

ORGANIZATIONAL INNOVATION – SIGNIFICANT FACTORIAL CONNECTIONS

Alain SPALANZANI

University of Grenoble
Grenoble, France

alain.spalanzani@iae-grenoble.fr

Dumitru ZAIT

Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
Alexandru Ioan Cuza University

Iași, Romania

dzait@uaic.ro

Adriana ZAIT

Faculty of Economics and Business Administration
Alexandru Ioan Cuza University

Iași, Romania

adrianazait@yahoo.com

Abstract

Innovation provides for a certain organization the most important competitive advantages. Previous researches emphasized different influences and designed coherent organizational innovation factorial systems, suggesting particular relationships and models for different categories of innovations and organizations. An important issue of organizational innovation was, however, less considered and analyzed: it is the relation between different factors of organizational innovation and the performance of innovative activities, for which every organization spends important resources and puts into practice impressive strategies. Our study has as starting point a number of questions for which it intends to find answers or at least suggest possible solutions. The main question is: what elements (factors, variables, expenses and effects type) can be considered into the equation by a company in order to stimulate innovation and obtain a certain level of innovational performance? As an acceptable postulate for our approach, we considered that the innovational performance of an organization has to be associated with those novelties (products, services, activities, knowledge) recognized by the market, and which bring additional value to that organization, through commercialization. As immediate result, the study suggests a few logical relations between the construct of organizational innovation performance and the main influence factors. The study is mainly theoretical, with a deductive and ethical development, based on a thorough analysis of previous recent results in the field of organizational innovation.

Keywords: organizational innovation, innovation factors, organizational performance

JEL classification: M10, M21, O31, O32

1. CONTEXT AND RESEARCH PROBLEM

A large number of previous studies, both consistent and pertinent, focused on the factors of organizational innovation in an empirical manner, trying to emphasize and analyze factors in specific contexts or rather mechanisms already used by companies in order to stimulate the performance of innovative activities. It is difficult to find general or particular solutions based on logical basis only, for a company that has to innovate. Such an approach is, however, necessary, since the available cases offer only « fabricated » solutions, in particular circumstances, for which the results can not actually tell us if the choice was good or bad, or if a better one would have been possible.

For an organization in search of efficient innovation solutions, the knowledge in the field of the logical factors of novelty creation, of their interaction with other factors, internal or external, is probably the first important step in building an innovational strategy. Knowing other companies' experiences – through benchmarking or business intelligence – and adding supplementary arguments, on a statistical and subjective base, are important and significant, but not sufficient in order to identify and apply the best solutions for the creation of a successful innovative strategy. Applying similar strategies, putting into practice identical structures, based on the same innovation instruments does not guarantee the obtaining of good results for a company that uses a former experience. One possible explanation for a mismatch or failure is related to the sense we attribute to innovation as an activity and result of this activity. A structure, a mechanism or instrument, an innovational strategy is, for the company in discussion, an innovation in itself. Such a managerial or administrative innovation produces positive effects as long as it remains competitive. A too large extension of those elements of action will bring a reduction of the competitive advantage, leading even to disadvantages, at a certain moment in time. This preliminary conclusive observation is a premise of our study: the situation and functioning conditions for any organization/company are always particular, even if innovational factors are the same. In order to obtain the expected effects and the innovational performance, the appropriate connections have to be established among innovational factors. Thus, we establish an important hypothetical statement: the efficiency and performance of innovative activities of an organization/company are positively correlated with the capacity of the management to connect the general innovation factors with the specific functioning conditions of that organization, in order to accomplish the aim and objectives of that particular group of interests. This statement constitutes the fundament of our whole approach through which we intend to: 1 – identify and analyze the determinants of organizational innovation, and 2 – to build some logical relationships between the innovation factors and the necessary actions (considered through the economic effort cost) in order to accomplish the desired performance of the organizational innovation.

