to arrange the elements provided in this study based on their relative impact on employee creative behaviour. Since the research is restricted to a qualitative research method, a complimentary regression analysis would assist in discovering which of the labeled organizational climate elements has a certain link with public servants' creative behaviour.

About the Author:

Mohamed Sherief holds a Master of Public Administration from the University of Regina. Currently, he is a PhD student at the Johnson Shoyama Graduate School of Public Policy at the University of Saskatchewan. His research work focuses on Public Sector Innovation. In specific, he is interested in exploring the determinants of public servants' creative behaviour. He can be contacted at mms752@usask.ca

Acknowledgements:

The author recognizes the contribution of Rania Magdalwya of the University of Regina for her assistance with data editing and collection. Advice and support from Peter Phillips of the University of Saskatchewan is greatly appreciated.

References:

Amabile, Teresa M. 1985. Motivation and Creativity: Effects of Motivational Orientation on Creative Writers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48(2): 393-399.

Amabile, Teresa M. 1996. *Creativity in Context: Update to the Social Psychology of Creativity*. Boulder, Col.: Westview Press.

Amabile, Teresa M., & Nur D. Gryskiewicz. 1989. The creative environment scales: Work environment inventory. *Creativity Research Journal*, 2(4): 231-253.

Andrews, Frank M., & George F. Farris. 1967. Supervisory practices and innovation on scientific teams. *Personnel Psychology*, 20(4): 497-515.

Asch, Solomon E. 1956. Studies of Independence and Conformity: I. A Minority of One against Unanimous Majority. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 70(9): 1-70.

Axtell, Carolyn M., David J. Holman, Kerrie L. Unsworth, Toby D. Wall, Patrick E. Waterson, & E. Harrington. 2000. Shop floor Innovation: Facilitating the Suggestion and Implementation of Ideas. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73(3): 265-85.

Bain, Paul G., Leon Mann, & Andrew Pirola-Merlo. 2001. The innovation imperative: The relationships between team climate, innovation, and performance in research and development teams. *Small Group Research*, 32(1): 55-73.

Borins, Sandford F. 2001. Encouraging innovation in the public sector. *Journal of intellectual capital 2(*3*)*: 310-319.

Borins, Sandford F., ed. 2008. *Innovations in Government: Research, Recognition, and Replication*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution.

Boyne, George, A. 2002. Public and Private Management: What's the difference? *Journal of Management Studies*, 39(1): 97-122.

Byrne, Cristina L., Michael D. Mumford, Jamie D. Barrett, & William B. Vessey. 2009. Examining the leaders of creative efforts: What do they do, and what do they think about? *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 18(4): 256-268.

Crouch, Mira & Heather McKenzie. 2006. The logic of small samples in interview-based qualitative research. *Social Science Information*, 45(4): 483-499.

Denzin, Norman K., and Yvonna S. Lincoln. 1994. *Handbook of qualitative research*. Sage publications, Inc.

Demircioglu, Mehmet Akif & David B. Audretsch. 2017. Conditions for Innovation in Public Sector Organizations. Research Policy, 46(9): 1681-691.

D'Onfro, Jillian. 2015. The truth about Google's famous 20% time' policy. *Business Insider*.

Donnelon, Ann. 1993. Cross-functional teams in product development: Accommodating the structure to the process. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 10(5): 377–392.

Eisenhardt, Kathleen M. 1989. Building Theories from Case Study Research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14(4): 532-550

Ekvall, Göran. 1991. "The organizational culture of idea-management: A creative climate for the management of ideas." pp. 73–79 in J. Henry & D. Walker (Eds). *Managing innovation*. London: Sage.

Ekvall, Göran., & Lars Ryhammer. 1999. The creative climate: Its determinants and effects at a Swedish University. *Creativity Research Journal*, 12(4): 303-310.

Evan, William M. & Guy Black. 1967. Innovation in Business Organizations: Some Factors Associated with Success or Failure of Staff Proposals. *The Journal of Business*, 40(4): 519.

Farr, F. & Ford, C. 1990. Innovation at work. *In Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies*. Edited by Farr, James L., and Michael A. West. 3-13. New York: Wiley.

Gow, James Iain. 2014. Public Sector Innovation Theory Revisited. *The innovation journal*, 19(2): 1-22

Gertsen, Frank. 1998. How Continuous Improvement Develops as Companies Gain Experience. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 22(4): 303-326.

Gupta, Vishal, & Shailendra Singh. 2012. How leaders impact employee creativity: a study of Indian R&D laboratories. *Management Research Review*, 36(1): 66-88.

Harrison, David. A. & Katherine J. Klein. 2007. What's the Difference? Diversity Constructs as Separation, Variety, or Disparity in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(4): 1199-228.

Hülsheger, Ute R., Neil Anderson & Jesus F. Salgado. 2009. Team-Level Predictors of Innovation at Work: A Comprehensive Meta-Analysis Spanning Three Decades of Research. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5): 1128-1145.

Hunter, Samuel T., Katrina E. Bedell, & Michael D. Mumford. 2005. Dimensions of creative climate: A general taxonomy. *Korean Journal of Thinking & Problem Solving*, 15(2): 97-116.

Isaksen, Scott G., & Kenneth J. Lauer. 2002. The climate for creativity and change in teams. *Creativity and Innovation Management Journal*, 11(1): 74-86.