2. CONCEPTUAL AND METHODOLOGICAL BENCHMARKS

Innovation is generally accepted with the sense given by Amabile (1988), which emphasizes the relation between creativity, as the production of new and useful ideas, the mechanism build by the organization and the process of applying those ideas – thus obtaining an innovational activity and an innovation, as a result. Through the insurance of the appropriate conditions, the organization makes possible the conversion of creativity into innovation. Innovation has a novelty treat (product, service, idea, know-how, production

process, trading or use etc.), is realized through specific activities, specially the research ones, combining resources in order to satisfy a certain demand (existent or potential) and getting a certain gain/profit. In different approaches from the field of management, innovation is considered from various perspectives: as a product, project, program, process, enterprise, client, market, etc. (Harmancioglu N., Droge C., Calantone R.J., 2009) This is how innovation gets different forms, being radical, incremental, imitational, rupture, architectural, modular, evolutionary etc. One more point is necessary: the concept of innovation includes a vast area of activities, processes and results obtained through the valorization of creativity, but organizational innovation is that accomplished through a certain organization/company, using specific resources allocated for this aim and having a result which can be traded on the market. In comparison with the area that supports the organizational innovation action, this can be a technological or product one and a managerial or administrative one. For the first type the aim is to obtain products, services, technologies, ideas etc., while for the second type the aim is to obtain a significant change within the managerial structure, methods, instruments and techniques for that organization. The second form is actually the support for the first form. If these two forms of organizational innovation are not accomplished in a correlated manner and a certain complementarity, then innovation as a whole is negatively affected. An adequate managerial structure for innovation is the one that allows the best application of ideas in order to realize and commercialize new products. Moreover, when a company is engaged in buying a new product (equipment, technology, know-how) a certain form of organizational innovation takes place, even if this acquisition determines only small changes or adaptations at structural level.

As far as the factors that influence innovation are concerned, preferences are quite different, the accent being on different characteristics of the process or activities, participants, results, etc. In the most general approaches, organizational innovation has three sources: (1) organizational capabilities; (2) level of scientific and technological development (state of knowledge) and (3) markets (demand, competition, alliances etc.) (Shaista, E. Kh., Mroczkowski T., Bernstein B., 2006). In studies of intrapreneurial activities, the focus is on the heuristic development of innovational activities, through the use of individual efforts, informal networks and ad-hoc procedures. (V. Bouchard, 2009) In such an intrapreneurial perspective upon organizational innovation, V. Bouchard and C. Bos (2006) identify three source factors: individual autonomy, personal commitment and control through resources. V. Bouchard (2009) intervenes again on this typology, naming those factors « invariants » or « intrapreneurial keys », adding a fourth factor – interfaces management. Without stressing the aspects of logical homogeneity, this typology gets closer to an almost natural grouping in relation to the areas where innovation is produced: individual (through specific predisposition elements), organization (through resources, structures, and mechanisms used for innovating) and environment (through the circumstantial elements that induce or favor innovation).

Not seldom, though, the performance of organizational innovation was assumed to be influenced by just one factor, considered essential or at least the most important. Thus, organizational leadership frequently appears as being determinant, as far as organizational innovation is concerned. The “transformational leader” appears, in these approaches (Gumusluoglu L., Ilsev A., 2009), as that actor or group of actors able to transform individual values and employees’ mentalities or philosophies, making them to have more elevated needs and aspirations, to have superior expectations concerning the organization’s performance and thus to become active co participants for the accomplishment of innovational

activities. This leader should have some specific qualities: charismatic modeler; able to appreciate individualities; motivational inspiration, and capable to realize intellectual stimulation. Even if these qualities can not and are not precisely defined, they cover the image of an ideal leader for an ideal organization. He can potentate the employees' abilities to innovate through internal actions (encouragement, recognition, rewards, resources and time in the service of innovators) as well as external ones (alliances, cooperation with universities and administrative structures, attracting public resources etc.) Obviously, the role of the leader is here exaggerated, he wouldn't be able to obtain such an involvement for innovation without already having an organization with a specific know-how, knowledge and employees able to perform innovative activities. It is a rather unilateral and subjective perspective, trying to focus on the importance of this person for an innovative organization instead of extracting the key elements for the innovational performance of that organization. In other studies (Almeida and Phene, 2004) we find other influences, such as external knowledge, existent in the region or country of origin of the organization. Certainly, here too we can speak about a particular analysis of particular influence factors for the performance of organizational innovation. For the subsidiaries of international corporations, such influences become significant, but not essential. The accent is on the capacity of that corporation and its subsidiaries to share their knowledge with other actors from that region or country, based on the technological and scientific potential of the society and individuals from those regions. Such an analysis would somehow explain corporations' preferences for specific countries or regions in which they develop a subsidiary.

An exhaustive analysis of innovation and the innovational performance of the organization was realized by Th. Matheus (2009), who took over and adapted results from previous studies (Benfari et alii 1986 ; Bachrach and Baratz, 1962 ; Pfeffer, 1992 ; Carter, Scarbrough, 2001 ; Carter, Scarbrough, 2001 ; Hardy, 1996). He considers the influences of four specific factors (dimensions of the power of innovation) of the organizational innovation: the power of resources (rewards, prizes, sanctions, coercitive factors, authority, credibility, charisma, expertise, information and political affiliation), the power of processes (non-decision, agenda manipulation), the power of understanding (symbols, structures, values, languages, organizational modes, revenues legitimacy) and the power of the system (the ability to govern and exploit knowledge in terms of behaviors, beliefs concerning the truth). Used to analyze the characteristics of innovative activities from a particular field of activity (aero spatial industry), this typology remains one of the most interesting, its vulnerable point being the relativity of the operational covering.

Considering the position of innovational factors and their performance towards results we obtain other interesting typologies. The behavioral model proposed by Dilts and Bateson includes, for example, six variables or influence factors (see G. Benoit Cervantes, 2008): affiliation (collective founding values), identity (fundamental behavioral characteristics), beliefs and values (basic ideas and principles for action), capacities, resources and competencies (the willing to act), actions (ways of undertaking activities), and environment (external variables). By placing innovation in the area of creativity, Burns (2007), taking over the idea from Spence (1994) and McAlister & Pessemier (1982), offers a typology of «motivation for variation»: predisposition (direct) sources and situational (indirect) sources. Even if incomplete, this typological system recognizes essential innovational factors at their origins (naming them sources of innovation or variety, variety being actually considered natural object of the individual quest). A third group of factors could complete this typology in the logical sense of origins or sources for innovation: decisional sources. We will thus ob-

tain an integral typological system, with three categories of organizational variables of innovation: predisposition (the willing and capacity of the individual to search for and find sensational and uniqueness); situational (states or contexts in change, insatisfactions, inadequacies, including those referring to the relation with the organization's market) and decisional (autonomy, commitment, control, motivation).

a. Predisposition variables

Characterize the native and induced source mainly through cultural specificity, which determines a certain curiosity of the individual, combined with a certain intensity of his preferences for sensation, variety, uniqueness or change. At this level and through these variables, the individual becomes initial factor for all quests: either for ensuring basic or specific needs, or to check dreams and hypotheses, or to satisfy needs simply coming from curiosity, etc. Individuals have a certain natural disposition towards searching, but this is modified through subsequent acquisitions based on culture. In other words, the individual gets, during his life, knowledge and attitudes formed at inconscient level, informal and collective, through which he is determined to act in a specific way in order to know, discover or just survive. The level of his native intelligence, as well as other genetic inherited qualities help the individual to acquire and use, more or less quick, profound or superficial, better or worse, more or less similar comparing to others, all the rules, symbols and codes, the solutions provided by his own culture (family, school, society). In each individual there is a couple of inextricable factors that position him towards any event, conjuncture, need or desire: native intelligence, on one side, and the practical acquirement, on the other side. This individual couple is actually the primary source of questing and the primary variable of innovation. The intensity of this couple depends on the way in which management succeeds to put into practice structures and resources for the realization of innovative activities and to offer the individual the appropriate incentives in order to transform his creative potential into innovative action. The movement from what represents a potential state toward an action that produces innovative effects can be labeled as capability, operationalization or inertia. This is accomplished either spontaneously, or organized and deliberate, mainly through the innovational strategies of the organization.

Other predisposition variables could be considered those produced by the social capital or economic development. We could also add the existence of a social creative structure, in the sense attributed by Burns (2007), who suggests there is a positive correlation between the individual's preference for diversity and such a structure, named by him « creativogenic social structure ».