Isaksen, S.G., Kenneth J. Lauer & Göran Ekvall. 1999. Situational Outlook Questionnaire: a measure of the climate for creativity and change. *Psychological Reports*, 85(2): 665-74.

James, Lawrence R., & Saul B. Sells. 1981. "Psychological climate: Theoretical perspectives and empirical research." pp 275-295 in D. Magnusson (Ed.*). Toward a psychology of situations: An interactional perspective.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Janssen, Onne. 2000. Job demands, perceptions of effort-reward fairness and innovative work behaviour. *Journal of organizational and occupational psychology*, 73(3): 287-302.

Jaussi, Kimberly S. & Shelley D. Dionne. 2003. Leading for creativity: The role of unconventional leader behaviour. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 14(4-5): 475-498.

Jones, Allan P., & Lawrence R. James. 1979. Psychological Climate: Dimensions and Relationships of Individual and Aggregated Work Environment Perceptions. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance* 23(2): 201-50.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. 1982. The Middle Manager as Innovator. *Harvard Business Review*, 60(4):95-105.

Kuzel, AJ. 1992. "Sampling in qualitative inquiry." pp 31-44 in BF Crabtree & WL Miller (Eds.). *Research methods for primary care: Doing qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications.

Krause, Diana E. 2004. Influence-based Leadership as a Determinant of the Inclination to Innovate and of Innovation-related Behaviours. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1): 79-102.

Langfred, Claus. W. 2004. Too Much of a Good Thing? Negative Effects of High Trust and Individual Autonomy in Self-Managing Teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3): 385-99.

Latham, Scott F., & Michael Braun. 2009. Managerial risk, innovation, and organizational decline. *Journal of Management*, 35(2): 258-281.

Lattimer, Robert L. 1998. The Case for Diversity in Global Business, And the Impact of Diversity on Team Performance. *Competitiveness Review*, 8(2): 3-17.

Larrik, Richard P. 1993. Motivational factors in decision theories: the role of self-protection. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(3): 440-50.

Merriam-Webster, Dictionary. 2018. Accessed April 30, 2018. https://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/public%20servant?utm_campaign=sd&utm_medium=serp&utm_source=jsonld.

Morse, J.M. 2000. Determining sample size. *Qualitative health research* 10(1): 3-5.

Naumann, Stefanie E., & Nathan Bennett. 2002. The effects of procedural justice climate on work group performance. *Small Group Research*, 33(3): 361-377.

Nohria, Nitin, & Ranjay Gulati. 1996. Is Slack Good or Bad for Innovation? *Academy of Management Journal*, 39(5): 1245-264.

Oldham, Greg R. & Anne Cummings. 1996. Employee Creativity: Personal and Contextual Factors at Work. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 39(3): 607-634

Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. 2012. Guide to the Preparation of a Comprehensive Study for Proponents and Responsible Authorities. *STI Policy Profiles: Building Competences and Capacity to Innovate*. Accessed November 29, 2017. www.OECD.org/media/oecdorg/satellitesites/stie-outlook/files/policyprofile/STI%20Outlook%2012_%20PP%20Actors_Public%20Sector%20Innovation.pdf

Perry-Smith, Jill E., & Christina E. Shalley. 2003. The social side of creativity: A static and dynamic social network perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(1): 89–106.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey, & Robert I. Sutton. 1999. Knowing what to do is not enough: Turning knowledge into action. *California Management Review*, 42(1): 83-108.

Redmond, Matthew R., Michael D. Mumford, & Richard Teach. 1993. Putting Creativity to Work: Effects of Leader Behaviour on Subordinate Creativity. *Organizational behaviour and human decision processes*, 55(1): 120-151.

Schneider, Benjamin, & Arnon E. Reichers. 1983. On the etiology of climates. *Personnel Psychology*, 36(1): 19-39.

Schwarz, Mirela, & Joe Nandhakumar. 2002. Conceptualizing the Development of Strategic Ideas: A Grounded Theory Analysis. *British Journal of Management*, 13(1): 67-82.

Scott, Mitchell. 2002. "Analyzing Differences between Public and Private Sector Information Resource Management: Strategic Chief Information Officer Challenges and Critical Technologies." PhD diss., *Air Force Institute of Technology*.

Shogren, Rod. 1993. The Role of the Public Sector in Economic Development and Trade: Eunuch or Saviour? *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 52(3): 281–287.

Shalley, Christina E., Jing Zhou, and Greg R. Oldham. 2004. "The effects of personal and contextual characteristics on creativity: Where should we go from here?" *Journal of management* 30(6): 933-958.

Shin, Shung J., Tae-Yeol Kim, Jeong-Yeon Lee, & Lin Bian. 2012. Cognitive team diversity and individual team member creativity: A cross-level interaction. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1): 197-212.

Sosik, John J., Surinder S. Kahai, & Bruce J. Avolio. 1998. Transformational leadership and dimensions of creativity: motivating idea generation in computer-mediated groups. *Creativity Research Journal*, 11(2): 11-121.

Tjosvold, Dean, & Leonard T. McNeely. 1988. Innovation through Communication in an Educational Bureaucracy. *Communication Research*, 15(5): 568-81.

West, Michael & James L. 1990. "Innovation at work." pp 3-13 in Farr, James L., & Michael A. West (Eds.). *Innovation and creativity at work: Psychological and organizational strategies*. New York: Wiley.