Defining and measuring these predisposition variables can be achieved, in a relative way, through their aggregation into a unitary and unique variable and through intensity indexes in correlation with the situation of the organization, on one side, and the elements at the base of each predisposition variable, on the other side. Such a degree of intensity is actually determined by the position of the individual, framed by the culture of the region and that of the belonging organization, towards his need - material, spiritual, curiosity, uniqueness etc.)

b. Situational variables

Express the effects of different circumstances or contexts created by the organization, met or exploited and which manifest themselves through specific influences upon innovativeness, innovation and performance. Thus, one of the situations that can produce

incentives for organizational innovation is the change of option due to revenues, resources available, preferences, prices or basic needs of the organization (demands, a new market orientation, etc.) Another situation can be determined by the diversification of activities as a strategy of the organization, the appearance of new clients or providers, a diversified offer, including through the production of innovation at the provider or contractor, dissatisfaction towards certain products or services etc. In such situations, management has as principal solution innovation, either an internal one (new products or services), or an external one (reorientation of acquisitions towards a new technology, new equipments or new materials or energy supplies). Adaptation or adequacy of the own structures becomes organizational innovation, at a managerial level, this time.

For an organization, the market – the structure of demand and supply - is the most important element intervening through situational variables. Others are different rules of fiscal, law or institutional nature. Qualitative restrictions or standards concerning after sale services can be considered into the same category. Although the position of situation variables can be determined and analyzed, there are no easy ways of quantifying and measuring their influence, except in a small and relative way. We can consider these variables as implicit and manifesting the most important external incitation upon organizational innovation. It would be possible, however, to estimate a general indicator of the complexity and quality of a market (geographically and spatially determined) through which one could then evaluate a certain intensity of the innovation and its performance in correlation with that specific market – just an idea for further reflections. Such a market complexity index could then be related to the innovational performance of organizations from the same area – region or country.

c. Decisional or internal action variables

Constitute the action component of management in terms of innovation. Through these, management can act in order to mobilize and put into practice intrinsic innovational factors, involved through the former described predisposition and situational variables. We can include here three basic decisional variables: motivation, individual autonomy and control through resources. These variables have a conventional and formal character, being the only available ones for the use of management in establishing and exploiting his innovational strategies. An intelligent management and an adaptive, transformational leadership will act through these variables in order to efficiently connect the three dimensions of organizational innovation - the individual (creator and user of innovation), the enterprise (producer and consumer of innovation) and the environment (provider of innovational incentives and circumstances).

3. MOTIVATION

Motivation, as main decisional variable, appears in a double hypostasis, as a factor of innovation, also. On one side, she is a lever for the valorization of individuals' creative attributes, in their quality of employees or collaborators, internal or external. On the other side, she appears or can appear as an internal or external incentive of the management for innovation. The sense usually attributed, also used by us, is that referring to the mobilization of the individual towards a certain task, an innovative activity in our case, in agreement with the aim and objectives of the organization. Thus, motivation becomes a system of levers and incentives through which the individual is determines to accomplish a certain task within the

innovational activities framework and can be intrinsic (producing a positive reaction of the individual towards the specific task, as an intensity of interest, commitment, curiosity, satisfaction, challenge, etc.) or extrinsic (induced through control, the possible manifestation of unpleasant or undesirable situations, etc.). (Amabile, 1988) Innovational motivation is positioned, in principle, at a superior level comparing to the classic, basic motivation, its specific elements coming from the fact that the innovator, the main character and the target at the same time, has a somehow particular set of needs and expectations: information, knowledge, acknowledgement, relationing, resources, support, etc. Comparing to the pyramid of needs proposed by Maslow, for example, the needs and expectations of the potential innovator are rather placed in the area of spiritual satisfactions, even when the individual is not completely satisfied at the material level. A « psychological contract » with his organization can have a significant effect on the innovative investment of the employee, insuring him not only a security plus, but also a certain respect and autonomy. But the security of the job is not as important, for the innovator, as the intellectual challenge, for example (Sauerman H., Cohen W.M., 2009). We can sometimes notice (see V. Bouchard, 2009 ; V. Bouchard and C. Boss, 2006) that an effect of motivation, the personal commitment, is considered a factor, source or invariant for the organizational innovation. Other studies, however (Hornsby, Naffziger et Kuratko, 2009), see personal commitment rather as a product of the satisfaction of accomplishing a task, related to a possible status improvement in the case of success. The perspective of an internal or external reward determines in fact the intensity and force of personal commitment, who becomes a necessary support for organizational innovation.

The motivational factors of innovation are, basically, common levers of motivation: revenue (salary), job security, autonomy, career promotion, personal achievement, personal recognition, social acknowledgement, nature of activity, the quality of peers and managers. For innovation, though, more important become those incentives closer to a spiritual satisfaction: professional and social acknowledgement, getting specific responsibilities, research and information missions, promotion etc. At the revenue level, innovation depends more on the benefit participation programs than on the salary or other remuneration forms. The intensity with which each lever manifests depends also on other factors to be considered by the management when establishing specific innovational strategies – they will be described in the following subsection.

a. Individual autonomy

Is a factor for innovation in a somehow duplicatory way, function of the nature (form) and scope of innovational activities in which the individual is involved. Some innovational activities are by excellence individual, and here autonomy has to be complete, while other innovational activities require a certain team working and collaboration. So, the degree of autonomy is relative and depends on multiple factors, never having a unique determination, not even for the same organization. We can speak about autonomy in relation with an individual or a team, from several points of view: decisional (the freedom to take the appropriate decisions at the innovational unit level); resource type (to dispose of the necessary resources for assumed or compulsory activities); access type (to knowledge and information, relations and administrative structures, internal or external) ; action type (to accomplish innovational activities), etc. The actual autonomy has to be consistent with the innovational unit expectations, given by degree of autonomy for which the innovational performance attains the maximum level. This expectancy depends on the cultural specificity of the individual and not of the area in which the organization functions. Autonomy is a cultur-

al value and each person is used to work under specific autonomy conditions, only so being able to produce innovational performance.

The degree of individual autonomy is determined by two dimensions of the cultural specificity (considering the five dimensions proposed by Hofstede): individualism/colectivism and incertitude control. The assertion we here suggest for the degree of autonomy is the following: *individual creativity as support of innovation gets more productive as the degree of individual autonomy is better adapted to the cultural specificity from the innovator's country of origin.*

b. Control through resources

Is the most efficient decisional factor, but not necessarily the most important. Bu controlling resources, first of all management orients resources allocation and its quality, for different innovative projects. Control is obtained both through the allocation itself and through the follow up of the tasks' and objectives' accomplishment. Control is also a lever when it manifests simply as a material, technical or financial restriction. There is always a correlation between the allocation, pursuit and examination of resources using for innovative projects and the specificity of the project, the dimension of the team and the specificity of expectations as element of the cultural specificity and organizational culture. The advantage of using the resource lever is that one can almost always quantify and measure costs and results – it is definitely the most concrete and explicit variable when designing an innovational strategy for an organization.

4. LOGICAL INTERDEPENDENCE RELATIONS

Relations of special interest for the management of innovation are those concerning the interdependence between innovation factors and the efficiency of activities consacrated to innovation in the organization. As we were able to notice throughout our article, innovation, as a creative process for new products, services, etc. And its performance for the organization are the result of multiple factors connections. Some of these are part of a specific device of the organization, integrated within its structure, referring to leadership, allocated resources and the structural components of innovation (departaments, labs, teams, groups or innovation cells). We have to keep in mind that these devices have to be built, adapted and continuously improved, considering the assumed objectives, available resources and the intimate specific of the organization. Our study intends to emphasize the logical relations between a second group of innovational factors and the innovative capacity of the organization, by taking into consideration what we call the «intrinsic context» of the organization's functioning. The whole analysis and the attached explanations are based on thorough conclusions obtained from intercultural approaches and also those related to the organizational culture. This second group of factors, including motivation, autonomy and control through resources acts upon innovation and its performance in relation with an intrinsic context of the organization, formed by the cultural specificity, the social capital and the organizational culture. Cultural specificity provides behaviors, attitudes and positions towards action and solutions, elements with which the individual arrives into the organization and can not change. He is «culturally prepared» (disposes of a mental program, according to Hofstede) in order to think, act and solve problems in a certain way. Management has to consider this important aspect for all strategies and actions, only in this way being possible to obtain success. In relation with innovation, in order to increase the capacity and performance, the

employee has to be motivated, entailed in a more or less autonomous way and through a more intense or relaxed control, function of the found values of the dimensions of cultural specificity for the area (country, region) to which the employees belong. One can go as far as considering individual differences, without creating tensions through the way entailing in the innovative process is realized.

The social capital is also given, having, however, a bigger availability and accessibility for management. Moreover, it is offered somehow free of charge and does not need huge efforts in order to be valorized.

As far as organizational culture is concerned, the management's action is a constructive one, meant to anchor the organization's aim and objectives with the available resources (including the market), through adaptation and integration of employees function of their cultural determinants. The way in which such connections are made can be logically developed, by estimating the intensities of the influences of cultural innovational variables (motivation, autonomy and resources control), considering the dominants in terms of behavior, attitude and position towards actions and solutions of the employees. To the extent in which different elements of the intrinsic context of the organization determines the individual expectations in terms of motivation, autonomy and resources control, we can put into evidence one of the fundamental connection for the performance of organizational innovation, formulated as it follows:

Innovational behaviors of the individual manifest themselves and produce effects as a function of three elements – the cultural dominants (given for the individual), the social capital (knowledge and facilities provided by the social space of the region) and the organizational culture (the philosophy binding the individual to the organization's aim and objectives).

Through the elements selected within this general statement we can then derive the specific relations between the organizational innovation performance and each of the three active variables of innovation. Each variable has a specific behavior which has to be known and correctly used by management. In the stated conditions, in order to build a system of logical relations for the innovational capacity and performance of an organization we have first to establish the position of each variable. In the first stage of our approach we will have, as endogenous variables (dependent or output variables), the behavioral dimensions related to factors that favor innovation (innovation sources) and upon which we can act through motivation, autonomy and control: personal commitment is the most important. Motivation, autonomy and control through resources will be our exogeneous variables (independent or input variables). The fundamental logical relation for the whole innovation's system of connections will be (1):

$$(1) y_j = f(x_i) + \varepsilon_{ij}, \text{ where}$$

y_j is the degree of commitment ;

x_i is the involvement level of innovation factor i (i taking the values motivation, autonomy, control);

ε_{ij} is the estimator of the deviation between the theoretical and the real value of the expected result, in relation with the variable i considered exogenous.

In a second stage we will establish the dependency between the allocated costs for each factor influencing innovation, factor that here becomes dependent or endogenous variable, and the intensity with which that factor will produce effects upon innovation. In order to

build and estimate the structures for these relations, based on the previous explanations, we postulate the following theoretical hypotheses of the system:

Statement 1: The innovative productivity of an individual or group tends to reach the maximum value when the value of the considered motivational stimulus approaches the expected value; this expected value of a motivational stimulus is culturally determined through the cultural specificity of the origin country or region of the individual or group, as well as through the organizational culture.

Statement 2: The innovative productivity of an individual or group tends to reach the maximum value to the extent in which his autonomy lies between the limits of its cultural expectations; the expected autonomy, in a cultural sense, is given by the level determined through the cultural specificity of the origin country or region of the individual or group, as well as through the organizational culture.

Statement 3: The innovative productivity of an individual or group tends to reach the maximum value to the extent in which the resource allocation for the needed activities respects the expected margins; the allocation expected margins are given by the habit provided by the cultural specificity and organizational culture, in relation with the maximum admitted error for the estimations concerning the allocation of resources for a specific task.

Statement 4: The innovative productivity of an individual or group tends to reach the maximum value when motivation, autonomy and resources allocation approach their cultural determined levels.

When these statements are respected, we can build and estimate a relation for each of the three variables, now endogenous, and then an integrative general relation. Considering now the result of the innovation activity as endogenous variable and the influence factors (decisional variables of innovation) as exogenous variables, the general integrative relation could have the form (2):

$$(2) Y = f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) + E, \text{ where}$$

Y is the total expected result for the innovative activity (benefit, sales values, etc.),

x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n are levels of costs allocation for each of the considered exogenous variables,

E is the total residual between the theoretical and the correct values of the expected result.

In principle, $Y = \sum y_i + \sum \varepsilon_{ij}$, but in reality the theoretical result comes from the aggregation of partial functions and not as a simple summation.

The practical application of this reasoning needs very good estimations for all involved elements: factors' costs, expected effects. The best way of measuring the effect produced by an innovative activity is to estimate the revenue possible to be obtained through its application into practice. (Ashish Sood, Gerard J. Tellis, apud Michael F. Wolf, 2008) Although correct as an idea, as a practical estimation there are many difficulties, and so the estimation of costs, as well as results for innovation remains a problem with approximated solutions.

5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

Our study emphasized three basic ideas. The first one concerns the necessity to identify the factors of organizational innovation and the performance of such activities in relation with their position towards the expected results. In this way we were able to logically organ-

ize those factors into predisposition ones (individually or collectively given, unformal and unconscious, situational ones (internal and external incentives for innovation) and decisional ones (action factors). To this system we can add, if such be the case, a fourth group, that of laws, rules and standards, public policies or administrative decisions with impact upon the organization.

The second idea of our study is related to the identification, explanation and quantification of the connections based on which innovative mechanisms of the organization function. In this respect we introduced a specific construct, named “intrinsic context of the organizational innovation”, in order to find not only a reasonable, but also correct explanation of the huge differences between organizations situated in different cultural regions and having different organizational cultures. Cultural specificity, social capital and organizational culture are reference elements for this intrinsic context, acting in favor of or inhibiting the innovational potential and performance of an organization. Based on results provided by intercultural and organizational cultural studies, we were able to derive a general statement concerning the relation between the elements of the intrinsic context and the innovative behavior of an individual or group. Of course, besides the logical arguments presented, supplementary testing and validation procedures are necessary.

The third important idea resulting from our approach is that there are, and can be described, explained and estimated formal logical relations among the three dimensions of organizational innovation: intrinsic context, organizational devices (decisional factors of innovation, mainly) and the organizational innovation potential and performance. Four statements lie at the basis of those relations estimation, and they need to be tested for validation. If validated, they could be integrated into a general theory of organizational innovation.

References

- [1] Almeida, P., Phene, A., Subsidiaries and knowledge creation: the influence of the MNC and host country on innovation, *Strategic Management Journal* n.25/2004, pp. 847 - 864.
- [2] Amabile, T.M., A model of creativity and innovation in organizations, *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 10/1988, pp 123 - 167, JAI Press.
- [3] Benoit-Cervantes G., *La boîte à outils de l'innovation*, Dunod, 2008.
- [4] Bouchard, V., Bos, C., Dispositifs intrapreneuriaux et créativité organisationnelle. Une conception tronquée?, *Revue Française de Gestion*, Vol. 32, No. 161/2006, pp. 95 - 109.
- [5] Bouchard, V., *Intrapreneuriat. Innovation et Croissance*, Dunod, 2009.
- [6] Burns, D.J., Toward an explanation model of innovation behavior, *Journal of Business and Psychology*, vol.21, n. 4/2007, pp. 461 - 488.
- [7] Gumusluoglu, L., Ilsev, A., Transformational Leadership and Organizational Innovation: The Roles of Internal and External Support for Innovation, *The Journal of Product Innovation Management*, n.26/2009, pp. 264 - 277.
- [8] Harmancioglu, N., Droge, C., Calantone, R.J., Theoretical lenses and domain definition in innovation research, *European Journal of Marketing* vol. 43, n.1/2/2009, pp. 229 - 263.
- [9] Matheus, T., A conceptual model and illustrative research framework for inter-organizational innovation, *Management Research News*, vol. 32, n. 3, 2009, pp. 254 - 271.
- [10] Sauerman, H., Cohen, W.M., Motivation to Innovate. R&D employees who find intellectual challenge motivating tend to be more productive, *MIT Sloan Management Review*, vol.50, n. 3/2009.